

On Universal Features for High-Dimensional Learning and Inference

Shao-Lun Huang, *Member, IEEE*, Anuran Makur, *Student Member, IEEE*,
Gregory W. Wornell, *Fellow, IEEE*, and Lizhong Zheng *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—We consider the problem of identifying universal low-dimensional features from high-dimensional data for inference tasks in settings involving learning. For such problems, we introduce natural notions of universality and we show a local equivalence among them. Our analysis is naturally expressed via information geometry, and represents a conceptually and computationally useful analysis. The development reveals the complementary roles of the singular value decomposition, Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation, the canonical correlation and principle component analyses of Hotelling and Pearson, Tishby’s information bottleneck, Wyner’s common information, Ky Fan k -norms, and Brieman and Friedman’s alternating conditional expectations algorithm. We further illustrate how this framework facilitates understanding and optimizing aspects of learning systems, including multinomial logistic (softmax) regression and the associated neural network architecture, matrix factorization methods for collaborative filtering and other applications, rank-constrained multivariate linear regression, and forms of semi-supervised learning.

Index Terms—machine learning, statistical inference, sufficient statistics, information geometry, logistic regression, neural networks, information bottleneck, maximal correlation, alternating conditional expectations algorithm, canonical correlation analysis, principal component analysis, common information, Ky Fan k -norm, matrix factorization, collaborative filtering, reduced-rank linear regression.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN many contemporary and emerging applications of machine learning and statistical inference, the phenomena of interest are characterized by variables defined over large alphabets. Familiar examples, among many others, include the relationship between individual consumers and products that may be of interest to them, and the relationship between images and text in a visual search setting. In such scenarios, not only are the data high-dimensional, but the collection of possible inference tasks is also large. At the same time, training data available to learn the underlying relationships is often quite limited relative to its dimensionality.

Manuscript received September 2019. This work was supported in part by NSF under Grant Nos. CCF-1717610 and CCF-1816209. This work was presented in part at the Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT-2017) [1], Aachen, Germany, June 2017, the Inform. Theory and Appl. Workshop (ITA-2018), Feb. 2018 [2], and at the Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW-2018), Guangzhou, China, Nov. 2018 [3].

S-L. Huang is with the Data Science and Information Technology Research Center, Tsinghua-Berkeley Shenzhen Institute, Shenzhen, China (Email: shaolun.huang@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn). A. Makur, G. W. Wornell, and L. Zheng are with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139. (Email: {a_makur, lizhong, gww}@mit.edu).

From this perspective, for a given level of training data, there is a need to understand which inference tasks can be most effectively carried out, and, in turn, what features of the data are most relevant to them. As we develop in this paper, a natural framework for addressing such questions rather broadly can be traced back to the work of Hirschfeld [4].

As we will develop, the problem can be equivalently expressed as one of “universal” feature extraction, and show that diverse notions of such universality lead to precisely the same features. Our development emphasizes an information theoretic treatment of the associated questions, and in particular we adopt a convenient “local” information geometric analysis that provides useful insight. In turn, as we describe, the interpretation of such features in terms of a suitable singular value decomposition (SVD) facilitates their computation.

An outline of the paper, and summary of its key contributions, is as follows:

Section II: As a foundation, and focusing on finite alphabets, we describe the modal decomposition of bivariate distributions into constituent features that arises out of Hirschfeld’s analysis, developing it in terms of the SVD of a particular matrix characterization—termed the canonical dependence matrix (CDM)—of the distribution and the associated conditional expectation operator.

Section III: We describe the variational characterization of the modal decomposition in terms of standard SVD analysis, as further developed by Gebelein and Rényi, from which we obtain the resulting Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi (HGR) maximal correlation as the Ky Fan k -norm of the CDM. Via this analysis, the features defining the modal decomposition are obtained via an optimization.

Section IV: As a further foundation, we describe the local geometric analysis on the probability simplex that is associated with χ^2 -divergence. In the resulting Euclidean information space, distributions are represented as information vectors, and features as feature vectors, and we develop an equivalence between them via log-likelihoods. Via this geometry, we develop a suitable notion of weakly dependent variables for which we obtain a decomposition of mutual information and through which we interpret truncated modal decompositions as “information efficient.” Additionally, we characterize the error exponents in local decision making in terms of (mismatched) feature projections.

Section V: Via the local analysis, we develop several different characterizations of universal features, all of which coincide with the features that arise in the modal decomposition of the joint distribution. As an initial observation, we note

that features characterize a locally exponential family for the conditional distributions. For the remaining characterizations, we introduce latent local attribute variables. In particular: Section **V-C** obtains the modal decomposition features as the solution to a game between system designer and nature, where the system designer must choose features to detect attributes that nature chooses at random after these features are fixed; Section **V-D** obtains the same features as the solution to a cooperative game in which the system designer and nature seek the most detectable attributes and locally sufficient statistics for their detection; Section **V-E** obtains the same features as the solution to a local symmetric version of Tishby’s information bottleneck problem that seeks mutual information maximizing attributes and the associated locally sufficient statistics; and Section **V-F** obtains superpositions of these same features arise as locally sufficient statistics in the solution to a local version of Wyner’s common information, which using variational analysis we show specializes to the nuclear (trace) norm of the CDM. In turn, Section **V-G** develops Markov structure relating the resulting common information variable to the attributes optimizing the information bottleneck.

Section VI: We discuss the estimation of universal features from training data, starting from the statistical interpretation of the orthogonal iteration method of computing an SVD as the alternating conditional expectations (ACE) algorithm of Breiman and Friedman. We include the relevant analysis of sample complexity of feature recovery, which supports the empirical observation that in practice the dominant modes can typically be recovered with comparatively little training data.

Section VII: We use the context of collaborative filtering to develop matrix factorization perspectives associated with the modal decomposition. In particular, we formulate the problem of collaborative filtering as one of Bayesian attribute matching, and find that the optimum such filtering is achieved using a truncated modal decomposition, which corresponds to the optimum low-rank approximation to the empirical CDM, which differs from some other commonly used factorizations.

Section VIII: We analyze a local version of multinomial logistic regression; specifically, under weak dependence we show that softmax weights correspond to (normalized) conditional expectations, and that the resulting discriminative model matches, to first order, that of a Gaussian mixture without any Gaussian assumptions in the analysis. We further show that the optimizing features are, again, those of the modal decomposition, in which case the associated softmax weights are proportional to the “dual” features of the decomposition. Our analysis additionally quantifies the performance limits in this regime in terms of the associated singular values. As we discuss, this analysis implies a relationship between the ACE algorithm and methods used to train at least some classes of neural networks.

Section IX: We provide a treatment for Gaussian variables that parallels the preceding one for finite alphabets. To start, we construct the modal decomposition of covariance via the SVD of the canonical correlation matrix (CCM), and obtain the familiar formulation of Hotelling’s canonical correlation analysis (CCA) via the corresponding variational characterization. We further define a local Gaussian geometry,

the associated notion of weakly correlated variables, and construct a local modal decomposition of joint distributions of such variables in terms of the CCA features, which are linear. Via Gaussian attribute models, we then show these CCA features arise in the solution to universal feature problem formulations. Section **IX-H** shows they arise in the solution of an attribute estimation game in which nature chooses the attribute at random after the system designer chooses the linear features from which it will be estimated using a minimum mean-square error (MMSE) criterion, and Section **IX-I** shows they arise in the solution of the corresponding cooperative MMSE attribute estimation game; these analyses are global. Section **IX-J**, shows the CCA features arising in the solution to the local symmetric version of Tishby’s Gaussian information bottleneck problem, and Section **IX-K** describes how superpositions of CCA features arise in the solution to the (global) Gaussian version of Wyner’s common information problem; locally this common information is given by the nuclear norm of the CCM. Section **IX-L** describes the Markov relationships between the dominant attributes in the solution to the information bottleneck and the common information variable. Section **IX-M** interprets the features arising out of Pearson’s principal component analysis (PCA) as a special case of the preceding analyses in which the underlying variables are simultaneously diagonalizable, and Section **IX-N** discusses the estimation of CCA features, interpreting the associated SVD computation as a version of the ACE algorithm in which the features are linearly constrained. Section **IX-O** develops Gaussian attribute matching, and interprets the resulting procedure as one of optimum rank-constrained linear estimation, and Section **IX-P** develops a form of rank-constrained linear regression as the counterpart to softmax regression, and distinguishing it from classical formulations.

Section X: We provide a limited discussion of the application of universal feature analysis to problems beyond the realm of fully supervised learning. Section **X-A** describes the problem of “indirect” learning in which to carry out clustering on data, relationships to secondary data are exploited to define an appropriate measure of distance. We show, in particular, that our softmax analysis implies a natural procedure in which Gaussian mixture modeling is applied to the dominant features obtained from the modal decomposition with respect to the secondary data. By contrast, Section **X-B** discusses the problem of partially-supervised learning in which features are learned in an unsupervised manner, and labeled data is used only to obtain the classifier based on the resulting features. As an illustration of the use of universal features in this setting, an application to handwritten digit recognition using the MNIST database is described in which the relevant features are obtained via the common information between subblocks of MNIST images. A simple implementation achieves an error probability of 3.02%, close to that of a 3-layer neural net (with 300+100 hidden nodes), which yields an error probability of 3.05%.

Finally, Section **XI** contains some concluding remarks.

II. THE MODAL DECOMPOSITION OF JOINT DISTRIBUTIONS

Let X and Y denote random variables over finite alphabets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively, with joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$. Without loss of generality we assume throughout that the marginals satisfy $P_X(x) > 0$ and $P_Y(y) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, since otherwise the associated symbols may be removed from their respective alphabets. Accordingly, we let $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ denote the set of all such distributions.

For an arbitrary feature¹ $f: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, let $g: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be the feature induced by f through conditional expectation with respect to $P_{X|Y}(\cdot|y)$, i.e.,

$$g(y) = \mathbb{E}[f(X) | Y = y], \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (1)$$

Then we can express (1) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} g(y) &= \frac{1}{P_Y(y)} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X,Y}(x,y) f(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sqrt{P_X(x)} f(x), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\xi^Y(y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} B(x,y) \xi^X(x) \quad (2)$$

where we have defined

$$B(x,y) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$\xi^X(x) \triangleq \sqrt{P_X(x)} f(x) \quad (4a)$$

$$\xi^Y(y) \triangleq \sqrt{P_Y(y)} g(y) \quad (4b)$$

Clearly ξ^X and ξ^Y in (4) are equivalent representations for f and g respectively. But B in (3) is also an equivalent representation for $P_{X,Y}$, as we will verify shortly. Moreover, (2) expresses that B has an interpretation as a conditional expectation operator, and thus is equivalent to $P_{X|Y}$.

Next consider an arbitrary feature $\tilde{g}: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, and let $\tilde{f}: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be the feature induced by \tilde{g} through conditional expectation with respect to $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$, i.e.

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(Y) | X = x]. \quad (5)$$

Then using the notation (3) and that analogous to (4), i.e.,

$$\tilde{\xi}^X(x) = \sqrt{P_X(x)} \tilde{f}(x) \quad (6a)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}^Y(y) = \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \tilde{g}(y), \quad (6b)$$

we can express (5) in the form

$$\tilde{\xi}^X(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \underbrace{\tilde{B}(y,x)}_{\triangleq B(x,y)} \tilde{\xi}^Y(y), \quad (7)$$

where \tilde{B} is the adjoint of B . Likewise \tilde{B} is an equivalent representation for $P_{X,Y}$ and, in turn, $P_{Y|X}$.

¹The literature sometimes refers to these as embeddings, referring to functions of embeddings as features. However, our treatment does not require this distinction.

It is convenient to represent B as a matrix. Specifically, we let \mathbf{B} denote the $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ matrix whose (y,x) th entry is $B(x,y)$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{B} = \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{Y,X} \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right]^{-1}, \quad (8)$$

where $\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X}$ denotes a $|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ diagonal matrix whose x th diagonal entry is $\sqrt{P_X(x)}$, where $\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y}$ denotes a $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ diagonal matrix whose y th diagonal entry is $\sqrt{P_Y(y)}$, and where $\mathbf{P}_{Y,X}$ denotes the $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ matrix whose (y,x) th entry is $P_{Y,X}(y,x)$. In [5], \mathbf{B} is referred to as the *divergence transfer matrix (DTM)* associated with $P_{X,Y}$.²

Although for convenience we will generally restrict our attention to the case in which the marginals P_X and P_Y are strictly positive, note that extending the DTM definition to arbitrary nonnegative marginals is straightforward. In particular, it suffices make the x' th column of \mathbf{B} all zeros if $P_X(x') = 0$ for some $x' \in \mathcal{X}$, and, similarly, the y' th row of \mathbf{B} all zeros if $P_Y(y') = 0$ for some $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, i.e., (3) is extended via

$$B(x,y) \triangleq 0, \quad \text{all } x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y} \text{ such that} \\ P_X(x) = 0 \text{ or } P_Y(y) = 0. \quad (9)$$

Useful alternate forms of B and \tilde{B} are [cf. (3)]

$$B(x,y) = \frac{P_{Y|X}(y|x)}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sqrt{P_X(x)}$$

$$\tilde{B}(x,y) = \frac{P_{X|Y}(x|y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \sqrt{P_Y(y)},$$

from which we obtain the alternate matrix representations

$$\mathbf{B} = \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{Y|X} \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right] \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{B}^T = \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{X|Y} \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right], \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_{Y|X}$ denotes the $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ left (column) stochastic transition probability matrix whose (y,x) th entry is $P_{Y|X}(y|x)$, and where, similarly, $\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}$ denotes the $|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ left (column) stochastic transition probability matrix whose (x,y) th entry is $P_{X|Y}(x|y)$.

The SVD of \mathbf{B} takes the form

$$\mathbf{B} = \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \sigma_i \psi_i^Y (\psi_i^X)^T \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{i.e., } B(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \sigma_i \psi_i^X(x) \psi_i^Y(y),$$

with

$$K \triangleq \min\{|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}|\}, \quad (12b)$$

where σ_i denotes the i th singular value and where ψ_i^Y and ψ_i^X are the corresponding left and right singular vectors, and where by convention we order the singular values according to

$$\sigma_0 \geq \sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{K-1}. \quad (12c)$$

²The work of [5], building on [6], focuses on a communication network setting. Subsequently, [7] recognizes connections to learning that motivate aspects of, e.g., the present paper.

The following proposition establishes that B (and thus \bar{B}) is a contractive operator, a proof of which is provided in Appendix II-A.

Proposition 1: For \mathbf{B} defined via (8) we have

$$\|\mathbf{B}\|_s = 1, \quad (13)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_s$ denotes the spectral (i.e., operator) norm of its matrix argument.³ Moreover, in (12), the left and right singular vectors ψ_0^X and ψ_0^Y associated with singular value

$$\sigma_0 = 1 \quad (14a)$$

have elements

$$\psi_0^X(x) \triangleq \sqrt{P_X(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_0^Y(y) \triangleq \sqrt{P_Y(y)}. \quad (14b)$$

It follows immediately from the second part of Proposition 1 that \mathbf{B} is an equivalent representation for $P_{X,Y}$. Indeed, given \mathbf{B} , we can compute the singular vectors ψ_0^X and ψ_0^Y , from which we obtain P_X and P_Y via (14b). In turn, using these marginals together with \mathbf{B} , whose (y,x) th entry is (3), yields $P_{X,Y}(x,y) = B(x,y) \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}$. We provide a more complete characterization of the class of DTMs, i.e., $\mathbf{B}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})$ in Appendix II-B. In so doing, we extend the equivalence result above, establishing the continuity of bijective mapping between $P_{X,Y}$ and \mathbf{B} .

The SVD (12) provides a key expansion of the joint distribution $P_{X,Y}(x,y)$. In particular, we have the following result.

Proposition 2: Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} denote finite alphabets. Then for any $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, there exist features $f_i^* : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g_i^* : \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, such that

$$P_{X,Y}(x,y) = P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right], \quad (15)$$

where $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{K-1}$ are as defined in (12), and where⁴

$$\mathbb{E}[f_i^*(X)] = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, K-1\} \quad (16a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[g_i^*(Y)] = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, K-1\} \quad (16b)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[f_i^*(X) f_j^*(X)] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, K-1\} \quad (16c)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[g_i^*(Y) g_j^*(Y)] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}. \quad (16d)$$

Moreover, f_i^* and g_i^* are related to the singular vectors in (12) according to

$$f_i^*(x) \triangleq \frac{\psi_i^X(x)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1 \quad (17a)$$

$$g_i^*(y) \triangleq \frac{\psi_i^Y(y)}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1, \quad (17b)$$

³The spectral norm of an arbitrary matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_s = \max_i \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}),$$

where $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the i th singular value of \mathbf{A} .

⁴We use the Kronecker notation

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathcal{A} \text{ is true} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\psi_i^X(x)$ and $\psi_i^Y(y)$ are the x th and y th entries of ψ_i^X and ψ_i^Y , respectively.

Proof: It suffices to note that

$$B(x,y) = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \quad (18)$$

$$= \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i \psi_i^X(x) \psi_i^Y(y) \quad (19)$$

$$= \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)} + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i \sqrt{P_X(x)} f_i^*(x) \sqrt{P_Y(y)} g_i^*(y) \quad (20)$$

$$= \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right], \quad (21)$$

where to obtain (18) we have used (3), to obtain (19) we have used (12a) with (14), and where to obtain (20) we have made the choices (17), which we note satisfy the constraints (16). In particular, (16a) follows from the fact that ψ_0^X and ψ_i^X are orthogonal, for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, and, likewise, (16b) follows from the fact that ψ_0^Y and ψ_i^Y are orthogonal, for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$. Finally, (16c) and (16d) follow from the remaining orthogonality relations among the ψ_i^X and ψ_i^Y , respectively. ■

The expansion (15) in Proposition 2 effectively forms the basis of what is sometimes referred to as ‘‘correspondence analysis,’’ which was originated by Hirschfeld [4] and sought to extend the applicability of the methods of Pearson [8], [9]. Such analysis was later independently developed and further extended by Lancaster [10], [11], and yet another independent development began with the work of Gebelein [12], upon which the work of Rényi [13] was based.⁵ This analysis was reinvented again and further developed in [14], [15], which established the correspondence analysis terminology, and further interpreted in [16], [17].⁶ Subsequent developments appear in [19], [20], and more recent expositions and developments include [21], [22], and the practical guide [23].

The features (17) in (15) can be interpreted as suitably normalized sufficient statistics for inferences involving X and Y . Indeed, since

$$P_{Y|X}(y|x) = P_Y(y) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right] \quad (22a)$$

$$P_{X|Y}(x|y) = P_X(x) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right], \quad (22b)$$

it follows that⁷

$$f_*^{K-1}(x) \triangleq (f_1^*(x), \dots, f_{K-1}^*(x))$$

⁵The associated analysis was expressed in terms of eigenvalue decompositions of $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}$ instead of the SVD of \mathbf{B} , since the latter was not widely-used at the time.

⁶This terminology includes that of ‘‘inertia,’’ which is also adopted in a variety of works, an example of which is [18], which refers to ‘‘principal inertial components.’’

⁷Throughout, we use the convenient sequence notation $a^l \triangleq (a_1, \dots, a_l)$.

is a sufficient statistic for inferences about y based on x , i.e., we have the Markov structure

$$Y \leftrightarrow f_*^{K-1}(X) \leftrightarrow X.$$

Analogously,

$$g_*^{K-1}(y) \triangleq (g_1^*(y), \dots, g_{K-1}^*(y))$$

is a sufficient statistic for inferences about x based on y , i.e., we have the Markov structure

$$X \leftrightarrow g_*^{K-1}(Y) \leftrightarrow Y.$$

Combining these results, we have

$$X \leftrightarrow (f_*^{K-1}(X), g_*^{K-1}(Y)) \leftrightarrow Y. \quad (23)$$

Additionally, note that Proposition 2 has additional consequences that are direct result of its connection to the SVD of \mathbf{B} . In particular, since the left and right singular vectors are related according to

$$\sigma_i \psi_i^Y = \mathbf{B} \psi_i^X \quad (24a)$$

$$\sigma_i \psi_i^X = \mathbf{B}^T \psi_i^Y, \quad (24b)$$

it follows from (17) that the f_i^* and g_i^* are related according to

$$\sigma_i f_i^*(x) = \mathbb{E} [g_i^*(Y) | X = x] \quad (25a)$$

$$\sigma_i g_i^*(y) = \mathbb{E} [f_i^*(X) | Y = y], \quad (25b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K - 1$. Moreover, in turn, we obtain, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, K - 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [f_i^*(X) g_j^*(Y)] &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [f_i^*(X) | Y = y] g_j^*(Y)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\sigma_i g_i^*(Y) g_j^*(Y)] \\ &= \sigma_i \mathbb{1}_{i=j}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The Canonical Dependence Matrix

In our development, it is convenient for our analysis to remove the zeroth mode from \mathbf{B} . We do this by defining the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ whose (y, x) th entry is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}(y, x) &\triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y) - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i \psi_i^X(x) \psi_i^Y(y), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where in the last equality we have expressed its SVD in terms of that for \mathbf{B} , and from which we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ has singular values

$$1 \geq \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{K-1} \geq \sigma_K = 0,$$

where we have defined the zero singular value σ_K as a notational convenience. Note that we can interpret \tilde{B} as the conditional expectation operator $\mathbb{E}[\cdot | Y = y]$ restricted to the (sub)space of zero-mean features $f(X)$, which produces a

corresponding zero-mean features $g(Y)$. We refer to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, which we can equivalently write in the form⁸

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \left[\mathbf{P}_{Y|X} - \mathbf{P}_Y \mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}^T \right] \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right] \quad (28)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i \psi_i^Y (\psi_i^X)^T, \quad (29)$$

as the *canonical dependence matrix (CDM)*. Some additional perspectives on this representation of the conditional expectation operator—and thus the particular choice of SVD—are provided in Appendix II-C.

It is worth emphasizing that restricting attention to features of X and Y that are zero-mean is without loss of generality, as there is an invertible mapping between any set of features and their zero-mean counterparts. As a result, we will generally impose this constraint.

III. VARIATIONAL CHARACTERIZATION OF THE MODAL DECOMPOSITION

The feature functions (f_i^*, g_i^*) , $i = 1, 2, \dots, K - 1$, in Proposition 2 can be equivalently obtained from a variational characterization, via which the key connection to the correlation maximization problem considered (in turn) by Hirschfeld [4], Gebelein [12], and Rényi [13] is obtained, as we now develop.

A. Variational Characterizations of the SVD

We begin by summarizing some classical variational results on the SVD that will be useful in our analysis. First, we have the following lemma (see, e.g., [24, Corollary 4.3.39, p. 248]).

Lemma 3: Given an arbitrary $k_1 \times k_2$ matrix \mathbf{A} and any $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$, we have⁹

$$\max_{\{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2 \times k} : \mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{I}\}} \|\mathbf{A} \mathbf{M}\|_{\text{F}}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A})^2, \quad (30)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{F}}$ denotes the Frobenius norm of its matrix argument,¹⁰ and where $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{k_1, k_2\}}(\mathbf{A})$ denote the (ordered) singular values of \mathbf{A} . Moreover, the maximum in (30) is achieved by

$$\mathbf{M} = [\psi_1(\mathbf{A}) \quad \dots \quad \psi_k(\mathbf{A})], \quad (31)$$

with $\psi_i(\mathbf{A})$ denoting the right singular vector of \mathbf{A} corresponding to $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$, for $i = 1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}$.

Second, the following lemma, essentially due to von Neumann (see, e.g., [25] [24, Theorem 7.4.1.1]), will also be useful in our analysis, and can be obtained using Lemma 3 in conjunction with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

⁸As first used in Appendix II-A, we use $\mathbf{1}$ to denote a vector of all ones (with dimension implied by context).

⁹We use \mathbf{I} to denote the identity matrix of appropriate dimension.

¹⁰Specifically, the Frobenius norm of an arbitrary matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\text{F}} \triangleq \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}) = \sum_i \sigma_i(\mathbf{A})^2,$$

where $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the i th singular value of \mathbf{A} , and where $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the trace of its matrix argument.

Lemma 4: Given an arbitrary $k_1 \times k_2$ matrix \mathbf{A} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\substack{\mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k}, \mathbf{M}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_2 \times k}: \\ \mathbf{M}_1^T \mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{M}_2^T \mathbf{M}_2 = \mathbf{I}}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_1^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{M}_2) \\ = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

with $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{k_1, k_2\}}(\mathbf{A})$ denoting the (ordered) singular values of \mathbf{A} . Moreover, the maximum in (32) is achieved by

$$\mathbf{M}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^{(j)}(\mathbf{A}) & \dots & \psi_k^{(j)}(\mathbf{A}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (33)$$

with $\psi_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\psi_i^{(2)}(\mathbf{A})$ denoting the left and right singular vectors, respectively, of \mathbf{A} corresponding to $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$, for $i = 1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}$.

B. Maximal Correlation Features

We now have the following result, which relates the modal decomposition and correlation maximization, and reveals the role of the Ky Fan k -norms (as defined in, e.g., [24, Section 7.4.8]) in the analysis.

Proposition 5: For any $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, the dominant k features (17) in Proposition 2, i.e.,

$$f_*^k \triangleq (f_1^*, \dots, f_k^*) \quad \text{and} \quad g_*^k \triangleq (g_1^*, \dots, g_k^*), \quad (34)$$

are obtained via¹¹

$$\begin{aligned} (f_*^k, g_*^k) &= \arg \min_{(f^k, g^k) \in \mathcal{F}_k \times \mathcal{G}_k} \mathbb{E}[\|f^k(X) - g^k(Y)\|^2] \\ &= \arg \max_{(f^k, g^k) \in \mathcal{F}_k \times \mathcal{G}_k} \sigma(f^k, g^k), \end{aligned} \quad (35a)$$

where

$$\sigma(f^k, g^k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[(f^k(X))^T g^k(Y) \right] \quad (35b)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_k \triangleq \left\{ f^k : \mathbb{E} \left[f^k(X) \right] = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[f^k(X) f^k(X)^T \right] = \mathbf{I} \right\} \quad (35c)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_k \triangleq \left\{ g^k : \mathbb{E} \left[g^k(Y) \right] = \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[g^k(Y) g^k(Y)^T \right] = \mathbf{I} \right\}. \quad (35d)$$

Moreover, the resulting maximal correlation is

$$\sigma(f_*^k, g_*^k) = \mathbb{E} \left[(f_*^k(X))^T g_*^k(Y) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i, \quad (36)$$

which we note is the Ky Fan k -norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$.¹²

The quantity (36) is often referred to as the Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi (HGR) maximal correlation associated with the distribution $P_{X,Y}$ (particularly in the special case $k=1$).

¹¹We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the Euclidean norm, i.e., $\|a^k\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2}$ for any k and a^k .

¹²We use $\|\cdot\|_{(k)}$ to denote the Ky Fan k -norm of its argument, i.e., for $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$,

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_{(k)} \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}), \quad (37)$$

with $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$ denoting its singular values.

Proof: First, note that the constraints (35c) and (35d) express (16) in Proposition 2. Next, to facilitate our development, we define [cf. (4)]

$$\xi_i^X(x) \triangleq \sqrt{P_X(x)} f_i(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{X} \quad (38a)$$

$$\xi_i^Y(y) \triangleq \sqrt{P_Y(y)} g_i(y), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (38b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K$. We refer to ξ_i^X and ξ_i^Y as the *feature vectors* associated with the feature functions f_i and g_i , respectively, and we further use ξ_i^X and ξ_i^Y to denote column vectors whose x th and y th entries are $\xi_i^X(x)$ and $\xi_i^Y(y)$, respectively. Then

$$\sigma(f^k, g^k) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(f_i, g_i) \quad (39a)$$

with

$$\sigma_i(f_i, g_i) = \mathbb{E} [f_i(X) g_i(Y)] = (\xi_i^Y)^T \mathbf{B} \xi_i^X = (\xi_i^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \xi_i^X, \quad (39b)$$

where the last equality in (39b) follows from the mean constraints in (35c) and (35d), which imply, for $i = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sqrt{P_X(x)} \xi_i^X(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \xi_i^Y(y) = 0.$$

In turn, from (39) we have

$$\sigma(f^k, g^k) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\xi_i^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \xi_i^X = \text{tr} \left((\Xi^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X \right), \quad (40)$$

where

$$\Xi^X \triangleq [\xi_1^X \quad \dots \quad \xi_k^X] \quad (41a)$$

$$\Xi^Y \triangleq [\xi_1^Y \quad \dots \quad \xi_k^Y]. \quad (41b)$$

Moreover, from the covariance constraints in (35c) and (35d) we have

$$(\Xi^X)^T \Xi^X = (\Xi^Y)^T \Xi^Y = \mathbf{I}. \quad (42)$$

Hence, applying Lemma 4 we immediately obtain that (40) is maximized subject to (42) by the feature vectors

$$\Xi^X = \Psi_{(k)}^X \quad (43a)$$

$$\Xi^Y = \Psi_{(k)}^Y, \quad (43b)$$

with

$$\Psi_{(k)}^X \triangleq [\psi_1^X \quad \dots \quad \psi_k^X] \quad (44a)$$

$$\Psi_{(k)}^Y \triangleq [\psi_1^Y \quad \dots \quad \psi_k^Y], \quad (44b)$$

whence f_i^* and g_i^* as given by (17), for $i = 1, \dots, k$. The final statement of the proposition follows immediately from the properties of the SVD; specifically,

$$(\psi_i^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \psi_i^X = \sigma_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad \blacksquare$$

IV. LOCAL INFORMATION GEOMETRY

Further interpretation of the features f_*^{K-1} and g_*^{K-1} arising out of the modal decomposition of Section II benefits from developing the underlying inner product space. More specifically, a local analysis of information geometry leads to key information-theoretic interpretations of (17) as *universal* features. Accordingly, we begin with a foundation for such analysis.

A. Basic Concepts, Terminology, and Notation

Let $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ denote the space of distributions on some finite alphabet \mathcal{Z} , where $|\mathcal{Z}| < \infty$, and let $\text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ denote the relative interior of $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, i.e., the subset of strictly positive distributions.

Definition 6 (ϵ -Neighborhood): For a given $\epsilon > 0$, the ϵ -neighborhood of a reference distribution $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ is the set of distributions in a (Neyman) χ^2 -divergence [26] ball of radius ϵ^2 about P_0 , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0) \triangleq \left\{ P' \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}} : D_{\chi^2}(P' \| P_0) \leq \epsilon^2 \right\}, \quad (45a)$$

where for $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $Q \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$,

$$D_{\chi^2}(P \| Q) \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{(Q(z) - P(z))^2}{Q(z)}. \quad (45b)$$

In the sequel, we assume that all the distributions of interest, including all empirical distributions that may be observed, lie in such an ϵ -neighborhood of the prescribed P_0 . While we don't restrict ϵ to be small, most of our information-theoretic insights arise from the asymptotics corresponding to $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

An equivalent representation for a distribution $P \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ is in terms of its *information vector*

$$\phi(z) \triangleq \frac{P(z) - P_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)}}, \quad (46)$$

which we note satisfies

$$\|\phi\| \leq 1, \quad (47)$$

with $\|\cdot\|$ denoting the usual Euclidean norm.¹³ We will sometimes find it convenient to express $\phi = \phi(\cdot)$ as a $|\mathcal{Z}|$ -dimensional column vector ϕ , according to some arbitrarily chosen but fixed ordering of the elements of \mathcal{Z} .

Hence, we can equivalently interpret the $(|\mathcal{Z}| - 1)$ -dimensional neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ as the set of distributions whose corresponding information vectors lie in the unit Euclidean ball about the origin. Note that since

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sqrt{P_0(z)} \phi(z) = 0, \quad (48)$$

the $(|\mathcal{Z}| - 1)$ -dimensional vector space subset

$$\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0) = \left\{ \phi : \langle \sqrt{P_0}, \phi \rangle = 0 \text{ and } \|\phi\| \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (49)$$

with $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denoting the usual Euclidean inner product,¹⁴ characterizes all the possible information vectors: $\phi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ if and only if $P \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$, for all ϵ sufficiently small. It is convenient to refer to $\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ as *information space*. When the

¹³Specifically, for ϕ defined on \mathcal{Z} ,

$$\|\phi\|^2 \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \phi(z)^2.$$

¹⁴Specifically, for ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 defined on \mathcal{Z} ,

$$\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \phi_1(z) \phi_2(z).$$

relevant reference distribution P_0 is clear from context we will generally omit it from our notation, and simply use $\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ to refer to this space.

For a feature function h , we let

$$\xi(z) \triangleq \sqrt{P_0(z)} h(z) \quad (50)$$

denote its associated feature vector. As with information vectors, we will sometimes find it convenient to express $\xi = \xi(\cdot)$ as a $|\mathcal{Z}|$ -dimensional column vector ξ , according to the chosen ordering of the elements of \mathcal{Z} . Moreover, there is an effective equivalence of feature vectors and information vectors, which the following proposition establishes. A proof is provided in Appendix IV-A.

Proposition 7: Let $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ be an arbitrary reference distribution, and ϵ a positive constant. Then for any distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$,

$$h(z) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{P(z)}{P_0(z)} - 1 \right) \quad (51)$$

is a feature function satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h(Z)] = 0, \quad (52)$$

and has as its feature vector the information vector of $P(z)$, i.e.,

$$\xi(z) = \phi(z) = \frac{P(z) - P_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)}}. \quad (53)$$

Conversely, for any feature function $h: \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that (52) holds,

$$P(z) = P_0(z)(1 + \epsilon h(z)) \quad (54)$$

is a valid distribution for all ϵ sufficiently small, and has as its information vector the feature vector of h , i.e.,

$$\phi(z) = \xi(z) = \sqrt{P_0(z)} h(z). \quad (55)$$

The following corollary of Proposition 7 specific to the case of (relative) *log-likelihood* feature functions is further useful in our analysis. A proof is provided in Appendix IV-B.

Corollary 8: Let $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ be an arbitrary reference distribution and ϵ a positive constant. Then for any distribution $P \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ with associated information vector ϕ , the feature vector ξ_{LL} associated with the relative log-likelihood feature function¹⁵

$$h_{\text{LL}}(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\log \frac{P(z)}{P_0(z)} - \mathbb{E}_{P_0} \left[\log \frac{P(Z)}{P_0(Z)} \right] \right), \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (56)$$

satisfies¹⁶

$$\xi_{\text{LL}}(z) = \phi(z) + o(1), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}. \quad (57)$$

Conversely, every feature function $h: \mathcal{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h(Z)] = 0$ can be interpreted to first order as a (relative) log-likelihood, i.e., can be expressed in the form

$$h(z) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\log \frac{P(z)}{P_0(z)} - \mathbb{E}_{P_0} \left[\log \frac{P(Z)}{P_0(Z)} \right] \right) + o(1), \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (58)$$

¹⁵Throughout, all logarithms are base e , i.e., natural.

¹⁶Note that the $o(1)$ term has zero mean with respect to P_0 , consistent with $\xi_{\text{LL}} \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$.

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$

A consequence of Proposition 7 is that we do not need to distinguish between feature vectors and information vectors in the underlying inner product space. Indeed, note that when without loss of generality we normalize a feature h so that both (52) and

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h(Z)^2] = 1,$$

are satisfied, then we have $\xi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$, where ξ is the feature vector associated with h , as defined in (50).

The following lemma, verified in Appendix IV-C, interprets inner products between feature vectors and information vectors.

Lemma 9: For any $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$, let h be a feature function satisfying (52) with associated feature vector $\xi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $P \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ with associated information vector $\phi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_P[h(Z)] = \epsilon \langle \phi, \xi \rangle.$$

The squared-norm of a feature vector is its variance; specifically, for a feature function h satisfying (52) so $\xi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h(Z)^2] = \|\xi\|^2. \quad (59)$$

However, it is natural to interpret the squared-norm of an information vector in terms of Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence¹⁷ with respect to P_0 , which follows as a special case of the following more general lemma. A proof is provided in Appendix IV-D.

Lemma 10: For a given $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ be arbitrary, and let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 denote the corresponding information vectors, respectively. Then

$$D(P_1 \| P_2) \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_1(z) \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (60)$$

a special case of which is, for $P \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ and with ϕ denoting its information vector,¹⁸

$$D(P \| P_0) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\phi\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (61)$$

since $\phi_0 \equiv 0$ is the information vector associated with P_0 .

Note that as (60) reflects, divergence is symmetric in P_1 and P_2 to first order in ϵ^2 .

Additionally, in (60) we recognize $\phi_1 - \phi_2$ as, to first order, the information vector associated with the log-likelihood ratio feature function

$$h_{\text{LLR}}(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} - \mathbb{E}_{P_0} \left[\log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} \right] \right). \quad (62a)$$

In particular, since

$$\log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} = \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_0(z)} - \log \frac{P_2(z)}{P_0(z)},$$

¹⁷For $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, we use the usual

$$D(P \| Q) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) \log \frac{P(z)}{Q(z)}$$

to denote KL divergence of Q from P .

¹⁸Note, for comparison, that $D_{\chi^2}(P \| P_0) = \epsilon^2 \|\phi\|^2$.

it follows from the first part of Corollary 8 that (62a) has feature vector

$$\xi_{\text{LLR}}(z) = \phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z) + o(1), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}. \quad (62b)$$

It is also important to appreciate that (60) is invariant to the choice of reference distribution within the neighborhood, which is an immediate consequence of the following result, verified in Appendix IV-E.

Lemma 11: For a given $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ and $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small that $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0) \subset \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$, let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ be arbitrary, and let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be the corresponding information vectors. Then for any $\tilde{P}_0 \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$, the information vectors

$$\tilde{\phi}_1(z) \triangleq \frac{P_1(z) - \tilde{P}_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{\tilde{P}_0(z)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}_2(z) \triangleq \frac{P_2(z) - \tilde{P}_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{\tilde{P}_0(z)}}$$

satisfy, for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$\tilde{\phi}_1(z) - \tilde{\phi}_2(z) = (\phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z))(1 + o(1)), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (63)$$

B. Weakly Dependent Variables

An instance of local analysis corresponds to weak dependence between variables, a concept we formally define as follows.

Definition 12 (ϵ -Dependence): Let Z and W be defined over alphabets \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{W} , respectively, and distributed according to $P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$, where $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$ is the (usual) restriction of the simplex to distributions with strictly positive marginals. Then Z and W are ϵ -dependent if there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that¹⁹

$$P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}(P_Z P_W), \quad (64)$$

where P_Z and P_W are the marginal distributions associated with $P_{Z,W}$.

As related notions of ϵ -dependence, we can replace (64) with one of

$$P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{W}}(P_W), \quad \text{all } z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (65)$$

$$P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z), \quad \text{all } w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (66)$$

Asymptotically, all these notions are equivalent, however, as the following lemma establishes; a proof is provided in Appendix IV-F

Lemma 13: Let Z and W be defined over alphabets \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{W} , respectively, and distributed according to $P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$, where $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}$ is the (usual) restriction of the simplex to distributions with strictly positive marginals. When

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_Z(z) > 0, \quad \text{all } z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (67a)$$

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_W(w) > 0, \quad \text{all } w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (67b)$$

¹⁹Note that the condition (64) is equivalent to

$$D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z,W} \| P_Z P_W) \leq \epsilon^2,$$

the left-hand side of which defines mutual information with respect to χ^2 -divergence. This mutual information was historically referred to as ‘‘mean-square contingency’’ [4], a concept introduced by Pearson.

the following statements are equivalent (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$):

$$P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{N}_{O(\epsilon)}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}(P_Z P_W) \quad (68a)$$

$$P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z) \in \mathcal{N}_{O(\epsilon)}^{\mathcal{W}}(P_W), \quad \text{all } z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (68b)$$

$$P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{O(\epsilon)}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z), \quad \text{all } w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (68c)$$

Accordingly, any of (68) can be used to characterize $O(\epsilon)$ -dependence. In the sequel, except where the distinction is needed, with some abuse of terminology we will use ϵ -dependence and $O(\epsilon)$ -dependence interchangeably.

A further asymptotic equivalence between the notion of ϵ -dependence based on χ^2 -divergence and one based on KL divergence is established by the following lemma, whose proof is provided in Appendix IV-G.

Lemma 14: Under the hypotheses of Lemma 13,

$$I(Z; W) = O(\epsilon^2) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{N}_{O(\epsilon)}^{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{W}}(P_Z P_W). \quad (69)$$

Finally, for completeness, we have the following asymptotic equivalences among notions of ϵ -dependence based on KL divergence, analogous to Lemma 13. A proof is provided in Appendix IV-H.

Lemma 15: Under the hypotheses of Lemma 13, the following statements are equivalent (as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$):

$$I(Z; W) = O(\epsilon^2) \quad (70a)$$

$$D(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z) \| P_W) = O(\epsilon^2), \quad \text{all } z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (70b)$$

$$D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \| P_Z) = O(\epsilon^2), \quad \text{all } w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (70c)$$

We will exploit the various equivalences (68)–(70) in our analysis.

C. The Modal Decomposition of Mutual Information

The modal decomposition (15) of $P_{X,Y}$ leads directly to a corresponding decomposition of mutual information when X and Y are weakly dependent. In particular, we have the following result.

Lemma 16: Let $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ be ϵ -dependent random variables, and let $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ denote the associated CDM. Then

$$I(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (71)$$

where the summation is $O(\epsilon^2)$.

Proof: It suffices to make the choices $P = P_{X,Y}$ and $P_0 = P_X P_Y$ in (61) of Lemma 10, and recognize that the corresponding information vector—which is convenient to express as a matrix in this case—has elements

$$\phi(x, y) = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y) - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \tilde{B}(x, y). \quad (72)$$

Then, since the Frobenius norm of an information vector in matrix form coincides with its Euclidean norm, and since for any matrix \mathbf{A} whose singular values are $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}), \dots, \sigma_l(\mathbf{A})$ for some l , we have $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^l \sigma_i(\mathbf{A})^2$, (71) follows.

Finally, that the first term on the right-hand side of (71) is at most $O(\epsilon^2)$ follows from applying the constraint (47) to the information vector defined via (72). ■

A key interpretation of the decomposition (71) is as follows. For each $1 \leq k \leq K-1$, the bivariate function

$$P_{X,Y}^{(k)}(x, y) \triangleq P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right) \quad (73a)$$

obtained by truncating (15) sums to unity and, for all ϵ sufficiently small, is nonnegative for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, so has the interpretation as a joint distribution for new variables $(X^{(k)}, Y^{(k)})$, i.e., $P_{X,Y}^{(k)} = P_{X^{(k)}, Y^{(k)}}$, having the same (original) marginals P_X and P_Y for all such k . Moreover, these new variables have mutual information

$$I(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (73b)$$

Hence, the k th term in the expansion contributes an increment of $\sigma_k^2/2 + o(\epsilon^2)$ to the mutual information. From this perspective, the chosen ordering captures the largest proportion of mutual information from the fewest number of terms. Valuable complementary perspectives on these order- k distributions will become apparent later in our development.

D. The Local Geometry of Decision Making

In our development, it will be useful to exploit a geometric interpretation of traditional binary hypothesis testing, which we now describe. In particular, suppose we observe m samples $z_1^m = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$ drawn in an independent, identically distributed (i.i.d.) manner from either distribution P_1 or distribution P_2 , where $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$. As in Section IV-A, let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 denote the associated information vectors.

For this problem, for some $1 \leq k \leq K-1$, consider a sequence of k -dimensional statistics

$$\ell^k = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k) \quad (74a)$$

with

$$\ell_l = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m h_l(z_j), \quad l = 1, \dots, k, \quad (74b)$$

for some feature functions $h^k = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ with associated feature vectors $\xi^k = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$.

Without loss of generality we restrict our attention to normalized feature functions such that the statistics

$$h^k(Z) = (h_1(Z), \dots, h_k(Z))$$

are zero mean, unit-variance, and uncorrelated with respect to P_0 , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h_i(Z)] = 0, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \quad (75a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0}[h_i(Z) h_j(Z)] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}, \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}. \quad (75b)$$

Indeed, if $h^k(Z)$ had any other mean and (nonsingular) covariance structure, then we could apply an invertible trans-




Fig. 1: The local geometry of decision making for distinguishing i.i.d. samples z^m over alphabet \mathcal{Z} from one of $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ based on a statistic $\ell = (1/m) \sum_{i=1}^m h^k(z_i)$ involving feature functions h^k . In information space $\mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$, where the reference distribution P_0 maps to the origin, ℓ corresponds to the projection of the information vector $\hat{\phi}$ for \hat{P} onto subspace spanned by the feature vectors ξ^k for h^k . The optimum decision rule projects $\hat{\phi}$ directly onto $\phi_1 - \phi_2$, the feature vector associated with the log-likelihood ratio h_{LLR} .

formation to ℓ^k to generate an equivalent statistic $\tilde{\ell}^k$ with the desired structure.²⁰

With \hat{P} denoting the empirical distribution of the data z_1^m , we can express (74b) in the form

$$\ell_l = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{P}(z) h_l(z) = \epsilon \langle \hat{\phi}, \xi_l \rangle$$

where we have used Lemma 9 with $P = \hat{P}$, and where

$$\hat{\phi}(z) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{\hat{P}(z) - P_0(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}}. \quad (76)$$

is the *observed* information vector [cf. (46)]. The associated geometry is depicted in Fig. 1.

Our main result is as follows, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IV-I.

Lemma 17: Given a reference distribution $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ a constant $\epsilon > 0$ and integers m and k , let z_1, \dots, z_m denote i.i.d. samples from one of P_1 or P_2 , where $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$ and both strictly positive. Then the error probability p_e for deciding whether P_1 or P_2 is the generating distribution, based on a statistic ℓ^k of the form (74) with normalized feature functions h^k , decays exponentially in m as $m \rightarrow \infty$, with (Chernoff) exponent

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e}{m} \triangleq E_{h^k} = \sum_{l=1}^k E_{h_l}, \quad (77a)$$

where

$$E_{h_l} \triangleq \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \langle \phi_1 - \phi_2, \xi_l \rangle^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (77b)$$

²⁰In particular, with ℓ denoting the vector representation of ℓ^k , if ℓ has mean vector μ_{ℓ} and covariance matrix is Λ_{ℓ} , then $\tilde{\ell} \triangleq \Lambda_{\ell}^{-1/2} (\ell - \mu_{\ell})$, with $\Lambda_{\tilde{\ell}}^{1/2}$ denoting any square root matrix of Λ_{ℓ} , has mean $\mu_{\tilde{\ell}} = \mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Lambda_{\tilde{\ell}} = \mathbf{I}$ as desired.

The k -fold local efficiency $\nu(h^k)$ of the rule defined by h^k quantifies the goodness of the exponent (77) in Lemma 17 relative to the ideal exponent

$$E \triangleq \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|.$$

Specifically,

$$\nu(h^k) \triangleq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{E_{h^k}}{E} = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^k \langle \phi_1 - \phi_2, \xi_l \rangle^2}{\|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|^2}. \quad (78)$$

It follows from Bessel's inequality that $0 \leq \nu(h^k) \leq 1$, and from (62) that the upper bound is achieved by the choices

$$h_1 = h_{\text{LLR}}, \quad \text{and} \quad h_i \equiv 0, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, k\}, \quad (79)$$

i.e., the log-likelihood ratio is an optimum statistic, as expected. In the sequel, we focus on inference scenarios in which such a statistic cannot be used directly.

V. UNIVERSAL FEATURE CHARACTERIZATIONS

We now develop several complementary formulations of the universal feature selection problem, and show that they yield the same features, and that these features are directly related to the modal decomposition of $P_{X,Y}$.

As an initial viewpoint, when X and Y are weakly dependent, their conditional distributions are exponential families in which the features in the modal decomposition (15) are natural statistics. Specifically, when X and Y are ϵ -dependent according to Definition 12, we have, starting from (22a),

$$P_{Y|X}(y|x) = P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) + o(\epsilon) \right\}, \quad (80)$$

where we have used the Taylor series approximation $e^{\omega} = 1 + \omega + o(\omega)$ and that the exponent in the first term in (80) is $O(\epsilon)$. We recognize the posterior (80) as an exponential family with natural parameters $g_*^{K-1}(y)$ and natural statistics $f_*^{K-1}(x)$. Moreover, by symmetry we have, or equivalently via (22b),

$$P_{X|Y}(x|y) = P_X(x) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) + o(\epsilon) \right\}, \quad (81)$$

from which we see that for inferences about X from Y , the roles of the features are reversed in the associated posterior: $f_*^{K-1}(x)$ are the natural parameters and $g_*^{K-1}(y)$ are the natural statistics.

Since exponential families with such structure are widely used in discriminative models for learning, we can interpret the (80) and (81) as indicating universal feature choices. Moreover, dimensionally-reduced families of the form

$$P_{Y|X}^{(k)}(y|x) = P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) + o(\epsilon) \right\}$$

$$P_{X|Y}^{(k)}(x|y) = P_X(x) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) + o(\epsilon) \right\}$$

for some $1 \leq k \leq K - 1$ represent approximations that maximize the retained mutual information, as per the discussion in Section IV-C surrounding (73). We develop and interpret these posterior distributions further in Section VIII. However, there are other senses in which the features in (15) are universal, which we develop first, and which require a data model we now introduce.

A. Latent Attribute and Statistic Model

In the sequel, we further develop universal features from the modal decomposition (15) via the introduction of latent (auxiliary) variables. Latent variable models have a long history in facilitating both the interpretation and exploitation of relationships in data. While the original focus was on linear relationships, corresponding to factor analysis as introduced by Spearman [27], the modern view is considerably broader; see, e.g., [28] for a discussion.

As we now describe, our treatment models scenarios in which the inference task involving X and Y is not known in advance through the introduction of latent *attribute* variables whose values we seek to determine. We emphasize at the outset that in this model, we treat $P_{X,Y}$ as known or, equivalently, to have been sufficiently reliably estimated from training samples, an efficient process for which we will later discuss.

We begin by formalizing the notion of an attribute.²¹

Definition 18 (ϵ -Attribute): Given $\epsilon > 0$ and $P_Z \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ for some \mathcal{Z} , then W on some alphabet \mathcal{W} with $2 \leq |\mathcal{W}| \leq |\mathcal{Z}|$ and having distribution $P_W \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{W}})$ is an ϵ -attribute of Z if W is ϵ -dependent on Z , i.e.,

$$P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z), \quad w \in \mathcal{W},$$

$P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \notin \mathcal{N}_0^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and W is conditionally independent of all other variables in the model given Z .

Such attributes are specified by a collection of parameters. In particular, we have the following.

Definition 19 (ϵ -Attribute Configuration): Given $\epsilon > 0$ and $P_Z \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$ for some \mathcal{Z} , then ϵ -attribute W of Z is characterized by its *configuration*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z) \triangleq & \left\{ \mathcal{W}, \{P_W(w), w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w), w \in \mathcal{W}\} : \right. \\ & P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \\ & \left. \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{Z|W}(z|w) = P_Z(z), \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

which can be equivalently expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z) = & \left\{ \mathcal{W}, \{P_W(w), w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{\phi_w^{Z|W}, w \in \mathcal{W}\} : \right. \\ & \phi_w^{Z|W} \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_Z), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \\ & \left. \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{Z|W}(z) = 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

²¹More generally, we use *attribute* to refer to an ϵ -attribute in which there is no restriction on ϵ , i.e., it can be arbitrarily large.

where

$$\phi_w^{Z|W}(z) \triangleq \frac{P_{Z|W}(z|w) - P_Z(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Z(z)}}, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad w \in \mathcal{W} \quad (84)$$

define the information vectors associated with the ϵ -attribute W .

In Definition 19, we note that the equivalent form (83) is a consequence of the fact the constraint

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{Z|W}(z|w) = P_Z(z),$$

implies the information vectors must satisfy

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{Z|W}(z) = 0. \quad (85)$$

In the context of a given model $P_{X,Y}$, the attribute variables U and V for X and Y , respectively, are characterized by the Markov structure

$$U \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow V. \quad (86)$$

More generally, in the case of m samples drawn from $P_{X,Y}$, our model has the Markov structure

$$U \leftrightarrow X^m \leftrightarrow Y^m \leftrightarrow V \quad (87a)$$

with the conditional independence and memoryless structure

$$P_{X^m|U}(x^m|u) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{X|U}(x_i|u) \quad (87b)$$

$$P_{Y^m|V}(y^m|v) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{Y|V}(y_i|v) \quad (87c)$$

$$P_{X^m, Y^m}(x^m, y^m) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{X,Y}(x_i, y_i). \quad (87d)$$

The attributes U and V can be interpreted as instances of *class* variables, whose values correspond to different categories of X and Y behavior, respectively.

Our development focuses on the case where U and V depend only weakly on X and Y . Specifically, we consider the ϵ -dependence

$$P_{X|U}(\cdot|u) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{U}$$

$$P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Via Lemma 10, ϵ -dependence can be equivalently expressed as the condition

$$D(P_{X|U}(\cdot|u) \| P_X) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (1 + o(1)), \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{U} \quad (88a)$$

$$D(P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v) \| P_Y) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (1 + o(1)), \quad \text{for all } v \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (88b)$$

which, in turn, of course implies

$$I(X; U) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P_U(u) D(P_{X|U}(\cdot|u) \| P_X) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (1 + o(1)) \quad (89a)$$

$$I(Y; V) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} P_V(v) D(P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v) \| P_Y) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (1 + o(1)). \quad (89b)$$

For inferences about attributes U and V , we will generally consider statistics of the form

$$S^k \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f^k(X_i) \quad \text{and} \quad T^k \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g^k(Y_i), \quad (90)$$

for some $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ and feature choices $f^k: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$ and $g^k: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$. Moreover, in accordance with our earlier discussion, without loss of generality we restrict our attention to normalized features, i.e. $(f^k, g^k) \in \mathcal{F}_k \times \mathcal{G}_k$ with \mathcal{F}_k and \mathcal{G}_k as defined in (35c) and (35d), respectively. As we will develop, the particular choices

$$S_*^k \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_*^k(X_i) \quad \text{and} \quad T_*^k \triangleq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m g_*^k(Y_i), \quad (91)$$

with f_*^k and g_*^k as defined in (34) play a special role.

Finally, we will sometimes extend the model (87) to the case of multidimensional U and V with special structure, which we term *multi-attributes*.²²

Definition 20 (ϵ -Multi-Attribute): Given $\epsilon > 0$, l , and Z over some alphabet \mathcal{Z} , then an attribute W of Z with configuration $\mathcal{C}_{l\epsilon}^Z(P_Z)$ over alphabet \mathcal{W} is an l -dimensional ϵ -multi-attribute W^l over alphabet $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{W}_l$ if the variables W^l are:

1) such that

$$|\mathcal{W}_i| \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad P_{W_i} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{W}_i}), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, l\};$$

2) ϵ -dependent on Z , i.e.,

$$P_{Z|W_i}(\cdot|w_i) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^Z(P_Z), \quad \text{all } w_i \in \mathcal{W}_i \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, l;$$

$$P_{Z|W_i}(\cdot|w_i) \notin \mathcal{N}_0^Z(P_Z),$$

3) conditionally independent given Z , i.e.,

$$P_{W^l|Z}(w^l|z) = \prod_{i=1}^l P_{W_i|Z}(w_i|z), \quad \text{all } w^l \in \mathcal{W}, z \in \mathcal{Z};$$

and

4) (marginally) independent, i.e.,

$$P_{W^l}(w^l) = \prod_{i=1}^l P_{W_i}(w_i), \quad \text{all } w^l \in \mathcal{W}.$$

We use $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon}^{Z,l}(P_Z)$ to denote the configuration of such a ϵ -multi-attribute variable.

Multi-attribute variables have the following key orthogonality property. A proof is provided in Appendix V-A.

Lemma 21: For some $\epsilon > 0$ and integer $l \geq 1$, let W^l be an ϵ -multi-attribute of $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ over alphabet $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{W}_l$. Then with the information vector notation

$$\phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i}(z) \triangleq \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i) - P_Z(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Z(z)}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, l, \quad (92)$$

we have, for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$,

$$\langle \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i}, \phi_{w_j}^{Z|W_j} \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \neq j, w_i \in \mathcal{W}_i \text{ and } w_j \in \mathcal{W}_j.$$

²²As in the case of attributes, we more generally use *multi-attribute* to refer to an ϵ -multi-attribute in which there is no restriction on ϵ , i.e., it can be arbitrarily large.

In addition, multi-attributes admit the following information vector decomposition.²³

Lemma 22: For some $\epsilon > 0$ and integer $l \geq 1$, let W^l be an ϵ -multi-attribute of $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ over alphabet $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{W}_l$. Then with the information vector notation

$$\phi_{w^l}^{Z|W^l}(z) \triangleq \frac{P_{Z|W^l}(z|w^l) - P_Z(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Z(z)}}, \quad (93)$$

and $\phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i}$ as defined in (92), we have

$$\phi_{w^l}^{Z|W^l} = \sum_{i=1}^l \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i} + o(1). \quad (94)$$

A proof is provided in Appendix V-B, and exploits the following simple approximation.

Fact 23: For any integer $l \geq 1$ and constants ϵ and a_1, \dots, a_l , then as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\prod_{i=1}^l (1 + \epsilon a_i) = 1 + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^l a_i + o(\epsilon). \quad (95)$$

For multi-attributes U^k and V^k of X and Y , respectively, we use

$$\phi_{u_i}^{X|U_i}(x) \triangleq \frac{P_{X|U_i}(x|u_i) - P_X(x)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_X(x)}} \quad (96a)$$

$$\phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i}(y) \triangleq \frac{P_{Y|V_i}(y|v_i) - P_Y(y)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \quad (96b)$$

to denote the information vectors corresponding to $P_{X|U_i}(\cdot|u_i)$ and $P_{Y|V_i}(\cdot|v_i)$, respectively.

Note that for the extended Markov model (87), orthogonality for multi-attribute U^k of X^m further implies that the U^k are conditionally independent given X_j , each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and X^m are conditionally independent given U_i , each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, i.e.,

$$P_{U^k|X_j}(u^k|x_j) = \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i|X_j}(u_i|x_j) \quad (97a)$$

$$P_{X^m|U_i}(x^m|u_i) = \prod_{j=1}^m P_{X_j|U_i}(x_j|u_i), \quad (97b)$$

and the orthogonality for multi-attribute V^k of Y^m implies V^k are conditionally independent given Y_j , each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and Y^m are conditionally independent given V_i , each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, i.e.,

$$P_{V^k|Y_j}(v^k|y_j) = \prod_{i=1}^k P_{V_i|Y_j}(v_i|y_j) \quad (98a)$$

$$P_{Y^m|V_i}(y^m|v_i) = \prod_{j=1}^m P_{Y_j|V_i}(y_j|v_i). \quad (98b)$$

²³Note that this decomposition implies that an ϵ -multi-attribute is an $l\epsilon$ -attribute.

B. Induced Local Geometries of Attribute Variables

We now express the relationships between U, V and X, Y geometrically. In particular, we show that the local geometry of $P_{X|U}(\cdot|u)$ in the simplex \mathcal{P}^X induces a corresponding local geometry for $P_{Y|U}(\cdot|u)$ in the simplex \mathcal{P}^Y via the operator \mathbf{B} , and, likewise, the local geometry of $P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v)$ in the simplex \mathcal{P}^Y induces a corresponding local geometry for $P_{X|V}(\cdot|v)$ in the simplex \mathcal{P}^X via the adjoint.

Indeed, the Markov relation $U \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y$ implies

$$P_Y(y) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x) P_X(x)$$

$$P_{Y|U}(y|u) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x) P_{X|U}(x|u),$$

from which we conclude that a neighborhood of P_X in the simplex \mathcal{P}^X maps to a neighborhood of P_Y in the simplex \mathcal{P}^Y . In particular, with P_X and P_Y as the reference distributions in \mathcal{P}^X and \mathcal{P}^Y , respectively, the information vectors

$$\phi_u^{X|U}(x) = \frac{P_{X|U}(x|u) - P_X(x)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_X(x)}} \quad (99a)$$

$$\phi_u^{Y|U}(y) = \frac{P_{Y|U}(y|u) - P_Y(y)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \quad (99b)$$

associated with the distributions $P_{X|U}(\cdot|u)$ and $P_{Y|U}(\cdot|u)$, respectively, satisfy

$$\phi_u^{Y|U}(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{Y|X}(y|x) \sqrt{P_X(x)} \phi_u^{X|U}(x). \quad (100)$$

With $\phi_u^{X|U}$ and $\phi_u^{Y|U}$ denoting the associated column vectors, using (10) we can equivalently express (100) in the matrix form

$$\phi_u^{Y|U} = \mathbf{B} \phi_u^{X|U}. \quad (101)$$

Evidently, \mathbf{B} maps a local divergence sphere in \mathcal{P}^X to a local divergence ellipsoid in \mathcal{P}^Y whose principal axes correspond to the left singular vectors of \mathbf{B} , as Fig. 2 depicts.

Analogously, the Markov relation $X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow V$ implies

$$P_X(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X|Y}(x|y) P_Y(y)$$

$$P_{X|V}(x|v) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X|Y}(x|y) P_{Y|V}(y|v),$$

from which we conclude that a neighborhood of P_Y in the simplex \mathcal{P}^Y maps to a neighborhood of P_X in the simplex \mathcal{P}^X . In particular, with the same reference distributions, and using (11), we obtain that the information vectors

$$\phi_v^{Y|V}(y) = \frac{P_{Y|V}(y|v) - P_Y(y)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \quad (102a)$$

$$\phi_v^{X|V}(x) = \frac{P_{X|V}(x|v) - P_X(x)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_X(x)}} \quad (102b)$$

associated with the distributions $P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v)$ and $P_{X|V}(\cdot|v)$ are related according to

$$\phi_v^{X|V} = \mathbf{B}^T \phi_v^{Y|V}, \quad (103)$$




Fig. 2: The information geometry associated with the DTM \mathbf{B} . For $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, the unit information vector ψ_i^X in \mathcal{P}^X maps via \mathbf{B} to the shorter information vector $\sigma_i \psi_i^Y$ in \mathcal{P}^Y , and the unit information vector ψ_i^Y in \mathcal{P}^Y maps via \mathbf{B}^T to the shorter information vector $\sigma_i \psi_i^X$ in \mathcal{P}^X .

where $\phi_v^{Y|V}$ and $\phi_v^{X|V}$ denote the corresponding column vectors. In this case, as Fig. 2 also depicts, \mathbf{B}^T maps a local divergence sphere in \mathcal{P}^Y to a local divergence ellipsoid in \mathcal{P}^X whose principal axes correspond to the right singular vectors of \mathbf{B} .

Finally, we note that there are constraints on the distributions governing the attributes U and V . In particular, we have [cf. (85)]

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P_U(u) \phi_u^{X|U}(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{X} \quad (104a)$$

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} P_V(v) \phi_v^{Y|V}(y) = 0, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (104b)$$

C. Minimum Error Probability Universal Features

In this section, we model the universal feature selection problem as the following game between a system designer and nature. First, nature chooses the distribution for latent attribute variables (U, V) in the Markov chain (86) at random. Next, before nature reveals its chosen distributions, the system designer chooses feature functions f^k and g^k knowing $P_{X,Y}$ and the probability law according to which nature chooses its distribution. Finally, after revealing its chosen distributions, the system designer implements a test for determining (U, V) with minimum error probability from statistics formed from its chosen features applied to samples of (X, Y) . The details are as follows.

Let $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^X(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y)$ denote configurations for attributes U and V , respectively, in the sense of Definition 19,

i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X) = \left\{ \mathcal{U}, \{P_U(u), u \in \mathcal{U}\}, \{P_{X|U}(\cdot|u), u \in \mathcal{U}\}: \right. \\ \left. P_{X|U}(\cdot|u) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), u \in \mathcal{U}, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P_U(u) P_{X|U}(x|u) = P_X(x), x \in \mathcal{X} \right\} \quad (105a)$$

$$= \left\{ \mathcal{U}, \{P_U(u), u \in \mathcal{U}\}, \{\phi_u^{X|U}, u \in \mathcal{U}\}: \right. \\ \left. \phi_u^{X|U} \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{X}}, u \in \mathcal{U}, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} P_U(u) \phi_u^{X|U}(x) = 0, x \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y) = \left\{ \mathcal{V}, \{P_V(v), v \in \mathcal{V}\}, \{P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v), v \in \mathcal{V}\}: \right. \\ \left. P_{Y|V}(\cdot|v) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), v \in \mathcal{V}, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} P_V(v) P_{Y|V}(y|v) = P_Y(y), y \in \mathcal{Y} \right\}, \quad (105b)$$

$$= \left\{ \mathcal{V}, \{P_V(v), v \in \mathcal{V}\}, \{\phi_v^{Y|V}, v \in \mathcal{V}\}: \right. \\ \left. \phi_v^{Y|V} \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Y}}, v \in \mathcal{V}, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} P_V(v) \phi_v^{Y|V}(y) = 0, y \in \mathcal{Y} \right\}.$$

In choosing a configuration pair, nature uses a probability law in which the ensemble for each attribute is characterized by rotational invariance, our definition for which relies on the following concept of spherical symmetry [29], [30].

Definition 24 (Spherical Symmetry): A $k_1 \times k_2$ random matrix \mathbf{Z} is spherically symmetric if for any orthogonal $k_1 \times k_1$ and $k_2 \times k_2$ matrices \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_2 , respectively, we have

$$\mathbf{Z} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Q}_2, \quad (106)$$

where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution.

Moreover, the following consequence of spherical symmetry is useful in our analysis; a proof is provided in Appendix V-C.²⁴

Lemma 25: Let \mathbf{Z} be a $k_1 \times k_2$ spherically symmetric random matrix. Then if \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 are any fixed matrices of compatible dimensions, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{A}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}_2 \right\|_F^2 \right] = \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \left\| \mathbf{A}_1 \right\|_F^2 \left\| \mathbf{A}_2 \right\|_F^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{Z} \right\|_F^2 \right]. \quad (107)$$

Our ensemble of interest is defined in terms of spherical symmetry as follows.

Definition 26 (Rotation Invariant Ensemble): Given $\epsilon > 0$, a rotationally invariant ensemble (RIE) for an ϵ -attribute W of a variable Z is a collection of attribute configurations of the form (83), together with a probability measure over the collection

²⁴The proof introduces the notation \mathbf{e}_i for the (elementary) vector whose i th element is 1, and all other elements are 0, which we will more generally find convenient in our analysis.

such that $\Phi^{Z|W}$, the $|\mathcal{Z}| \times |\mathcal{W}|$ matrix whose columns are $\phi_w^{Z|W}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$,²⁵ is spherically symmetric.

In what follows, we denote the error probability in decisions for U and V based on S^k , respectively, via

$$p_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), f^k) \quad \text{and} \quad p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), f^k), \quad (109a)$$

and those for the decisions based on T^k via, respectively,

$$p_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), g^k) \quad \text{and} \quad p_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), g^k), \quad (109b)$$

where S^k and T^k are as defined in (90) for feature choices $f^k: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$ and $g^k: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$. In turn, we define the error exponents

$$\bar{E}^{U|S}(f^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\log p_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), f^k)]}{m} \quad (110a)$$

$$\bar{E}^{V|S}(f^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\log p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), f^k)]}{m} \quad (110b)$$

$$\bar{E}^{U|T}(g^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\log p_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), g^k)]}{m} \quad (110c)$$

$$\bar{E}^{V|T}(g^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\log p_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y), g^k)]}{m}, \quad (110d)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\cdot]$ denotes expectation with respect to the RIEs for $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)$.

Our main result is the following proposition, which identifies the features the system designer should choose, and the exponent of the resulting error probability. A proof is provided in Appendix V-D.

Proposition 27: Given $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ and attributes U and V of X and Y , respectively, each drawn from a RIE for some $\epsilon > 0$, then for any dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$,²⁶

$$\left(\bar{E}^{U|S}(f^k), \bar{E}^{V|S}(f^k), \bar{E}^{U|T}(g^k), \bar{E}^{V|T}(g^k) \right) \\ \leq \left(\bar{E}_0^{X|U} \epsilon^2 k, \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2, \right. \\ \left. \bar{E}_0^{X|U} \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2, \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} \epsilon^2 k \right) + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (111)$$

where $\bar{E}_0^{X|U}$ and $\bar{E}_0^{Y|V}$ are positive constants that do not depend on ϵ , k , or $P_{X,Y}$. Moreover, all the inequalities in (111) simultaneously hold with equality for the choices (f_*^k, g_*^k) as defined in (34), i.e., the associated multi-objective maximization has a unique²⁷ Pareto-optimal solution.

²⁵With some abuse of terminology and notation, we will say the w th column of $\Phi^{Z|W}$ is $\Phi^{Z|W} \mathbf{e}_w = \phi_w^{Z|W}$, to avoid cumbersome exposition. More precisely, given an (arbitrary) bijective function $\mathbb{1}_W: \mathcal{W} \mapsto \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{W}|\}$ with inverse $\mathbb{1}_W^{-1}$,

$$\Phi^{Z|W} \triangleq \left[\phi_{\mathbb{1}_W^{-1}(1)}^{Z|W} \quad \cdots \quad \phi_{\mathbb{1}_W^{-1}(|\mathcal{W}|)}^{Z|W} \right], \quad (108)$$

i.e., the $\mathbb{1}_W(w)$ th column of $\Phi^{Z|W}$ is $\Phi^{Z|W} \mathbf{e}_{\mathbb{1}_W(w)} = \phi_w^{Z|W}$.

²⁶For arbitrary sequences a^l and b^l of arbitrary length l , we use $a^l \leq b^l$ to denote that $a_i \leq b_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$.

²⁷Note that while the optimized multi-objective function is unique, the features that achieve them need not be, as is the case when there are repeated singular values.

We emphasize that the result does not depend on any details of probability law governing nature's choice other than the RIE property. Hence, f_*^k, g_*^k are optimum no matter what priors we might place over various parameters of the configurations $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X), \mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)$ generating the RIE. In this sense, their optimality is fairly strong.

D. Universal Features via a Cooperative Game

In this section, we show how the same universal features arise as the solution to a *cooperative game*, which further reveals the latent variable configurations for which these features are effectively sufficient statistics. In this game, for a given $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, nature chooses configurations $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y)$ of multi-attribute variable collections $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ in (87), and the system designer chooses the features f^k and g^k . Their shared goal is to identify variables (U^k, V^k) that are, in an appropriate sense, most detectable from the statistics (s^k, t^k) as defined in (90) in terms of these features.

The specific shared goal of nature and the system designer is to maximize the probability that the least detectable of U_1, \dots, U_i and the least detectable of V_1, \dots, V_i , for $i = 1, \dots, k$, are correctly detected, as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

For the analysis of this game, the following min-max characterization of singular values is useful. [24, Theorem 4.2.6].

Lemma 28 (Courant-Fischer): Let \mathbf{A} be a $k_1 \times k_2$ matrix with singular values $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$ where $k = \min\{k_1, k_2\}$. Then for every $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}) = \max_{\{\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^k : \dim(\mathcal{S})=i\}} \min_{\{\phi \in \mathcal{S} : \|\phi\|=1\}} \|\mathbf{A}\phi\|, \quad (112)$$

where \mathcal{S} denotes a subspace, and the maximum is achieved by $\phi = \psi_i^R$, a right singular vector of \mathbf{A} corresponding to $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$.

In addition, in our development the following well-known inequality, which follows from the fact that $\|\cdot\|_s$ is the matrix norm induced by the (Euclidean) vector norm $\|\cdot\|$, is convenient.

Fact 29: For any compatible matrices \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 , we have $\|\mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{A}_2\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_s \|\mathbf{A}_2\|_F$.

In the sequel, we denote the error probabilities in decisions based on S^k about each of constituent elements of U^k and V^k , respectively, via

$$p_e^{U_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), f^k) \quad \text{and} \quad p_e^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), f^k), \quad (113a)$$

and those based based on T^k via, respectively,

$$p_e^{U_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), g^k) \quad \text{and} \quad p_e^{V_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), g^k), \quad (113b)$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, where S^k and T^k are as defined in (90) for feature choices $f^k: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$ and $g^k: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$. In turn,

we define the error exponents

$$E^{U_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), f^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{U_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), f^k)}{m} \quad (114a)$$

$$E^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), f^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), f^k)}{m} \quad (114b)$$

$$E^{U_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), g^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{U_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), g^k)}{m} \quad (114c)$$

$$E^{V_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), g^k) \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{V_i|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), g^k)}{m}. \quad (114d)$$

Our main result is as follows. A proof is provided in Appendix V-E.

Proposition 30: Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$ and $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, let $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y)$ denote configurations of ϵ -multi-attribute variables U^k and V^k of X and Y , respectively, for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\min_{j \leq i} E^{U_j|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), f^k), i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \right. \\ & \quad \min_{j \leq i} E^{V_j|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), f^k), i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ & \quad \min_{j \leq i} E^{U_j|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X), g^k), i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ & \quad \left. \min_{j \leq i} E^{V_j|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y), g^k), i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \right) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2}, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sigma_i^2, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sigma_i^2, i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \frac{\epsilon^2}{2}, i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \right) + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (115) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the inequalities in (115) all hold with equality when (f^k, g^k) are chosen to be (f_*^k, g_*^k) as defined in (34), and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y)$ as chosen to be, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon,*}^{\mathcal{X},k}(P_X) \\ & \triangleq \left\{ \mathcal{U}_i = \{+1, -1\}, \{P_{U_i}(u_i) = 1/2, u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i\}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \{P_{X|U_i}(x|u_i) = P_X(x)(1 + \epsilon u_i f_i^*(x)), \right. \\ & \quad \left. u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i, x \in \mathcal{X}\}, i = 1, \dots, k \right\} \quad (116a) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon,*}^{\mathcal{Y},k}(P_Y) \\ & \triangleq \left\{ \mathcal{V}_i = \{+1, -1\}, \{P_{V_i}(v_i) = 1/2, v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i\}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \{P_{Y|V_i}(y|v_i) = P_Y(y)(1 + \epsilon v_i g_i^*(y)), \right. \\ & \quad \left. v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}, i = 1, \dots, k \right\}, \quad (116b) \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the associated multi-objective maximization has a unique Pareto-optimal solution.

In addition, from the Markov structure (86) and the modal structure (25), we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 31: The optimizing multi-attribute variables U^k and V^k in Proposition 30 have the property that

$$P_{X|V_i}(x|v_i) = P_X(x)(1 + \epsilon v_i \sigma_i f_i^*(x)) \quad (117a)$$

$$P_{Y|U_i}(y|u_i) = P_Y(y)(1 + \epsilon u_i \sigma_i g_i^*(y)). \quad (117b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Given data (x^m, y^m) from the extended Markov model (87), it further follows that (S_*^k, T_*^k) defined via (91) is, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, a sufficient statistic for inferences about the optimizing multi-attributes (U^k, V^k) , i.e., we have the Markov chains

$$(U^k, V^k) \leftrightarrow (S_*^k, T_*^k) \leftrightarrow (X^m, Y^m), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad (118)$$

and

$$U^k \leftrightarrow S_*^k \leftrightarrow T_*^k \leftrightarrow V^k, \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (119)$$

In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix V-F.

Corollary 32: In the solution to the optimization in Proposition 30 for the extended model (87),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{U^k, V^k | X^m, Y^m}(u^k, v^k | x^m, y^m) \\ = \frac{1}{4^k} \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k (u_i s_i^* + v_i t_i^*) \right) + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (120)$$

with, consistent with (91),

$$s_i^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m f_i^*(x_j) \quad \text{and} \quad t_i^* = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m g_i^*(y_j). \quad (121)$$

Moreover,

$$P_{U^k | S_*^k, T_*^k, V^k}(u^k | s_*^k, t_*^k, v^k) = \frac{1}{2^k} \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k u_i s_i^* \right) + o(\epsilon) \quad (122a)$$

$$P_{V^k | S_*^k, T_*^k, U^k}(v^k | s_*^k, t_*^k, u^k) = \frac{1}{2^k} \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i^* \right) + o(\epsilon). \quad (122b)$$

In essence, Corollary 32 shows that in making inferences about the (optimizing) attributes U^k and V^k from high-cardinality data (X^m, Y^m) , it is sufficient to extract a low-dimensional real-valued sufficient statistic (S_*^k, T_*^k) . Moreover, it is clear that it is sufficient to extract a statistic of dimension k corresponding to the number of “significant” singular values of \mathbf{B} . As importantly, we emphasize that the sufficient statistic pair (S_*^k, T_*^k) involves *separate* processing of X^m and Y^m , and as such implies significantly lower computational complexity than would generally be required for statistics that require joint processing of (X^m, Y^m) .

In addition, as suggested by Corollary 32 and revealed in its proof,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{U^k, V^k | X^m, Y^m}(u^k, v^k | x^m, y^m) \\ = \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i, V_i | X^m, Y^m}(u_i, v_i | x^m, y^m) \end{aligned} \quad (123a)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} P_{U_i, V_i | X^m, Y^m}(u_i, v_i | x^m, y^m) \\ = \frac{1}{4} (1 + \epsilon m (u_i s_i^* + v_i t_i^*)) + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (123b)$$

from which we see that to achieve the optimum exponents given by (115), it is sufficient for decisions about the attribute pair (U_i, V_i) to be made based on the statistic (S_i^*, T_i^*) alone. Moreover, (123a) reveals that although not imposed as a constraint, the optimizing configuration is such that the U^k are conditionally independent of Y^m (and the V^k are conditionally independent of X^m).

E. Universal Features via an Information Bottleneck

In this section, we show that the same configurations $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon, *}^{X, k}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon, *}^{Y, k}(P_Y)$ that are optimum in the cooperative game of Section V-D are the solution to a natural mutual information maximization problem, which provides a third viewpoint from which to interpret f_*^k and g_*^k as universal features.

Our main result is as follows. A proof is provided in Appendix V-G.

Proposition 33: Given $\epsilon > 0$, $P_{X, Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y}$, and ϵ -multi-attribute variables $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ for some k in the Markov chain (86), then

$$I(U^k; V^k) \leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^4). \quad (124)$$

Moreover, the inequality in (124) holds with equality when the configurations $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon, *}^{X, k}(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon, *}^{Y, k}(P_Y)$ of U^k and V^k , respectively, are given by (116), in which case

$$\begin{aligned} P_{U^k, V^k}(u^k, v^k) \\ = \frac{1}{4^k} \left(1 + \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i u_i v_i \right) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad u^k, v^k \in \{+1, -1\}^k. \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

We interpret the optimizing multi-attribute pair (U^k, V^k) in Proposition 33, with joint distribution (125), as expressing the dominant components of the dependency in the relationship between X and Y as determined by $P_{X, Y}$. This is reflected in the fact that

$$P_{U^k, V^k}(u^k, v^k) = \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i, V_i}(u_i, v_i)$$

with, for $i, j = 1, \dots, k$,

$$P_{U_i, V_j}(u_i, v_j) = \frac{1}{4} (1 + \epsilon^2 \sigma_i u_i v_j \mathbb{1}_{i=j}) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (126)$$

for which [cf. (71)]

$$I(U_i; V_j) = \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sigma_i^2 \mathbb{1}_{i=j} + o(\epsilon^4). \quad (127)$$

An immediate consequence of Proposition 33 is that for observations X^m, Y^m from the model (87), we have that (S_*^k, T_*^k) is a sufficient statistic for inferences about U^k, V^k ,

i.e., Corollary 32 applies. This sufficiency can be equivalently expressed in the form

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{I(U^k, V^k; X^m, Y^m)}{I(U^k, V^k; S_*^k, T_*^k)} = 1. \quad (128)$$

Note too that (125) provides a higher-order characterization of P_{U^k, V^k} than that derived from (120). Indeed, from the latter (setting $m = 1$ for convenience) we obtain only

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{U^k, V^k}(u^k, v^k) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X, Y}(x, y) P_{U^k, V^k | X, Y}(u^k, v^k, x, y) \\ &= \frac{1}{4^k} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X, Y}(x, y) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k (u_i f_i^*(x) + v_i g_i^*(y)) \right) + o(\epsilon) \\ &= \frac{1}{4^k} + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, it follows from the discussion in Section IV-B that when $\mathcal{U}_i = \mathcal{V}_i = \{+1, -1\}$ and $P_{U_i} = P_{V_i} \equiv 1/2$, then the ϵ -multi-attribute constraints $P_{X|U_i}(\cdot | u_i) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X}}(P_X)$ and $P_{Y|V_i}(\cdot | v_i) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)$ are equivalent to $I(X, U_i) \leq \epsilon^2/2$ and $I(Y, V_i) \leq \epsilon^2/2$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$. As a result, Proposition 33 can be equivalently expressed in the form of a solution to an information bottleneck problem [31] in the weak dependence regime.²⁸ In particular, we have the following immediate corollary.²⁹

Corollary 34: Given $\epsilon > 0$, $P_{X, Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ and variables $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ in the Markov chain (86), then

$$\max_{U^k, V^k} I(U^k; V^k) = \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^4),$$

where the maximization is over all configurations of (U^k, V^k) such that: constituent variables (U_i, V_i) , $i = 1, \dots, k$ satisfy: 1) $\max\{I(U_i; X), I(V_i; Y)\} \leq \epsilon^2/2$; 2) they are binary and equiprobable, i.e., $U_i, V_i \in \{+1, -1\}$ and $P_{U_i} = P_{V_i} \equiv 1/2$; 3) U^k and V^k are each collections of independent variables; and 4) the U^k and V^k are each collections of conditionally independent variables given X and Y , respectively. Moreover, the maximum is achieved by the configurations (116).

As an aside, different but related one-sided information bottleneck problems can also be analyzed within the same framework of analysis. For example, the following result is proved in Appendix V-H.³⁰

²⁸For an early application of the use of information bottleneck techniques in learning, see [32], [33].

²⁹As the proof reveals, sufficiently weak pairwise dependence will suffice for condition 3, but we impose mutual independence for convenience. Moreover, while condition 4 alone implies a degree of weak marginal dependence, it is insufficient. Finally, conditions 3 and 4 together can be viewed, in some sense, as ‘‘entropy maximizing’’ conditions.

³⁰Other variations of this result correspond to avoiding the binary, equiprobable and mutual information constraints and instead using $D(P_{X|U}(\cdot | u) \| P_X) \leq \epsilon^2/2$ for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Alternatively, by the equidistant property of capacity-achieving output distributions, we can equivalently express this divergence constraint as $\max_{P_U} I(X; U) \leq \epsilon^2/2$.

Proposition 35: Given $\epsilon > 0$, $P_{X, Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ and variables $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ in the Markov chain (86), then

$$\max_{V^k} I(V^k; X) = \max_{U^k} I(U^k; Y) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2),$$

where the maximization is over all configurations of (U^k, V^k) such that: constituent variables U_i, V_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$ satisfy: 1) $\max\{I(U_i; X), I(V_i; Y)\} \leq \epsilon^2/2$; 2) they are binary and equiprobable, i.e., $U_i, V_i \in \{+1, -1\}$ and $P_{U_i} = P_{V_i} \equiv 1/2$; 3) U^k and V^k are each collections of independent variables; and 4) the U^k and V^k are collections of conditionally independent variables given X and Y , respectively. Moreover, the maximum is achieved by the configurations (116).

As a further comment, work on aspects the more general information bottleneck problem and the associated role of hyper-contractivity analysis in its treatment includes [34]–[43]. From this perspective, the development of this section reveals that a number of the subtleties that complicate such analysis and lead to anomalous behavior are avoided by the restriction to local variables.

F. Universal Features via Common Information

As we develop in this section, there is a key relationship between the optimizing multi-attributes (U^k, V^k) in Section V-E (and Section V-D), and the common information associated with the pair (X, Y) characterized by a given joint distribution $P_{X, Y}$. Recall that Wyner³¹ [46] defines common information via an auxiliary variable W as

$$C(X, Y) = \min_{P_{W|X, Y}: X \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y} I(W; X, Y). \quad (129)$$

The results we obtain are for the case where X and Y are extra-weakly dependent; specifically, for some $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* \leq \epsilon, \quad (130)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ denotes the nuclear norm of its argument.³² We refer to X and Y as sub- ϵ dependent in this case, since by standard norm inequalities [47]

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*, \quad (131)$$

whence $P_{X, Y} \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y)$, i.e., sub- ϵ dependence implies ϵ -dependence.³³ We further use $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y)$ to denote the joint distributions in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ with sub- ϵ dependence given marginals P_X and P_Y , via which (131) expresses

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y) \subset \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y). \quad (132)$$

³¹Although we do not make use of them in our treatment, related but different notions of common information include those due to Gács and Körner [44] and Witsenhausen [45].

³²Specifically, the nuclear norm of an arbitrary matrix \mathbf{A} is

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_* \triangleq \text{tr} \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}} \right) = \sum_i \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}),$$

where $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the i th singular value of \mathbf{A} . Note that the nuclear norm is the Ky Fan k -norm with $k = \text{rank}(\mathbf{A})$, i.e., $\|\mathbf{A}\|_* = \|\mathbf{A}\|_{(\text{rank}(\mathbf{A}))}$.

³³Of course, since $\|\mathbf{A}\|_* \leq \sqrt{\text{rank}(\mathbf{A})} \|\mathbf{A}\|_{\text{F}}$ for any \mathbf{A} , we also have that ϵ -dependence implies sub- $(K\epsilon)$ dependence. In turn, $O(\epsilon)$ -dependence and sub- $O(\epsilon)$ dependence are equivalent.

Under sub- ϵ dependence, we define the following restricted common information.

Definition 36 (ϵ -Common Information): Given $P_{X,Y} \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{X \times Y}(P_X P_Y)$ for $\epsilon > 0$, the ϵ -common information is

$$C_\epsilon(X, Y) = \min_{P_{W|X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon} I(W; X, Y), \quad (133)$$

where

$$\mathcal{P}_\epsilon \triangleq \left\{ P_{W|X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^W, \text{ some } \mathcal{W}: X \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y \text{ and } \begin{aligned} &P_{X|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^X(P_X), P_{Y|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^Y(P_Y), \\ &\text{for all } w \in \mathcal{W} \text{ and } \delta(\cdot) > 0 \text{ such that } \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (134)$$

In Definition 36, a configuration of W such that $P_{W|X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}_\epsilon$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{X,Y}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \mathcal{W}, \{P_W(w), w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{P_{X|W}(\cdot|w), w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{P_{Y|W}(\cdot|w), w \in \mathcal{W}\} \right\} \quad (135)$$

subject to the constraints

$$P_{X|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^X(P_X), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (136a)$$

$$P_{Y|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^Y(P_Y), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (136b)$$

for some δ such that $\delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, and

$$P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) = P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|w). \quad (137)$$

In turn, (137) implies the constraint

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) = P_{X,Y}(x, y), \quad (138)$$

which further implies the constraints

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{X|W}(x|w) = P_X(x) \quad (139a)$$

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) = P_Y(y). \quad (139b)$$

Defining the information vectors

$$\phi_w^{X|W}(x) \triangleq \frac{P_{X|W}(x|w) - P_X(x)}{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_X(x)}} \quad (140a)$$

$$\phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \triangleq \frac{P_{Y|W}(y|w) - P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, \quad (140b)$$

and

$$\tilde{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|w) - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}}, \quad (140c)$$

we can equivalently express (135) in the form

$$\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{X,Y}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \mathcal{W}, \{P_W(w), w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{\phi_w^{X|W}, w \in \mathcal{W}\}, \{\phi_w^{Y|W}, w \in \mathcal{W}\} \right\} \quad (141)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\phi_w^{X|W} \in \mathcal{J}^X, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (142a)$$

$$\phi_w^{Y|W} \in \mathcal{J}^Y, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (142b)$$

which correspond to (136), and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) &= \check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) + \sqrt{\frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{2}} \phi_w^{X|W}(x) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \end{aligned} \quad (143a)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) &\triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{P_Y(y)} \phi_w^{X|W}(x) + \sqrt{P_X(x)} \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (143b)$$

as well as

$$\delta(\epsilon) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{X|W}(x) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) = \tilde{B}(y, x), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (144)$$

and

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{X|W}(x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (145a)$$

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) = 0, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (145b)$$

which correspond to (137)–(139), respectively. In particular, we obtain (145) from (139) using (140a)–(140b), and we obtain (143) from

$$P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|w) \quad (146)$$

$$= P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) \quad (147)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= (P_X(x) + \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_X(x)} \phi_w^{X|W}(x)) \\ &\quad \cdot (P_Y(y) + \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \phi_w^{Y|W}(y)) \\ &= P_X(x) P_Y(y) + \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)} \\ &\quad \cdot \left[\sqrt{P_Y(y)} \phi_w^{X|W}(x) + \sqrt{P_X(x)} \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \phi_w^{X|W}(x) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (148)$$

where we have used (137) and (140a)–(140b), and where we recognize the term in brackets as $\sqrt{2} \tilde{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x)$ according to (140c). Finally, we obtain (144) from the expectation of (148) with respect to P_W , yielding

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X,Y}(x, y) &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) \\ &= P_X(x) P_Y(y) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)} \\ &\quad \cdot \delta(\epsilon) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{X|W}(x) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y), \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

where we have used (145), and where we recognize $\tilde{B}(y, x)$ as defined in (27) as the final factor in (149).

The following variational characterization of the nuclear (i.e., trace) norm (see, e.g., [48], [49]) is useful in our development.

Lemma 37: Given an arbitrary $k_1 \times k_2$ matrix \mathbf{A} , we have

$$\min_{\substack{k, \mathbf{M}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k}, \mathbf{M}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k_2} \\ \mathbf{M}_1 \mathbf{M}_2 = \mathbf{A}}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_1\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{M}_2\|_F^2 \right) = \|\mathbf{A}\|_* \quad (150)$$

In particular, we obtain that the ϵ -common information is given by the nuclear norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. A proof is provided in Appendix V-I.

Proposition 38: Given $P_{X,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y)$ for $\epsilon > 0$, we have³⁴

$$C(X, Y) \leq C_\epsilon(X, Y) = \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* + o(\epsilon), \quad (151a)$$

where

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* = \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i, \quad (151b)$$

which is achieved by the configuration

$$\begin{aligned} C_*^{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}}(P_{X,Y}) &= \left\{ \mathcal{W} = \{\pm 1, \dots, \pm(K-1)\}, \right. \\ &P_W(w) = \frac{\sigma_{|w|}}{2\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*}, \\ &P_{X|W}(x|w) = P_X(x) \left(1 + \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} f_{|w|}^*(x) \right), \\ &P_{Y|W}(y|w) = P_Y(y) \left(1 + \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} g_{|w|}^*(y) \right) \left. \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (152)$$

and $\delta(\epsilon) = \epsilon$ in (134).

We note that while in general the cardinality of W in the characterization of Wyner's common information is known only to satisfy the upper bound $|W| \leq |\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$, we obtain that cardinality $|W| = 2(K-1)$, which is much smaller when \mathcal{X} and/or \mathcal{Y} is large, suffices to achieve ϵ -common information as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Given data (x^m, y^m) from the extended model

$$X^m \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y^m, \quad (153a)$$

with

$$P_{X^m|W}(x^m|w) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{X|W}(x_i|w) \quad (153b)$$

$$P_{Y^m|W}(y^m|w) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{Y|W}(y_i|w) \quad (153c)$$

$$P_{X^m, Y^m}(x^m, y^m) = \prod_{i=1}^m P_{X,Y}(x_i, y_i), \quad (153d)$$

³⁴ Since $I(W; X, Y) \geq \max\{I(W; X), I(W; Y)\}$ by the chain rule, it follows that our result does not change if we further include in (134) of Definition 36 all distributions $P_{X|W}(\cdot|w)$ and $P_{Y|W}(\cdot|w)$ that for all $w \in W$ do not depend on ϵ , since they will give rise to nonvanishing $I(W; X)$ and $I(W; Y)$. In essence, the configurations our definition omits are those for which the P_W is increasingly severely imbalanced as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

it further follows from Proposition 38 that

$$R_*^{K-1} \triangleq S_*^{K-1} + T_*^{K-1} \quad (154)$$

with S_*^{K-1} and T_*^{K-1} as defined via (91), is, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, a sufficient statistic for inferences about the ϵ -common information variable W , i.e., we have the Markov chain

$$W \leftrightarrow R_*^{K-1} \leftrightarrow (S_*^{K-1}, T_*^{K-1}) \leftrightarrow (X^m, Y^m), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (155)$$

In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix V-J.

Corollary 39: In the solution to the optimization in Proposition 38 for the extended model (153),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{W|X^m, Y^m}(w|x^m, y^m) &= \frac{\sigma_{|w|}}{2\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*} \left(1 + m \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} r_{|w|}^* \right) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}), \end{aligned} \quad (156)$$

where, consistent with (154),

$$r_i^* = s_i^* + t_i^*, \quad (157)$$

and s_i^* and t_i^* are as defined in (121).

The sufficiency relation of Corollary 39 can be equivalently expressed in the form

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{I(W; X^m, Y^m)}{I(W; R_*^{K-1})} = 1.$$

In essence, Corollary 39 shows that in making inferences about the ϵ -common information variable W from high-cardinality data (X^m, Y^m) , it is sufficient to extract a low-dimensional real-valued sufficient statistic R_*^{K-1} . And we emphasize that a consequence of the way common information is defined is that the sufficient statistic R_*^{K-1} involves *separate* processing of X^m and Y^m .

G. Relating Common Information to Dominant Structure

The ϵ -common information variable W can be related to the dominant structure sequence pair (U^{K-1}, V^{K-1}) . To develop this, let us equivalently express W as

$$W \triangleq W^{K-1} = (W_1, \dots, W_{K-1}), \quad (158a)$$

where each W_i is a variable defined over alphabet

$$\mathcal{W}_o \triangleq \{-1, 0, +1\} \quad (158b)$$

according to

$$W_i \triangleq \begin{cases} +1 & W = i \\ -1 & W = -i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (158c)$$

We can interpret W_i as effectively capturing the ϵ -common information in (U_i, V_i) , which is defined, consistent with Definition 36, as

$$C_\epsilon(U_i, V_i) = \min_{P_{\tilde{W}_i|U_i, V_i} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\epsilon} I(\tilde{W}_i; U_i, V_i), \quad (159)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_\epsilon &\triangleq \\ &\left\{ P_{\tilde{W}_i|U_i,V_i} \in \mathcal{P}^{\tilde{W}_i}, \text{ some } \tilde{W}_i: U_i \leftrightarrow \tilde{W}_i \leftrightarrow V_i \text{ and} \right. \\ &P_{U_i|\tilde{W}_i}(\cdot|\tilde{w}_i) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^{\mathcal{U}_i}(P_{U_i}), P_{V_i|\tilde{W}_i}(\cdot|\tilde{w}_i) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)}}^{\mathcal{V}_i}(P_{V_i}), \\ &\left. \text{for all } \tilde{w}_i \in \tilde{W}_i \text{ and } \delta(\cdot) > 0 \text{ such that } \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0. \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix V-K.

Corollary 40: Given $P_{X,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y)$ for $\epsilon > 0$, and let W^{K-1} be the representation (158) of the optimizing ϵ -common information variable W in Proposition 38. Then

$$C_\epsilon(X, Y) = I(W; X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} I(W_i; X, Y) + o(\epsilon), \quad (161)$$

where

$$I(W_i; X, Y) = \sigma_i + o(\epsilon), \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1. \quad (162)$$

Moreover, if (U^{K-1}, V^{K-1}) are the optimizing $\tilde{\epsilon}$ -multi-attributes in Proposition 33 for some $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$, then

$$C_\epsilon(U_i, V_i) = \tilde{\epsilon}^2 I(W_i; X, Y) + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2 \epsilon), \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1. \quad (163)$$

The associated data processing implications follow from the extended Markov structure (153). In particular, an (asymptotically) sufficient statistic for making decisions about W_i from (X^m, Y^m) is

$$R_i^* = S_i^* + T_i^*, \quad (164)$$

i.e., we have the Markov chain

$$W_i \leftrightarrow R_i^* \leftrightarrow (S_i^*, T_i^*) \leftrightarrow (X^m, Y^m), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix V-L.

Corollary 41: For W_i as defined in (158),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{W_i|X^m, Y^m}(w_i|x^m, y^m) &= \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma_i}{2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*} (1 + m w_i \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} r_i^*) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & w_i = \pm 1 \\ \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_i}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*}\right) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}) & w_i = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (165)$$

whose dominant term depends on x^m, y^m only through r_i^* .

By comparison, \tilde{W}_i satisfies the asymptotic Markov structure

$$\tilde{W}_i \leftrightarrow Z_i \leftrightarrow R_i^* \leftrightarrow (X^m, Y^m), \quad \tilde{\epsilon}, \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$Z_i \triangleq U_i + V_i. \quad (166)$$

In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix V-M.

Corollary 42: For \tilde{W}_i as defined in (159),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\tilde{W}_i|Z_i, X^m, Y^m}(\tilde{w}_i|z_i, x^m, y^m) &= \\ &= o(\tilde{\epsilon}\sqrt{\epsilon}) + \begin{cases} (1 + \text{sgn}(\tilde{w}_i z_i) \sqrt{\sigma_i})/2 & z_i = \pm 2 \\ 0 & z_i = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (167a)$$

whose dominant term depends on x^m, y^m (and thus r_i^*) only through z_i , and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z_i|X^m, Y^m}(z_i|x^m, y^m) &= \\ &= o(\tilde{\epsilon}) + \begin{cases} (1 + \tilde{\epsilon} m \text{sgn}(z_i) r_i^*)/4 & z_i = \pm 2 \\ 1/2 & z_i = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (167b)$$

whose dominant term depends on x^m, y^m only through r_i^* .

VI. EFFICIENT LEARNING OF MODAL DECOMPOSITIONS

Since the universal features developed in Section V are naturally expressed in terms of the modal decomposition (15) of the joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$, efficient learning of this decomposition from data is key to the practical applicability of these features. We discuss some of the main aspects of such computational issues in this section.

We begin by more fully describing the scenario of interest. To this point in our development, for pedagogical reasons our model has been that $P_{X,Y}$ is known, by which we mean practically that it has been reliably estimated from some training phase. When this is the case, the problem of efficiently computing the modal decomposition is simply one of efficient computation of the SVD of the associated matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$.

However, in practice, of course, learning $P_{X,Y}$ is an important aspect of the overall feature selection process in the inference pipeline. Accordingly, this section describes how this learning can be accomplished efficiently from samples as part of the computation of the modal decomposition.

It will be convenient in our exposition to first consider the modal computation from known $P_{X,Y}$, then use the resulting foundation to address the problem of learning the modal decomposition from samples.

A. Computing the Modal Decomposition

Given $P_{X,Y}$, computation of the SVD of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is a straightforward exercise in numerical linear algebra. In particular, from $P_{X,Y}$ we compute marginals P_X and P_Y , then construct $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ via (28), then apply any of many well-established numerical methods for computing the SVD of a matrix—see, e.g., [47], [50], [51]. However, in this section we further develop an interpretation of the resulting computation in the context of probabilistic analysis that will be particularly useful in the sequel. We emphasize at the outset that the results of this subsection are largely not new, but rather establish the viewpoints and interpretations we need for our subsequent development.

1) *Orthogonal Iteration:* Among the oldest and simplest approaches to the computation of the principal singular value and vector of a matrix is referred to as *power iteration* or the *power method* [47], [50], [51]. Moreover, power iteration can be used in a sequential manner to recover any number of the largest singular values and their corresponding singular vectors. However, when the first $1 < k \leq K-1$ dominant modes are desired, it is more efficient to compute them in parallel via a generalization of power iteration. The most direct generalization is referred to as *orthogonal iteration* [47,

Section 7.3.2].³⁵ This algorithm has a corresponding relation to the generalized variational characterizations of the SVD we have used throughout our analysis.

To implement orthogonal iteration, we start with some $|\mathcal{X}| \times k$ matrix $\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,0}$, which is typically chosen at random, and then execute the following iterative procedure:

- 1) Set $l = 0$.
- 2) Orthogonalize $\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l}$ to obtain $\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l}$ via the (thin or reduced) QR decomposition [47]

$$\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} = \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} \Theta_{(k)}^{X,l}, \quad (168)$$

in which $\Theta_{(k)}^{X,l}$ is a $k \times k$ upper triangular matrix.

- 3) Compute

$$\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l}, \quad (169)$$

then orthogonalize to obtain $\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l}$ via the (thin or reduced) QR decomposition

$$\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} = \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} \Theta_{(k)}^{Y,l}, \quad (170)$$

in which $\Theta_{(k)}^{Y,l}$ is a $k \times k$ upper triangular matrix.

- 4) Produce the update

$$\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l}. \quad (171)$$

- 5) Increment l and return to Step 2.

The QR decompositions employed in the orthogonalizations in this algorithm can be directly implemented using, e.g., the Gram-Schmidt procedure. However, numerical stability can be improved in practice through the use of Householder transformations [47].

The convergence of this procedure depends on the properties of

$$\mathbf{A} = (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T \bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,0}, \quad (172)$$

where $\Psi_{(k)}^X$ is the matrix of dominant singular vectors defined in (44). In particular, using $a_{i,j}$ to denote the (i,j) th entry of \mathbf{A} , when $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{k+1}$ are unique and there exist distinct j_1, \dots, j_k such that $a_{i,j_i} \neq 0$ for each i , then we obtain, as $l \rightarrow \infty$, [47, Theorem 7.3.1]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} &\rightarrow \Psi_{(k)}^X \\ \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} &\rightarrow \Psi_{(k)}^Y \\ (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} &\rightarrow \Sigma_{(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Sigma_{(k)}$ is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$. Moreover, convergence is exponentially fast.³⁶ When $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ are not distinct (but still $\sigma_k > \sigma_{k+1}$), natural generalizations of these results are obtained [47, Theorem 7.3.1].

³⁵A refinement of orthogonal iteration referred to as *QR iteration* [47, Section 7.3.3] forms the basis of most practical implementations, and can be used in conjunction with various acceleration techniques.

³⁶However, it is worth emphasizing that the closer a pair of dominant singular values are to each other, the poorer the convergence rate.

2) *Statistical Interpretation as the ACE Algorithm*: The use of orthogonal iteration to compute the dominant modes in (15) has a direct statistical interpretation that corresponds to what is referred to as the alternating conditional expectations (ACE) algorithm [52], [53].

In particular, choosing the correspondences

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_i(x) &\triangleq \frac{\hat{\psi}_i^{X,l}(x)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}}, & \bar{f}_i(x) &\triangleq \frac{\bar{\psi}_i^{X,l}(x)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}}, \\ \hat{g}_i(y) &\triangleq \frac{\hat{\psi}_i^{Y,l}(y)}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, & \bar{g}_i(y) &\triangleq \frac{\bar{\psi}_i^{Y,l}(y)}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\psi}_1^{X,l} & \dots & \hat{\psi}_k^{X,l} \end{bmatrix} \\ \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\psi}_1^{Y,l} & \dots & \hat{\psi}_k^{Y,l} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{X,l} &= \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\psi}_1^{X,l} & \dots & \bar{\psi}_k^{X,l} \end{bmatrix} \\ \bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^{Y,l} &= \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\psi}_1^{Y,l} & \dots & \bar{\psi}_k^{Y,l} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

we can rewrite the procedure of Section VI-A1 in the form of Algorithm 1, which iteratively computes both the dominant k features (f_*, g_*) and

$$\sigma^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i,$$

the Ky Fan k -norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. As such, the convergence behavior follows immediately from the corresponding analysis of orthogonal iteration.³⁷

To obtain Algorithm 1, we use that (168) and (170) can be equivalently expressed in the form³⁸

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}^k(x) &= (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^T \hat{f}^k(x), & x &\in \mathcal{X} \\ \bar{g}^k(y) &= (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^T \hat{g}^k(y), & y &\in \mathcal{Y}, \end{aligned}$$

via which we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_X(x) \bar{f}^k(x) \bar{f}^k(x)^T &= (\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^T \bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^X = (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^T \Theta_{(k)}^X \\ \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_Y(y) \bar{g}^k(y) \bar{g}^k(y)^T &= (\bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \bar{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y = (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^T \Theta_{(k)}^Y, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$(\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^T \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X = (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y = \mathbf{I}.$$

³⁷We emphasize that the Cholesky decompositions in Algorithm 1 are unique when the associated covariance matrices are full rank, which is the case when: 1) the singular values are distinct; and 2) the covariance matrix of the initialization is positive definite, with components correlated with each of the dominant features in the modal decomposition.

³⁸For convenience, in this derivation, we drop the dependence on iteration (superscript l) from our notation, consistent with the notation in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 ACE Algorithm for Multiple Mode Computation

Require: Joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$, number of modes k

 1. Initialization: randomly choose $\bar{f}^k(x)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$
repeat

 2a. Center: $\bar{f}^k(x) \leftarrow \bar{f}^k(x) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{f}^k(X)]$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$

2b. Cholesky factor:

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{f}^k(X) \bar{f}^k(X)^T] = (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^T \Theta_{(k)}^X$$

2c. Whiten:

$$\hat{f}^k(x) \leftarrow (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^{-T} \bar{f}^k(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}$$

 2d. $\bar{g}^k(y) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^k(X) | Y = y]$, $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$

 2e. Center: $\bar{g}^k(y) \leftarrow \bar{g}^k(y) - \mathbb{E}[\bar{g}^k(Y)]$, $\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$

2f. Cholesky factor:

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{g}^k(Y) \bar{g}^k(Y)^T] = (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^T \Theta_{(k)}^Y$$

2g. Whiten:

$$\hat{g}^k(y) \leftarrow (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^{-T} \bar{g}^k(y), \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}$$

 2h. $\bar{f}^k(x) \leftarrow \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}^k(Y) | X = x]$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$

 2i. $\hat{\sigma}^{(k)} \leftarrow \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^k(X)^T \hat{g}^k(Y)]$
until $\hat{\sigma}^{(k)}$ stops increasing.

Additionally, we use that, via (27), (169) and (171) can be equivalently expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}^k(y) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \tilde{B}(y, x) \sqrt{P_X(x)} \hat{f}^k(x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^k(X) | Y = y] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}^k(X)] \\ \bar{f}^k(x) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{B}(y, x) \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \hat{g}^k(y) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}^k(Y) | X = x] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}^k(Y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note, too, that via Bayesian estimation theory, the conditional expectations in Algorithm 1 can be interpreted as minimum mean-square error (MMSE) estimates, and thus we can equivalently write the corresponding steps 2h and 2d as optimizations; specifically, we have, respectively, the variational characterizations

$$\bar{f}^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \arg \min_{f^k(\cdot)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}^k(X) - \hat{g}^k(Y)\|^2 \right] \quad (173a)$$

$$\bar{g}^k(\cdot) \leftarrow \arg \min_{g^k(\cdot)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}^k(X) - g^k(Y)\|^2 \right], \quad (173b)$$

where we note that these optimizations can, themselves, be carried out by an iterative procedure. Such implementations can be attractive when there are constraints on $f^k(\cdot)$ and $g^k(\cdot)$ based on, e.g., domain knowledge and/or other considerations.

B. Estimating the Modal Decomposition from Data

When the joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$ is unknown, as is common in applications, but we have (labeled) training data

$$\mathcal{T} \triangleq \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}, \quad (174)$$

drawn i.i.d. from $P_{X,Y}$, we can replace $P_{X,Y}$ in Algorithm 1 with the empirical distribution

$$\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{x=x_i} \mathbb{1}_{y=y_i} \quad (175)$$

to generate an estimate of the modal decomposition. In this case, the expectations in Algorithm 1 are all with respect to the corresponding empirical distributions. In particular, those in steps 2a-b and 2e-f are with respect to, respectively,

$$\hat{P}_X(x) \triangleq \sum_y \hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_Y(y) \triangleq \sum_x \hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y),$$

while those in steps 2d and 2h are with respect to, respectively,

$$\hat{P}_{X|Y}(x|y) \triangleq \frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y)}{\hat{P}_Y(y)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_{Y|X}(y|x) \triangleq \frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y)}{\hat{P}_X(x)},$$

and that in step 2i is with respect to $\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y)$.

Evidently, in this version of Algorithm 1, the computational complexity scales with the number of training samples n . There are a variety of ways to reduce this complexity in practice. For example, among other possibilities, in each basic iteration we can choose to operate on only a (comparatively small) randomly chosen subset of the training data and exploit bootstrapping techniques.

It is also worth emphasizing that in some scenarios we may have both *labeled* and *unlabeled* training data available, the latter of which correspond to samples $x_1, \dots, x_{n'}$ and $y_1, \dots, y_{n'}$, drawn i.i.d. from P_X and P_Y , respectively. While labeled data is typically expensive to obtain, since the labeling process often involves a significant amount of manual labor, unlabeled data is comparatively inexpensive to obtain, since no correspondences need be identified. As such, it is often possible to accurately estimate P_X and P_Y . In such scenarios, the corresponding version of Algorithm 1 replaces $P_{X,Y}$ with an estimate based the labeled training data subject the marginal constraints P_X and P_Y , which can be constructed in a variety of ways; see, e.g., [54]–[56].

In the sequel, we quantify the accuracy of the modal decomposition when estimated from data. In light of the preceding discussion, for this analysis, \hat{f}_i^* , \hat{g}_i^* , and $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ are defined via the modal decomposition

$$\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y) = P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^K \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{f}_i^*(x) \hat{g}_i^*(y) \right], \quad (176)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_1 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\sigma}_K \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_i^*(X) \hat{f}_j^*(X)] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_i^*(Y) \hat{g}_j^*(Y)] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. We emphasize that in (176) we only have $\hat{\sigma}_K = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_i^*(X)] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_i^*(Y)] = 0$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, when $\hat{P}_X = P_X$ and $\hat{P}_Y = P_Y$.³⁹ Accordingly, in analysis, we will frequently find it convenient to use the equivalent zero-mean features

$$\check{f}_i^*(x) \triangleq \hat{f}_i^*(x) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_i^*(X)] \quad (177a)$$

$$\check{g}_i^*(y) \triangleq \hat{g}_i^*(y) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_i^*(Y)] \quad (177b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K$.

The decomposition (176) corresponds to the singular value decomposition of the quasi-CDM $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ whose (y, x) th entry is

$$\hat{B}(x, y) \triangleq \frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y) - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}}, \quad (178)$$

³⁹As such these properties effectively hold when $n \gg \max\{|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$.

i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} \triangleq \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \left[\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{Y,X} - \mathbf{P}_Y \mathbf{P}_X \right] \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right]^{-1} \quad (179)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{\psi}_i^Y (\hat{\psi}_i^X)^\top, \quad (180)$$

where the singular vectors in (180) have elements

$$\hat{\psi}_i^X(x) \triangleq \sqrt{P_X(x)} \hat{f}_i^*(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (181a)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_i^Y(y) \triangleq \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \hat{g}_i^*(y), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (181b)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K$.

There are several aspects of the modal decomposition estimation whose sample complexity is of interest, which we now address.

1) *Sample Complexity of Maximal Correlation Estimates:*

In this section, we determine the number of samples required to obtain accurate estimates $\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_k$ of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$, for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$.⁴⁰ Specifically, we focus on the measure

$$\mu_1^k(P_{X,Y}, \hat{P}_{X,Y}) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i|, \quad (182)$$

and related quantities.

We begin with the following tail probability bound, a proof of which is provided in Appendix VI-A.

Proposition 43: For $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, let $p_0 > 0$ be such that

$$P_X(x) \geq p_0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_Y(y) \geq p_0, \quad \text{all } x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (183)$$

Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \sqrt{k/2}/p_0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}, \quad (184)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ are defined via (176) with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples.

A key consequence of Proposition 43 is the following corollary.

Corollary 44: Suppose $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is such that (183) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 0$. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and n sufficiently large that $n \geq 16 \ln(4kn)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{6k + 8k \ln(nk)}{p_0^2 n}, \quad (185)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ are defined via (176) with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples.

The proof of Corollary 44, provided in Appendix VI-B, makes use of the following simple lemma, which is a straightforward exercise in calculus.

Lemma 45: Given $a, b > 0$, the convex function $\varphi_{a,b}: \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ defined via

$$\varphi_{a,b}(\omega) \triangleq \omega + ae^{-b\omega}, \quad (186)$$

⁴⁰ Although the case $k = K$ is typically less of interest (since $\sigma_K = 0$), we include it for completeness. For this case, $f_K^*(X)$ and $g_K^*(Y)$ can be chosen freely subject to the constraint that they are uncorrelated with $f_*^{K-1}(X)$ and $g_*^{K-1}(Y)$, respectively.

has its minimum at

$$\omega_* \triangleq \arg \min_{\omega} \varphi_{a,b}(\omega) = \frac{1}{b} \ln(ab), \quad (187)$$

where it takes value

$$\min_{\omega} \varphi_{a,b}(\omega) = \varphi_{a,b}(\omega_*) = \frac{1 + \ln(ab)}{b}. \quad (188)$$

Additional consequences of Proposition 43 and Corollary 44 are that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i) \right| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i) \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{6k + 8k \ln(nk)}{p_0^2 n},$$

respectively, which follow from the triangle inequality; specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{(k)} - \|\mathbf{A}_2\|_{(k)} \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^k (\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)|, \end{aligned} \quad (189)$$

for any $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$ and $k \in \{1, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$, with $\sigma_1(\cdot) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{k_1, k_2\}}(\cdot)$ denoting the ordered singular values of its (matrix) argument.⁴¹

And still further consequences of Proposition 43 and Corollary 44 are that

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i)^2 \geq \delta^2 \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i)^2 \right] \leq \frac{6k + 8k \ln(nk)}{p_0^2 n},$$

respectively, which follow from the standard norm inequality

$$\|a^k\| \leq \|a^k\|_1 \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^k |a_i|, \quad \text{any } k \text{ and } a^k. \quad (190)$$

Finally, for ϵ -dependent X and Y , variables $X^{(k)}, Y^{(k)}$ defined via (73a) have mutual information $I(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)})$ given by (73). Accordingly, a natural estimate of this mutual information is

$$\hat{I}(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)}) \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{\sigma}_i^2,$$

for which the error is

$$\hat{I}(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)}) - I(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (191)$$

The results of Proposition 43 and Corollary 44 can be used to bound the error (191); specifically, we have the following corollary, whose proof is provided in Appendix VI-C.

⁴¹Note that (189), in turn, means that, more generally, Lemma 104 in Appendix VI-A also quantifies the stability of Ky Fan k -norms.

Corollary 46: Suppose $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is such that (183) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 0$, and let $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ be defined via (176) with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples. Then for any $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq \sqrt{k/2}/p_0^2$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^4 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}, \quad (192)$$

and, for n such that $n \geq 16 \ln(4kn)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{6k + 8k \ln(nk)}{p_0^4 n}. \quad (193)$$

More generally, it should be emphasized that, as the proofs of Proposition 43, Corollary 44, and Corollary 46 reveal, their results hold not only for the k dominant singular values $\hat{\sigma}_i$ and σ_i , but for arbitrary (corresponding) subsets of k singular values.

2) *Sample Complexity of Feature Estimates:* In this section, we determine the number of samples required to obtain accurate estimates

$$\check{f}_*^k = (\check{f}_1^*, \dots, \check{f}_k^*) \quad \text{and} \quad \check{g}_*^k = (\check{g}_1^*, \dots, \check{g}_k^*)$$

of the features f_*^k and g_*^k , respectively, for $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$. Our development focuses on measuring the accuracy of these estimates by the extent to which they preserve as much of the mutual information between X and Y as possible, in the local sense, corresponding to $\sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_k^2$. Specifically, we measure this via⁴²

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2^k(P_{X,Y}, \hat{P}_{X,Y}) \\ \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left| \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)]\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)]\|^2 \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

To facilitate interpretation of the measure (194), note that since

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f^k(X)]\|^2 \right] \quad (195)$$

with Ξ^X denoting the collection of feature vectors associated with f^k as defined in (41a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{f^k \in \mathcal{F}_k} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f^k(X)]\|^2 \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)]\|^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{F}_k is as defined in (35c).

We begin with the following tail probability bound, a proof of which is provided in Appendix VI-D.

⁴²To avoid unnecessarily cumbersome expressions, we have left implicit the conditioning on $\check{f}_*^k(\cdot)$ in the expectation in (194).

Proposition 47: Let $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ be such that (183) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 0$. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq 4k$,⁴³

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left| \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)]\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)]\|^2 \right| \geq \delta \right] \right\} \\ \leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{64 k^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

where \check{f}_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ are defined via (177a) and (176), with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples.

Note that by symmetry, it also follows immediately from Proposition 47 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\check{g}_*^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\left| \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{Y|X}} [g_*^k(Y)]\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{Y|X}} [\check{g}_*^k(Y)]\|^2 \right| \geq \delta \right] \right\} \\ \leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{64 k^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

where, analogously, \check{g}_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ are defined via (177b) and (176).

A key consequence of Proposition 47 is the following corollary, whose proof, provided in Appendix VI-E, makes use of Lemma 45.

Corollary 48: Let $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ be such that (183) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 0$. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and n sufficiently large that

$$\frac{p_0 n}{64} \geq \frac{1}{(|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|)} \quad (198a)$$

and

$$\frac{p_0 n}{4} \geq \ln \left(\frac{p_0 n}{64} (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \right), \quad (198b)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left| \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)]\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)]\|^2 \right| \right]^2 \right) \right] \\ \leq \frac{64k^2 \left(\ln[p_0 n (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|)] - 3 \right)}{p_0 n}, \end{aligned} \quad (199)$$

where \check{f}_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ are defined via (177a) and (176), with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples, and where (with slight abuse of notation) we use $\mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k}[\cdot]$ to denote expectation with respect to the distribution governing the random map \check{f}_*^k .

3) *Complementary Sample Complexity Bounds:* In Proposition 43, we bound the sample complexity of maximal correlation estimates via a Frobenius norm bound, while in Proposition 47, we bound the sample complexity of feature estimates via a spectral norm bound. However, we may interchange these analyses, using spectral norm bounds to analyze sample complexity of maximal correlation estimates, and Frobenius norm bounds to analyze the sample complexity of feature estimates.

⁴³With slight abuse of notation, we use $\mathbb{P}_{\check{f}_*^k}\{\cdot\}$ to denote probability with respect to the distribution governing the random map $\check{f}_*^k(\cdot)$.

In this way, we obtain complementary results. In particular, we have the following alternative bound on the sample complexity of maximal correlation estimates, a proof of which is provided in Appendix VI-F.

Proposition 49: For $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, let $p_0 > 0$ be such that (183) is satisfied. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq k$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\} \leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{4k^2} \right\}, \quad (200)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ are defined via (176) with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples.

Moreover, Proposition 49 can be used to obtain an alternative version of Corollary 44.

Likewise, we have the following alternative bound on the sample complexity of feature estimates, a proof of which is provided in Appendix VI-G.

Proposition 50: Let $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ be such that (183) is satisfied for some $p_0 > 0$. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq (4/p_0)/\sqrt{k/2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{f_*^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\hat{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \geq \delta \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{128k} \right\}, \quad (201)$$

where \hat{f}_i^* for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ are defined via (177a) and (176), with $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denoting the empirical distribution based on n training samples.

Proposition 50 can similarly be used to obtain an alternative version of Corollary 48.

Comparing (200) to (184) for maximum correlation estimates, and (201) to (196) for feature estimates, we see that the alternative bounds depend on the parameters in different ways, and apply in different regimes. As such, each may be better than the other in different regimes.

4) *A Related Measure of Feature Quality:* A natural measure of feature quality closely related to that defined in (194) is

$$\mu_{2'}^k(P_{X,Y}, \hat{P}_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\| \mathbb{E} [f_*^k(X) g_*^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E} [\hat{f}_*^k(X) \hat{g}_*^k(Y)^T] \right\|_{\text{F}}. \quad (202)$$

See Appendix VI-H for an analysis of (202), which establishes that sample complexity bounds very similar to those for (194) apply.

5) *Sample Complexity Error Exponent Analysis:* Further sample complexity results can be obtained in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ via large deviations analysis, complementing the results of Sections VI-B1–VI-B3.

In this analysis, for a given $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ we focus on the empirical DTM $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ whose (y, x) th entry is⁴⁴

$$\hat{B}(x, y) \triangleq \frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y)}{\sqrt{\hat{P}_X(x)} \sqrt{\hat{P}_Y(y)}}, \quad (203)$$

for which \hat{f}_i^* , \hat{g}_i^* , and $\hat{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$ are defined via the modal decomposition

$$\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x, y) = \hat{P}_X(x) \hat{P}_Y(y) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{f}_i^*(x) \hat{g}_i^*(y) \right], \quad (204)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_1 \geq \dots \geq \hat{\sigma}_{K-1} \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_X} [\hat{f}_i^*(X) \hat{f}_j^*(X)] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_Y} [\hat{g}_i^*(Y) \hat{g}_j^*(Y)] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$. Eq. (204) corresponds to the singular value decomposition

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} = \sum_{i=0}^{K-1} \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{\psi}_i^Y (\hat{\psi}_i^X)^T, \quad (205)$$

where for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ the singular vectors in (205) are related to the feature vectors in (204) as in (181), and where [cf. (14)]

$$\hat{\sigma}_0 = 1, \quad \hat{\psi}_0^X(x) = \sqrt{\hat{P}_X(x)}, \quad \hat{\psi}_0^Y(y) = \sqrt{\hat{P}_Y(y)}.$$

Motivated by the analyses in the previous sections, we consider the following neighborhoods of $P_{X,Y}$:

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta^{\text{F}}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} : \|\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \delta \right\} \quad (206a)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta^{\text{s}}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} : \|\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}\|_{\text{s}} \leq \delta \right\} \quad (206b)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\delta^{\text{k}}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \left\{ \hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} : \left| \|\mathbf{B} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 - \|\mathbf{B} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right| \leq \delta \right\}, \quad (206c)$$

$$1 \leq k \leq K-1,$$

for any $\delta > 0$, where $\hat{\mathbf{B}}$ is the DTM corresponding to $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$. We denote the k dominant singular vectors using $\hat{\psi}_i^X$, and $\hat{\psi}_i^Y$, and define

$$\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \triangleq [\hat{\psi}_1^X \ \dots \ \hat{\psi}_k^X] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y \triangleq [\hat{\psi}_1^Y \ \dots \ \hat{\psi}_k^Y]. \quad (207)$$

Our main result relates the error exponents for (206c) to those of (206a) and (206b); a proof is provided in Appendix VI-I.

Proposition 51: For any $P_{X,Y} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})$, any $0 < \delta < B_{\min}(P_{X,Y})$ with

$$B_{\min}(P_{X,Y}) \triangleq \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} B(x, y) > 0, \quad (208)$$

⁴⁴By contrast, in the preceding sections the analysis focused on the quasi-CDM defined via (178), which uses true instead of empirical marginals and removes the zeroth mode, resulting in the decomposition (176). However, the re-use of notation is convenient. Also, more generally $\hat{B}(x, y) \triangleq 0$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\hat{P}_X(x) = 0$ or $\hat{P}_Y(y) = 0$, consistent with (9).

and $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$, $\mathcal{S}_\delta^S(P_{X,Y})$, and $\mathcal{S}_\delta^k(P_{X,Y})$ as defined in (206),

$$E(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k(P_{X,Y})) \geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})) = E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})) \quad (209a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k(P_{X,Y})) &\geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^S(P_{X,Y})) = E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^S(P_{X,Y})) \\ &\geq E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})), \end{aligned} \quad (209b)$$

for $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, where for $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y}$,

$$E(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq -\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S} \right\} \quad (210)$$

$$E_*(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq -\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S} \right\} \quad (211)$$

$$E_-(\mathcal{S}) \triangleq \inf_{\hat{P}_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}} D(\hat{P}_{X,Y} \| P_{X,Y}). \quad (212)$$

Proposition 51 quantifies, e.g., the relative difficulties of achieving small

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\hat{B}(x, y) - B(x, y))^2,$$

which corresponds to (206a), small⁴⁵

$$\max_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_1} \left(\mathbb{E}[f(X)g(Y)] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{X,Y}}[f(X)g(Y)] \right),$$

which corresponds to (206b) when $\hat{P}_X = P_X$ and $\hat{P}_Y = P_Y$ (and which is a good approximation for moderately large n), and small

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}}[f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}}[\hat{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \right|$$

which corresponds to (206c)—and which is closely related to achieving small

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}[f_*^k(X)g_*^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_*^k(X)\hat{g}_*^k(Y)^T] \right\|_F,$$

according to the discussion of Section VI-B4.

Finally, the following lemma, whose proof is provided in Appendix VI-J, provides a local characterization of related Chernoff exponents.⁴⁶

Lemma 52: For $P_Z \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^Z)$ and every $h: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[h(Z)] \neq 0$ and $\text{var}[h(Z)] > 0$, and with \hat{P}_Z denoting the empirical distribution formed from n i.i.d. samples of P_Z , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2}{\gamma^2 n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_Z}[h(Z)]}{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]} - 1 \right| \geq \gamma \right\} \\ = -\frac{(\mathbb{E}[h(Z)])^2}{\text{var}[h(Z)]}. \end{aligned} \quad (213)$$

We can apply Lemma 52 to $h(Z) = f(X)g(Y)$ with $Z = (X, Y)$ for different choices of f and g . In particular, it follows

⁴⁵This is the special ($k=1$) case of expressing $\|\mathbf{B} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_{(k)}$ in the form

$$\max_{(f^k, g^k) \in \mathcal{F}_k \times \mathcal{G}_k} \left[\mathbb{E}[f^k(X)g^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{X,Y}}[f^k(X)g^k(Y)^T] \right].$$

⁴⁶For related local exponent analysis, see, e.g., [57].

immediately that for any $P_{X,Y} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y})$, and any f and g such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(X)^2] &= \mathbb{E}[g(Y)^2] = 1 \\ \mathbb{E}[f(X)g(Y)] &\neq 0 \\ \text{var}[f(X)g(Y)] &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\Delta^2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \\ \cdot \log \left[\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{X,Y}}[f(X)g(Y)]}{\mathbb{E}[f(X)g(Y)]} - 1 \right| \geq \Delta \right\} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(X)g(Y)]^2}{\text{var}[f(X)g(Y)]}. \end{aligned} \quad (214)$$

As one instance of (214), we can choose $f = f_1^*$ and $g = g_1^*$ to quantify the sample complexity of estimating σ_1 . As another, we can choose

$$f(x) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{x=x_0}}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(y) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{y=y_0}}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}},$$

for some (x_0, y_0) , to quantify the sample complexity of estimating the (x_0, y_0) th entry of \mathbf{B} , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X)g(Y)] = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x_0, y_0)}{\sqrt{P_X(x_0)}\sqrt{P_Y(y_0)}} = B(x_0, y_0).$$

VII. COLLABORATIVE FILTERING AND MATRIX FACTORIZATION

A variety of high-dimensional learning and inference problems can be addressed within the preceding framework of analysis. One example is the design of recommender systems [58] based on collaborative filtering [59]. These systems aim to predict the preferences of individual users for various items from (limited) knowledge of some of their and other users' item preferences, such as may be obtained from ratings data and/or records of prior choices. Among the most successful forms of collaborative filtering to date have been matrix factorization methods based on latent factor models and involving low-rank approximation techniques [60]–[62], a subset of which are formulated as matrix completion problems [63]–[66] or variations thereof [67], [68].

In applying such methods, the system designer must (implicitly or otherwise) choose: 1) how to model the available data expressing user preferences; 2) what matrix representation to factor; and 3) a criterion for evaluating the quality of candidate factorizations. The large literature in this area reflects the many choices available. In this section, we formulate the collaborative filtering problem as one of Bayesian decision making involving multi-attributes, and show that its solution corresponds to a matrix factorization method that differs in some significant respects from existing ones.

A. Bayesian Attribute Matching

As a convenient context popularized in [69], consider the content-provider problem of recommending movies to subscribers. Let \mathcal{X} be the collection of subscribers, and let \mathcal{Y}

be the collection of available movies. In turn, $(X, Y) = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ denotes the event that the next instant a movie is watched, it will be subscriber x watching movie y , and $P_{X,Y}(x, y)$ denotes the probability of this event.

With this notation, the associated conditional $P_{Y|X}(y|x)$ denotes the probability that if x is the next subscriber to watch a movie, he/she will select movie y . From this perspective, the recommendation problem can be interpreted as identifying values of y for which this conditional probability is high for the given x , or more generally sampling from $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$. Alternatively, if one seeks to avoid biasing the recommendation according to P_Y and replace it with a uniform distribution, we sample from the distribution proportional to $P_{X|Y}(x|\cdot)$ instead.

In practice, we must estimate $P_{X,Y}$ from data $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$, where (x_j, y_j) is a record of subscriber $X = x_j$ having selected movie $Y = y_j$ to watch at some point in the past. In particular, we treat these n records as i.i.d. samples from $P_{X,Y}$. In the regime of interest, there are comparatively few training samples n relative to the joint alphabet size $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, so to obtain meaningful results the procedure for estimating $P_{X,Y}$ must take this into account. In the sequel, this is accomplished by exploiting attribute variables, as we now develop.

In developing the key concepts, it is convenient to initially treat $P_{X,Y}$ as known, then return to the scenario of interest in which only the empirical distribution $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ is available.

To begin, we view the multi-attribute variables U^k and V^k in the Markov chain $U^k \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow V^k$ obtained in Section V-D (and Section V-E) as the dominant attributes of subscribers and movies, respectively. In turn the corresponding S_*^k and T_*^k , as defined in (91), represent sufficient statistics for the detection of these attributes.

Conceptually, for each movie y , there is an associated movie multi-attribute $V^k(y)$ generated randomly from y according to $P_{V^k|Y}(\cdot|y)$, as defined via (116b), that expresses its dominant characteristic. Likewise, for the target subscriber x , there is an associated movie multi-attribute $V_o^k(x)$ generated randomly from x according to $P_{V_o^k|X}(\cdot|x)$, as defined via (117a), that expresses his/her preferred movie characteristic. Having defined these multi-attributes, we can express the recommendation problem as one of Bayesian decision-making among multiple (not mutually exclusive) hypotheses. Specifically, $\mathcal{E}_y(x)$ denotes the event that there is an attribute match with movie y for subscriber x , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}_y(x) \triangleq \{V^k(y) = V_o^k(x)\}. \quad (215)$$

The following result characterizes the movie recommendation rule that results from maximizing the expected number of matches. A proof is provided in Appendix VII-A.

Proposition 53: Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, $l \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$, $P_{X,Y} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})$, and a collection $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ of l (distinct) movies for subscriber $x \in \mathcal{X}$, let the number that are a match be

$$M \triangleq \sum_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_y(x)}, \quad (216)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_y(x)$ as defined in (215), with the movie multi-attributes $V^k(y)$ (for movie $y \in \mathcal{Y}$) and $V_o^k(x)$ (for user $x \in \mathcal{X}$)

being independent and distributed according to, respectively, $P_{V^k|Y}(\cdot|y)$ and $P_{V_o^k|X}(\cdot|x)$ as defined via Proposition 30 and Corollary 31, i.e., according to⁴⁷

$$\begin{aligned} P_{V_o^k, V^k, X, Y}(v_o^k, v^k, x, y) \\ = P_{V_o^k|X}(v_o^k|x) P_{V^k|Y}(v^k|y) P_{X,Y}(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (217)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}[M] \leq \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^*(x)} \left(1 + \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (218)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{Y}}^*(x) \triangleq \{y_1^*(x), \dots, y_l^*(x)\} \quad (219)$$

is constructed sequentially according to

$$y_1^*(x) \triangleq \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \quad (220a)$$

$$y_j^*(x) \triangleq \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_1^*(x), \dots, y_{j-1}^*(x)\}} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y), \quad j = 2, \dots, l. \quad (220b)$$

Moreover, the inequality in (218) holds with equality when we choose $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x) = \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^*(x)$.

Note that in the case $l = 1$, the criterion in Proposition 53 specializes to the probability of a decision error, which our result establishes is minimized by the use of the *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) decision rule, generalizing the familiar result for Bayesian hypothesis testing. More generally, Proposition 53 establishes that we maximize the expected number of matches in our list by an MAP *list* decision rule: we recommend to subscriber x the l movies having the l highest probabilities of an attribute match. Note, too, that using (25b) we can write the k -dimensional (weighted) inner product that is the core computation in (220) in the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) = \sum_{i=1}^k g_i^*(y) \mathbb{E}[g_i^*(Y) | X = x],$$

which provides additional interpretation of the maximum inner product decision rule.

B. Interpretation as Matrix Factorization

To interpret Bayesian attribute matching as a form of matrix factorization, we have the following result establishing the decision rule as a maximum likelihood one based on a rank-reduced approximation to $P_{X,Y}$.

Corollary 54: Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, $l \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$, and $P_{X,Y} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})$, the optimum recommendation list in Proposition 53 can be expressed in the form

$$y_1^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X|Y}^{(k)}(x|y) \quad (221a)$$

$$y_j^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_1^*(x), \dots, y_{j-1}^*(x)\}} P_{X|Y}^{(k)}(x|y), \quad j = 2, \dots, l. \quad (221b)$$

⁴⁷Note that (217) implies, e.g., 1) $V_o^k \leftrightarrow (X, Y) \leftrightarrow V^k$; 2) $X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow V^k$; and 3) $V_o^k \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y$. These, in turn, imply, e.g., $V_o^k \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow V^k$ and $V_o^k \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow V^k$.

where

$$P_{X|Y}^{(k)}(x|y) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y}^{(k)}(x,y)}{P_Y(y)}.$$

with $P_{X,Y}^{(k)}$ as defined in (73a).

This corollary is an immediate consequence of the fact that the objective function in (220) can be equivalently written in terms of $P_{X,Y}^{(k)}$; specifically,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) = \frac{P_{X,Y}^{(k)}(x,y)}{P_X(x) P_Y(y)} - 1.$$

Moreover, $P_{X,Y}^{(k)}$ is the distribution corresponding to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)}$, which is the rank- k approximation to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ obtained by retaining the dominant k modes in the SVD of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. Equivalently, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)}$ is the rank-constrained approximation to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ obtained by minimizing $\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)}\|_{\text{F}}$, which follows from the well-known matrix approximation theorem [70] [24, Corollary 7.4.1.3(a) and Section 7.4.2] [47, Theorem 2.4.8].⁴⁸

Lemma 55 (Eckart-Young): If \mathbf{A} and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ are $k_1 \times k_2$ matrices such that \mathbf{A} has singular values $\sigma_1(\mathbf{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{k_1, k_2\}}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \leq k$, then

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \geq \sum_{i=k+1}^{\min\{k_1, k_2\}} \sigma_i^2. \quad (222)$$

C. Collaborative Filtering Based on Attribute Matching

The preceding results lead directly to a straightforward collaborative filtering procedure. In particular, given a history (174) of n prior movie selections by users, modeled as drawn i.i.d. from $P_{X,Y}$, we form the empirical distribution $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$, and use this distribution in Proposition 53 and Corollary 54. Consistent with the discussion in Section VI-B, we focus on the case in which P_X and P_Y can be accurately estimated, but $P_{X,Y}$ cannot.

As such, we effectively obtain the dominant k modes from the modal decomposition (176) using Algorithm 1 with the empirical distribution, then use the resulting $\hat{\sigma}_i$, \hat{f}_i^* , and \hat{g}_i^* , for $i = 1, \dots, k$, to form the score function

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{f}_i^*(x) \hat{g}_i^*(y),$$

whose maxima over y for a given subscriber x produce the movie recommendations. As our analysis in Section VI-B reflects, we can expect the estimated modes to be accurate provided k is sufficiently small relative to n . The complete procedure takes the form of Algorithm 2.

It is worth emphasizing that the attribute matching approach to collaborative filtering dictates factoring $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ as defined in (179), which differs from other approaches used in the literature. For example, popular alternatives include factoring the matrix representation $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{Y,X}$ of $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ itself [61], and factoring the matrix representation for pointwise mutual information

Algorithm 2 Collaborative Filtering by Attribute-Matching

Require: Subscriber list \mathcal{X} , movie list \mathcal{Y} , selections history \mathcal{T} , i.e., $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$, dimension k , recommendation list size l , target subscriber x

1. Estimate k modes of $P_{X,Y}$ from $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ via ACE:

$$\hat{\sigma}_i, \hat{f}_i(\cdot), \hat{g}_i(\cdot), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k$$

2. Initialize recommendation list: $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}^* = \emptyset$

3. Initialize candidates list: $\bar{\mathcal{Y}} = \mathcal{Y}$

for $j = 1, \dots, l$ **do**

$$4a. y^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}} \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{f}_i^*(x) \hat{g}_i^*(y)$$

4b. Update recommendation list: $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}^* \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^* \cup \{y^*\}$

4c. Update candidates list: $\bar{\mathcal{Y}} \leftarrow \bar{\mathcal{Y}} \setminus \{y^*\}$

end for

[73] (information density [74]), i.e., the matrix whose (y, x) th entry is

$$\log \frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x,y)}{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}, \quad (223)$$

as arises in natural language processing [75], [76].

D. Extensions

Finally, a natural alternative to the procedure of Corollary 54 are the recommendations

$$y_1^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{Y|X}^{(k)}(y|x) \quad (224a)$$

$$y_j^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_1^*(x), \dots, y_{j-1}^*(x)\}} P_{Y|X}^{(k)}(y|x), \quad j = 2, \dots, l. \quad (224b)$$

where

$$P_{Y|X}^{(k)}(y|x) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y}^{(k)}(x,y)}{P_X(x)}.$$

Unlike that of Corollary 54, this procedure includes the effect of P_Y in its recommendations. It is obtained by replacing (216) with

$$M \triangleq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} P_Y(y) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_y(x)},$$

and analytically extending the local analysis to $\epsilon = 1$, i.e., relaxing the weak dependence constraint.

VIII. SOFTMAX REGRESSION

As we develop in this section, a further characterization of the universal features in Proposition 2 is as the optimizing parameters in softmax regression (i.e., multinomial logistic regression) in the weak-dependence regime. Softmax regression [77], which originated with the introduction of logistic regression by Cox [78], has proven to be an extraordinarily useful classification architecture in a wide range of practical applications, and has well known approximation properties—see, e.g., [79]–[81]. As such, viewing our results from this perspective yields additional interpretations and insights. More generally, this form of regression can be expressed as an elementary form of neural network, and thus its analysis is useful

⁴⁸As discussed in [71], the original version of this approximation theorem was actually due to Schmidt [72].

in relating the preceding results to aspects of contemporary neural networks.

In softmax regression, for a class index Y and k -dimensional real-valued data S we fit a posterior of the form

$$\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(y|s) = P_Y(y) e^{s^T g(y) + \beta(y) - \alpha(s)},$$

to some $P_{S,Y}$ by choosing parameters g and β . Note that g is defined by⁴⁹ $|\mathcal{Y}|$ parameter vectors $g(1), \dots, g(|\mathcal{Y}|)$, each of dimension k . Likewise, β is defined by $|\mathcal{Y}|$ scalar parameters $\beta(1), \dots, \beta(|\mathcal{Y}|)$.

We characterize the optimizing softmax parameters in the weak-dependence regime as follows; a proof is provided in Appendix VIII-A.

Proposition 56: Given $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ such that X, Y are ϵ -dependent for some $\epsilon > 0$, a dimension k , and $s = f(x)$ for some $f: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k$, let

$$P_{S,Y}(s, y) = \sum_{\{x: f(x)=s\}} P_{X,Y}(x, y)$$

be the induced distribution, and let P_S denote the associated induced marginal, with μ_S its mean, and Λ_S its covariance, which we assume to be nonsingular.⁵⁰ Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y) &\triangleq \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Y}} : \right. \\ &P = \tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(y|s) \triangleq P_Y(y) e^{s^T g(y) + \beta(y) - \alpha(s)} \\ &\left. \text{for some } \beta: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R} \text{ and } g: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^k \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (225)$$

denote the exponential family with natural statistic $g(y)$ and natural parameter $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S} \triangleq f(\mathcal{X})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\tilde{P}_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s) D(P_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|S}(\cdot|s)) \\ &= I(Y; S) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \Lambda_S^{-1/2} (\mu_{S|Y}(Y) - \mu_S) \right\|^2 \right] + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (226)$$

with

$$\mu_{S|Y}(y) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[S|Y=y], \quad (227)$$

and is achieved by the parameters

$$g(y) = g_{*,S}(y) \triangleq \Lambda_S^{-1} (\mu_{S|Y}(y) - \mu_S) + o(\epsilon) \quad (228a)$$

$$\beta(y) = \beta_{*,S}(y) \triangleq -\mu_S^T g_{*,S}(y) + o(\epsilon), \quad (228b)$$

i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^*(y|s) \\ &\propto P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ (s - \mu_S)^T \Lambda_S^{-1} (\mu_{S|Y}(y) - \mu_S) \right\} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (228c)$$

⁴⁹In this section, we omit the superscript notation that we previously used to explicitly indicate the dimension of a multi-dimensional variable.

⁵⁰It is comparatively straightforward to verify that when Λ_S is singular, the proposition holds provided we replace the inverse Λ_S^{-1} wherever it appears with the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse Λ_S^\dagger and add to $g_{*,S}(y)$ any $g_\emptyset(y) \in \text{null}(\Lambda_S)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[g_\emptyset(Y)] = \mathbf{0}$.

A. Relation to Gaussian Mixture Analysis

It is useful to note that the optimum posterior (228c) in Proposition 56 matches that for a Gaussian mixture in which the components depend weakly on the class index, despite the fact that there are no Gaussian assumptions in the proposition. In particular, suppose that $P_{S|Y}(\cdot|y) = \mathcal{N}(\mu_{S|Y}(y), \Lambda_{S|Y})$, where $\Lambda_{S|Y}$ is positive definite and, as the notation reflects, does not depend on y , and where $\mu_{S|Y}(y) \triangleq \mu_S + \epsilon e(y)$ with $\mathbb{E}[e(Y)] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{Y|S}(y|s) \\ &\propto P_Y(y) P_{S|Y}(s|y) \\ &\propto P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (s - \mu_{S|Y}(y))^T \Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} (s - \mu_{S|Y}(y)) \right\} \\ &= P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[(s - \mu_S)^T \Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} (s - \mu_S) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2 (s - \mu_{S|Y}(y))^T \Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} (\mu_S - \mu_{S|Y}(y)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (\mu_S - \mu_{S|Y}(y))^T \Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} (\mu_S - \mu_{S|Y}(y)) \right] \right\} \\ &\propto P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ (s - \mu_{S|Y}(y))^T \Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} (\mu_{S|Y}(y) - \mu_S) \right\} \\ &\quad \cdot (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned} \quad (229)$$

$$= P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ (s - \mu_S)^T \Lambda_S^{-1} (\mu_{S|Y}(y) - \mu_S) \right\} (1 + o(1)), \quad (231)$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, where to obtain (229) we have used the simple expansion

$$s - \mu_{S|Y}(y) = (s - \mu_S) + (\mu_S - \mu_{S|Y}(y)),$$

and to obtain (230) we have used that in the exponent in (229) the first term does not depend on y , the second term is $O(\epsilon)$, and the third term is $o(\epsilon)$. To obtain (231) we have used that $\mu_{S|Y} - \mu_S$ and $\Lambda_{S|Y}^{-1} - \Lambda_S^{-1}$ are both $o(1)$. Hence, (231) and (228c) match, to first order.

B. Optimum Feature Design

Proposition 56 describes the optimizing softmax weights g and biases β for a given choice of f . When we further optimize over the choice of f , we obtain a direct relation to the modal decomposition of Proposition 2 and the universal posterior (80). In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix VIII-B.

Corollary 57: Given dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, if $P_{X,Y}$ is such that f_*^k as defined in (34) is injective (i.e., a one-to-one function), then

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\substack{\text{injective } f: \\ s=f(x)}} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s) D(P_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|S}^*(\cdot|s)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=k+1}^K \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (232)$$

and is achieved by

$$f_i(x) = f_i^*(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (233)$$

with f_i^* as defined in Proposition 2. Moreover, for this choice of f , the parameters

$$g_{*,S}(y) = (g_1^{*,S}(y), \dots, g_k^{*,S}(y)) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{*,S}(y)$$

in Proposition 56 take the form

$$g_i^{*,S}(y) = \sigma_i g_i^*(y), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \quad (234a)$$

$$\beta_{*,S} = 0 \quad (234b)$$

where $g_i^*(y)$ and σ_i are as defined in Proposition 2, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}_{Y|S_*}^*(y|f_*^k(x)) \\ & \propto P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right\} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (235)$$

C. Neural Network Insights

Since softmax regression can be interpreted as a simple neural network classifier with a single hidden layer [82], [83], our results can be equivalently expressed in terms of the optimization of such networks. Moreover, with the interpretation of universal features as a solution to a local information bottleneck as developed in Section V-E, these results shed insight into recent analyses of deep learning based on such bottlenecks [84]–[88] as well as related information-theoretic analyses [89].

The neural network architecture associated with softmax analysis is, in our notation, as depicted in Fig. 3. The input layer uses a so-called “one-hot” representation of the input x , corresponding to weights $\mathbb{1}_{x=j}$. Next, in the hidden layer, features $s_i = f_i(x)$ of the input x are generated using weights $f_i(j)$. Finally, in the output layer, the (unnormalized) log-posterior $\tau(y)$ is constructed according to

$$\tau(y) = \sum_{i=1}^k s_i g_i(y) + \beta(y), \quad y = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|$$

using output layer weights $g_i(y)$ and biases $\beta(y)$. The $\tau(y)$ are then combined and normalized to produce the posterior via the softmax processing

$$P_{Y|X}^*(y|x) = \frac{e^{\tau(y)}}{\sum_{y'=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} e^{\tau(y')}} = \varsigma \left(-\ln \sum_{y' \neq y} e^{\tau(y') - \tau(y)} \right), \quad (236a)$$

where

$$\varsigma(\omega) \triangleq \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\omega}} \quad (236b)$$

is the sigmoid function [83].

For such networks and their multi-layer generalizations, the optimization of the weights and biases is typically carried out using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [83]. As such, Proposition 56 implies that SGD is effectively computing empirical conditional expectations, and as such corresponds to an approximation to one step of the ACE algorithm. More generally, Corollary 57 establishes that jointly optimizing the

softmax parameters and data embeddings (features) can be accomplished iteratively via the full ACE algorithm.

To see this, let $\hat{P}_{S,Y}$ denote the empirical distribution for induced training data

$$\mathcal{T}_f = \{(s_1, y_1), \dots, (s_n, y_n)\}$$

generated from $P_{S,Y}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{P}_S(s) D(\hat{P}_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(\cdot|s)) \\ & = \hat{H}(Y|S) - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{S,Y}} [\log \tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(Y|S)]}_{\triangleq \ell(g,\beta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\ell(g, \beta)$ is the likelihood function, and $\hat{H}(Y|S)$ denotes the empirical conditional entropy. Then if the number of training samples is sufficiently large that, effectively,⁵¹

$$\hat{P}_Y(y) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \hat{P}_{S,Y}(s, y) = P_Y(y), \quad y \in \mathcal{Y},$$

the maximum-likelihood parameters are, via Proposition 56

$$\hat{g}_{*,S}(y) = \hat{\Lambda}_S^{-1} (\hat{\mu}_{S|Y}(y) - \hat{\mu}_S) + o(\epsilon) \quad (237a)$$

$$\hat{\beta}_{*,S}(y) = -\hat{\mu}_S^T \hat{g}_{*,S}(y) + o(\epsilon), \quad (237b)$$

where

$$\hat{\mu}_S = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_S} [S]$$

$$\hat{\mu}_{S|Y}(y) = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_{S|Y}(\cdot|y)} [S]$$

$$\hat{\Lambda}_S = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_S} [(S - \hat{\mu}_S)(S - \hat{\mu}_S)^T],$$

with

$$\hat{P}_S(s) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{P}_{S,Y}(s, y), \quad s \in \mathcal{S}$$

$$\hat{P}_{S|Y}(s|y) = \frac{\hat{P}_{S,Y}(s, y)}{P_Y(y)}, \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Likewise, further optimizing the likelihood for the training data (174) with respect to f such that $s = f(x)$ under the condition that $\hat{P}_S(s) = P_S(s)$ for $s \in \mathcal{S}$ yields that

$$\hat{f}_i(x) = \hat{f}_i^*(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{g}_i(y) = \hat{\sigma}_i \hat{g}_i^*(y), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$$

for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, where \hat{f}_i , \hat{g}_i , and $\hat{\sigma}_i$ are as defined in the analysis of Section VI-B and can (effectively) be computed via Algorithm 1; specifically, they characterize the modal decomposition of the empirical distribution as expressed by (176).

Such analysis suggests the potential for alternatives to SGD that more directly approximate empirical conditional expectation, and for interpretations of the iterative matrix factorizations inherent in, e.g., [90], [91]. Moreover, our analysis provides an upper bound (232) on performance against which the performance of various weight optimization strategies can be measured.

⁵¹There are only $|\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ degrees of freedom in P_Y , so that when $|\mathcal{S}|$ is large, as we assume, P_Y can be more accurately estimated from a given number of samples than $P_{S,Y}$, since the latter is described by $|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{Y}| - 1$ degrees of freedom.




Fig. 3: A neural network representation of our softmax regression framework. In this network, we use a one-hot representation of the input x , corresponding to the kronecker weights $\mathbb{1}_{x=j}$. The hidden layer is characterized by the feature weights $f_i(j)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{X}|\}$, and the output layer is parameterized by the weights $g_i(y)$ and biases $\beta(y)$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $y \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$. The softmax processing, as defined in (236), is represented by the sigmoid function $\zeta(\cdot)$ and operates on the unnormalized log-posterior $\tau(y)$.

Finally—and perhaps as importantly—we can view existing neural network implementations as a tool for efficiently computing conditional expectations. Indeed, direct computation of empirical conditional expectations can be prohibitively expensive in practice for typical alphabet sizes, which the use of SGD can circumvent.

Ultimately, these insights clarify both the importance of nonlinear activation functions in neural network, and the value of multilayer architectures, the details of which will be more fully described and developed in a subsequent paper.

IX. GAUSSIAN DISTRIBUTIONS AND LINEAR FEATURES

There is a natural counterpart to the development of the paper to this point for the case when X, Y are jointly Gaussian. As we will describe, the resulting features in this case are linear, and closely related to canonical correlation analysis (CCA) [92]–[94] and principal component analysis (PCA) [8], [95], [96]. More generally, the associated framework provides an analysis for the case of arbitrary distributions of continuous-valued variables subject to linear processing constraints.

A. Gaussian Variables

We begin with some convenient terminology, notation, and conventions. Our development focuses on Gaussian variables that take the form of (column) vectors. We use $\mathcal{N}(\mu_Z, \Lambda_Z)$ to denote the corresponding distribution of such a variable⁵² $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$, where μ_Z and Λ_Z denote the associated mean

⁵²In our Gaussian development, to avoid certain notational conflicts we drop the use of boldface characters for random vectors, but retain them for nonrandom ones, and to further simplify notation, we also forgo the use of superscripts to indicate the dimension of a variable, as in Section VIII.

vector and covariance matrix, respectively, parameterizing the distribution, i.e.,

$$P_Z(z) = \frac{|\Lambda_Z|^{-1/2}}{(2\pi)^{K_Z/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (z - \mu_Z)^T \Lambda_Z^{-1} (z - \mu_Z) \right\}, \quad (238)$$

with $|\cdot|$ denoting the determinant of its argument. Without loss of generality, we restrict our attention to variables Z such that Λ_Z is (strictly) positive definite since otherwise we may eliminate the associated redundancy by reducing the dimensionality of Z until the covariance matrix is positive definite. Also, for simplicity of exposition we restrict our attention to zero-mean variables whenever possible, while recognizing that nonzero means are unavoidable when conditioning on other such variables. The extension to the more general case is straightforward.

It will frequently be convenient to work with the following equivalent representation of a random variable.

Definition 58 (Normalized Variable): For a variable $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$ with mean μ_Z and covariance Λ_Z , the corresponding normalized variable is

$$\tilde{Z} \triangleq \Lambda_Z^{-1/2} (Z - \mu_Z) \quad (239)$$

and has mean 0 and covariance \mathbf{I} .

In the sequel, we will generally use $\tilde{\cdot}$ notation to indicate variables normalized according to Definition 58.

Next, consider an arbitrary pair of Gaussian variables, $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$ and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{K_W}$, which are jointly represented by

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ W \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Lambda_C), \quad (240a)$$

where

$$\Lambda_C = \mathbb{E} [C C^T] = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_Z & \Lambda_{ZW} \\ \Lambda_{WZ} & \Lambda_W \end{bmatrix}, \quad (240b)$$

so $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_Z)$, $W \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W)$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{WZ} = \mathbb{E}[WZ^T]$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{WZ}^T$.

It will frequently be convenient to express the relationship between such variables in the familiar innovations form, the notation for which we summarize as follows.

Lemma 59 (Innovations Form and MMSE Estimation): For any zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$, we have

$$Z = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{Z|W} W + \nu_{W \rightarrow Z}, \quad (241)$$

with gain matrix

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{Z|W} \triangleq \mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW} \mathbf{\Lambda}_W^{-1}, \quad (242)$$

and where $\nu_{W \rightarrow Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{Z|W})$ is independent of W and thus

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{Z|W} = \mathbb{E}[\nu_{W \rightarrow Z} \nu_{W \rightarrow Z}^T] = \mathbf{\Lambda}_Z - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW} \mathbf{\Lambda}_W^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{WZ}. \quad (243)$$

Moreover, the MMSE estimate of Z based on W follows immediately as

$$\hat{Z}(W) = \mathbb{E}[Z|W] = \mathbf{\Gamma}_{Z|W} W, \quad (244)$$

for which the mean-square error (MSE) in the resulting estimation error $\nu_{W \rightarrow Z}$ is, from (243),

$$\lambda_e^{Z|W} \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\|\nu_{W \rightarrow Z}\|^2] = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_{Z|W}). \quad (245)$$

B. The Modal Decomposition of Covariance

For the model of interest involving zero-mean jointly Gaussian $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ with covariances $\mathbf{\Lambda}_X$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y$, respectively, and cross-covariance $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{XY}$, it follows that the correlation structure among the equivalent normalized variables

$$\tilde{A} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{X} \\ \tilde{Y} \end{bmatrix} \quad (246)$$

is

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{B}} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (247)$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \triangleq \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{YX} \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{-1/2} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{Y|X} \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{1/2} \quad (248)$$

plays the role in Gaussian analysis corresponding to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ in the discrete case [3]. We recognize $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ as, of course, the central quantity in CCA, and refer to it as the *canonical correlation matrix (CCM)*.

The SVD of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ takes the form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{\Psi}^Y \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{\Psi}^X)^T = \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i \psi_i^Y (\psi_i^X)^T, \quad (249)$$

with

$$K \triangleq \min\{K_X, K_Y\}, \quad (250)$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is an $K_Y \times K_X$ diagonal matrix whose K diagonal entries are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K$, where

$$\mathbf{\Psi}^X = [\psi_1^X \quad \dots \quad \psi_{K_X}^X] \quad (251a)$$

$$\mathbf{\Psi}^Y = [\psi_1^Y \quad \dots \quad \psi_{K_Y}^Y] \quad (251b)$$

are $K_X \times K_X$ and $K_Y \times K_Y$ orthogonal matrices, respectively, and where, as before, we order the singular values according to $\sigma_1 \geq \dots \geq \sigma_K$.

Analogous to the case of finite alphabets, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is a contractive operator representing conditional expectation, i.e., $\sigma_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$, as is the case for $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ in the finite-alphabet case. In particular, this follows from the following standard result, a derivation of which we provide for convenience in Appendix IX-A.

Fact 60: Let \mathbf{M} be a matrix such that

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{M}^T & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$$

is symmetric, and let $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ denote the i th singular value of \mathbf{M} . Then $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is positive semidefinite if and only if $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M}) \leq 1$ for all i . More specifically, the i th pair of eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ are $1 \pm \sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ and the remaining eigenvalues are all unity.

In turn, the SVD (249) yields the following modal decomposition of the covariance $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{YX}$:

Proposition 61: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_X$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{XY}$, and let (249) denote the SVD of its CCM (248). Then there exist invertible linear mappings (coordinate transformation)

$$\mathbf{S}^* \triangleq \mathbf{f}^*(X) = [f_1^*(X) \quad \dots \quad f_{K_X}^*(X)]^T \triangleq (\mathbf{F}^*)^T X \quad (252a)$$

$$\mathbf{T}^* \triangleq \mathbf{g}^*(Y) = [g_1^*(Y) \quad \dots \quad g_{K_Y}^*(Y)]^T \triangleq (\mathbf{G}^*)^T Y \quad (252b)$$

satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}^*(X) \mathbf{f}^*(X)^T] = (\mathbf{F}^*)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X \mathbf{F}^* = \mathbf{I} \quad (253a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^*(Y) \mathbf{g}^*(Y)^T] = (\mathbf{G}^*)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y \mathbf{G}^* = \mathbf{I}, \quad (253b)$$

such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^*(Y) \mathbf{f}^*(X)^T] = \mathbf{\Sigma}, \quad (254)$$

i.e.,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{YX} = (\mathbf{G}^*)^{-T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{F}^*)^{-1} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y \mathbf{G}^* \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{F}^*)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X. \quad (255)$$

Proof: Let

$$\mathbf{F}^* \triangleq \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Psi}^X \quad (256a)$$

$$\mathbf{G}^* \triangleq \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Psi}^Y, \quad (256b)$$

which we note satisfy (253)

$$(\mathbf{F}^*)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X \mathbf{F}^* = (\mathbf{\Psi}^X)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_X \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Psi}^X = \mathbf{I}$$

$$(\mathbf{G}^*)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y \mathbf{G}^* = (\mathbf{\Psi}^Y)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Psi}^Y = \mathbf{I}.$$

Moreover, since

$$(\mathbf{F}^*)^{-1} = (\mathbf{\Psi}^X)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{1/2}$$

$$(\mathbf{G}^*)^{-1} = (\mathbf{\Psi}^Y)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{1/2},$$

it follows that (255) is satisfied, i.e.,

$$(\mathbf{G}^*)^{-T} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{F}^*)^{-1} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{1/2} \mathbf{\Psi}^Y \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{\Psi}^X)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{1/2} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{YX},$$

where to obtain the last equality we have used (249). ■

One consequence of Proposition 61 are the following conditional expectation relations, which are derived in Appendix IX-B

Corollary 62: The features \mathbf{f}^* and \mathbf{g}^* defined via (256) satisfy

$$\Sigma \mathbf{f}^*(X) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^*(Y) | X] \quad (257a)$$

$$\Sigma \mathbf{g}^*(Y) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}^*(X) | Y]. \quad (257b)$$

Finally, note that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ has the interpretation of the gain matrix in estimates of \tilde{Y} based on \tilde{X} (and vice-versa). In particular, from Lemma 59 it is readily verified that we have the innovations form

$$\tilde{Y} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{X} + \tilde{\nu}, \quad (258)$$

i.e., $\Gamma_{\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, with

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}^T] = \Lambda_{\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}} = \mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T,$$

so the resulting MSE in the MMSE estimate

$$\hat{Y}(\tilde{X}) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Y}|\tilde{X}] = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{X} \quad (259)$$

is

$$\tilde{\lambda}_e \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\nu}\|^2] = \text{tr}(\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T) = K_Y - \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_F^2. \quad (260)$$

As such, the SVD (249) has the further interpretation as a modal decomposition of the MMSE estimator (259).

C. Variational Characterization of the Modal Decomposition

As in the discrete case, the linear features $(\mathbf{f}^*, \mathbf{g}^*)$ in Proposition 61 can be equivalently obtained from a variational characterization, via which we obtain the key connection to CCA [92]–[94].

Proposition 63: For any $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*$ denote the first k columns of \mathbf{F}^* and \mathbf{G}^* , respectively, in Proposition 61, i.e.,

$$S_{(k)}^* \triangleq (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^T X \triangleq [f_1^*(X) \ \dots \ f_k^*(X)]^T \quad (261a)$$

$$T_{(k)}^* \triangleq (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^T Y \triangleq [g_1^*(Y) \ \dots \ g_k^*(Y)]^T. \quad (261b)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*) &= \arg \min_{(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T X - \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T Y\|^2 \right] \\ &= \arg \max_{(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}} \sigma(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (262)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) &\triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T X)^T \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T Y \right] \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_{YX} \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \end{aligned} \quad (263)$$

and

$$\mathcal{L} \triangleq \left\{ (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) : \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}_{(k)} = \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}_{(k)} = \mathbf{I} \right\}. \quad (264)$$

Moreover, the resulting maximal correlation (generalized Pearson correlation coefficient) is

$$\sigma(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*) = \text{tr} \left((\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^T \Lambda_{YX} \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^* \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i, \quad (265)$$

the Ky Fan k -norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$.

Proof: Without loss of generality, we reparameterize $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}$ in terms of new matrices⁵³ Ξ^X and Ξ^Y according to

$$\mathbf{F}_{(k)} = \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \Xi^X \quad (266a)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{(k)} = \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Xi^Y, \quad (266b)$$

in which case

$$\sigma(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_{YX} \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) = \text{tr} \left((\Xi^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X \right), \quad (267)$$

and (264) dictates that

$$(\Xi^X)^T \Xi^X = (\Xi^Y)^T \Xi^Y = \mathbf{I}. \quad (268)$$

From Lemma 4, it follows immediately that (267) is maximized subject to (268) when we choose

$$\Xi^X = \Psi_{(k)}^X \quad (269a)$$

$$\Xi^Y = \Psi_{(k)}^Y, \quad (269b)$$

where

$$\Psi_{(k)}^X \triangleq [\psi_1^X \ \dots \ \psi_k^X] \quad (270a)$$

$$\Psi_{(k)}^Y \triangleq [\psi_1^Y \ \dots \ \psi_k^Y], \quad (270b)$$

and the resulting maximal correlation is (265), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^* = \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \Psi_{(k)}^X \quad (271a)$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^* = \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Psi_{(k)}^Y, \quad (271b)$$

as claimed. \blacksquare

D. Local Gaussian Information Geometry

It will sometimes be useful to define a local analysis for Gaussian variables. For such analysis, there is a natural counterpart of the χ^2 -divergence (45b) used in the finite-alphabet case. In particular, we will make use of the following notion of neighborhood.

Definition 64 (Gaussian ϵ -Neighborhood): For a given $\epsilon > 0$, the ϵ -neighborhood of a K_0 -dimensional Gaussian distribution $P_0 = \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \Lambda_0)$ with positive definite Λ_0 is the set of Gaussian distributions in the following generalized divergence ball of radius ϵ^2 about P_0 , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{K_0}(P_0) \triangleq \{P' = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Lambda) : \bar{D}(P'|P_0) \leq \epsilon^2 K_0\}, \quad (272a)$$

where for $P = \mathcal{N}(\mu_P, \Lambda_P)$ and $Q = \mathcal{N}(\mu_Q, \Lambda_Q)$ with positive definite Λ_Q ,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{D}(P||Q) &\triangleq (\mu_P - \mu_Q)^T \Lambda_Q^{-1} (\mu_P - \mu_Q) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \|\Lambda_Q^{-1/2} (\Lambda_P - \Lambda_Q) \Lambda_Q^{-1/2}\|_F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (272b)$$

⁵³We refer to Ξ^X and Ξ^Y as the *feature weights* associated with the linear features S and T , and note that they play the role in Gaussian analysis corresponding to that played by the feature vectors Ξ^X and Ξ^Y in the discrete case.

Just as $D(\|\cdot\|)$, is invariant to a change of coordinates, $\bar{D}(\|\cdot\|)$ is invariant to invertible linear transformation of variables, i.e., mappings of the form $Z' = \mathbf{A}Z + \mathbf{c}$ with nonsingular \mathbf{A} . In particular, we have the following result.

Lemma 65: Let $\mathcal{N}(\mu_P, \mathbf{\Lambda}_P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mu_Q, \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q)$ be K_0 -dimensional Gaussian distributions with nonsingular $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q$. Then for any nonsingular matrix \mathbf{A} vector \mathbf{c} of compatible dimensions,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{D}(\mathcal{N}(\mu_P, \mathbf{\Lambda}_P) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\mu_Q, \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q)) \\ &= \bar{D}(\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}\mu_P + \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_P\mathbf{A}^T) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{A}\mu_Q + \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q\mathbf{A}^T)). \end{aligned} \quad (273)$$

A proof of this invariance is provided in Appendix IX-C, and makes use of the following simple identity.

Lemma 66: For any symmetric matrices \mathbf{M}_1 and \mathbf{M}_2 of equal dimension,

$$\|\mathbf{M}_1^{1/2}\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{M}_1^{1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_1\mathbf{M}_2\mathbf{M}_1\mathbf{M}_2). \quad (274)$$

E. Weakly Correlated Variables

An instance of the local analysis of Section IX-D corresponds to weak correlation between variables, a concept we formally define as follows.

Definition 67 (ϵ -Correlation): Let Z and W be zero-mean jointly Gaussian with dimensions K_Z and K_W , respectively. Then Z and W are ϵ -correlated when

$$P_{Z,W} \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon}^{K_Z+K_W}(P_Z P_W), \quad (275)$$

where P_Z and P_W are the marginal distributions associated with $P_{Z,W}$.

The following lemma, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-D, is useful in further characterizing ϵ -correlated variables.

Lemma 68: For any $\epsilon > 0$ and zero-mean, ϵ -correlated jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$,

$$\bar{D}(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W) = \epsilon^2 \|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (276)$$

where

$$\Phi^{Z|W} \triangleq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Z^{-1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW} \mathbf{\Lambda}_W^{-1/2}, \quad (277)$$

which we refer to as the *innovation matrix*.

In particular, it follows immediately from Lemma 68 that Z, W being ϵ -correlated is equivalent to the condition

$$\|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq K_Z + K_W. \quad (278)$$

It also follows that Z, W are ϵ -correlated when, on average, $P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon}^{K_Z+K_W}(P_Z)$. The following lemma is useful in establishing this result; a proof is provided in Appendix IX-E.

Lemma 69: For any $\epsilon > 0$ and zero-mean, ϵ -correlated jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$,

$$\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) = \epsilon^2 \|\Phi^{Z|W} w\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (279)$$

where $\Phi^{Z|W}$ is as defined in (277).

Our further equivalent condition for ϵ -correlation is then a consequence of the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-F.

Lemma 70: For any $\epsilon > 0$ and zero-mean, ϵ -correlated jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$, we have⁵⁴

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_W}[\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)] = \bar{D}(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W)(1 + o(1)). \quad (281)$$

Finally, yet another such equivalent notion of ϵ -correlation is

$$I(Z; W) = D(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W) \leq \epsilon^2(K_Z + K_W) \quad (282)$$

where for Gaussian distributions, KL divergence takes the familiar form

$$\begin{aligned} & D(\mathcal{N}(\mu_P, \mathbf{\Lambda}_P) \parallel \mathcal{N}(\mu_Q, \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\mu_P - \mu_Q)^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mu_P - \mu_Q) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{I}) - \ln |\mathbf{\Lambda}_P \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1}| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (283)$$

To establish (282), we make use of the following simple fact, whose proof is provided in Appendix IX-G.

Fact 71: Let δ be an arbitrary positive constant and \mathbf{A} an arbitrary matrix. Then

$$\ln |\mathbf{I} - \delta \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^T| = -\delta \|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + o(\delta).$$

As a first step, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-H.

Lemma 72: For any $\epsilon > 0$ and zero-mean, ϵ -correlated jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$,

$$D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (284)$$

The equivalence (282) is then an immediate consequence of the following corollary, whose proof is provided in Appendix IX-I.

Corollary 73: For any $\epsilon > 0$ and zero-mean, ϵ -correlated jointly Gaussian variables Z, W characterized by $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Z, \mathbf{\Lambda}_W$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{ZW}$,

$$I(Z; W) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{D}(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W)(1 + o(1)). \quad (285)$$

Finally, the following lemma is a useful generalization; a proof is provided in Appendix IX-J.

Lemma 74: Let $P_{X,Y}$ and $Q_{X,Y}$ denote candidate jointly Gaussian distributions for ϵ -correlated variables X, Y with given covariances $\mathbf{\Lambda}_X, \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y$, and $\epsilon > 0$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{XY}^P$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{XY}^Q$ denote the respective cross-covariances. Then

$$D(P_{X,Y} \parallel Q_{X,Y}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (286)$$

⁵⁴Note, too, that by symmetry we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_Z}[\bar{D}(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|Z) \parallel P_W)] = \mathbb{E}_{P_W}[\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)]. \quad (280)$$

Indeed, $\Phi^{W|Z} = (\Phi^{Z|W})^T$.

where [cf. (248)]

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P = \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Lambda_{YX}^P \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \quad (287a)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q = \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Lambda_{YX}^Q \Lambda_X^{-1/2}. \quad (287b)$$

F. Modal Decomposition of Jointly Gaussian Distributions

Section IX-B describes how the SVD of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ provides a modal decomposition of covariance for the jointly Gaussian X, Y model. As related analysis, this section describes how in the weak correlation regime, this SVD also provides a modal decomposition of mutual information and, more generally, the joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$.

First, since

$$\Phi^{Y|X} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \quad (288)$$

specializing Lemma 68, we obtain that X, Y are ϵ -correlated when

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_F^2 = \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \leq \epsilon^2 (K_X + K_Y). \quad (289)$$

In turn, when X, Y are ϵ -correlated we have, specializing Corollary 73,

$$I(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (290)$$

An interpretation of (290) is obtained in terms of the modal decomposition of $P_{X,Y}$, as we now describe. In this Gaussian scenario, in contrast to the finite alphabet case, the SVD is both a logarithmic-domain one and asymptotic. In particular, observe that as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, with $\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}$ as given by (247) for \tilde{A} as defined in (246), we have

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{A}}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} & -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T)^{-1} \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{B}} (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} & (\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T)^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} & -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{B}} & \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \end{bmatrix} + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (291)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{B}} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} + o(\epsilon), \quad (292)$$

whence

$$P_{\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \\ = \exp \left\{ -\frac{K_A}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{x}^T \tilde{x} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{y}^T \tilde{y} + \tilde{y}^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{x} + o(\epsilon) \right\} \\ = P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}) P_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{y}) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i \tilde{x}^T \psi_i^X (\psi_i^Y)^T \tilde{y} + o(\epsilon) \right\} \\ = P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}) P_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{y}) \prod_{i=1}^K \exp \left\{ \sigma_i \tilde{x}^T \psi_i^X (\psi_i^Y)^T \tilde{y} \right\} (1 + o(1)).$$

with $K_A = K_X + K_Y$.

As a result, we have

$$P_{X,Y}(x, y) \\ = |\Lambda_X|^{-1/2} |\Lambda_Y|^{-1/2} P_{\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}}(\Lambda_X^{-1/2} x, \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} y) \\ = P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left(\prod_{i=1}^K e^{\sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y)} \right) (1 + o(1)), \quad (293)$$

where f_i^* and g_i^* are the linear functions (252) determined in Proposition 61.

Furthermore, meaningful approximations to this joint distribution arise by considering, for $k < K$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_*^{(k)} \triangleq \Psi_{(k)}^Y \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T, \quad (294a)$$

where

$$\Sigma_{(k)} \triangleq (\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X \quad (294b)$$

is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$. In particular, if we let $X^{(k)}$ and $Y^{(k)}$ denote zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables with the same marginals as X and Y , respectively, but covariance⁵⁵ [cf. (255)]

$$\Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*} \triangleq \Lambda_{Y^{(k)} X^{(k)}} = \Lambda_Y^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_*^{(k)} \Lambda_X^{1/2} \\ = (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^{\dagger T} \Sigma_{(k)} (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^{\dagger} \\ = \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^* \Sigma_{(k)} (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^T \Lambda_X, \quad (295)$$

where $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*$ and $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*$ are as defined in (271) and $\Sigma_{(k)}$ is as defined in (294b), then it follows that the joint distribution of these new variables takes the form

$$P_{X,Y}^{(k)*}(x, y) \triangleq P_{X^{(k)}, Y^{(k)}}(x, y) \\ = P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left(\prod_{i=1}^k e^{\sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y)} \right) (1 + o(1)),$$

and

$$I(X^{(k)}; Y^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2).$$

Nonlinear Features and nonGaussian Distributions: In concluding this section, we briefly discuss connections to nonlinear features and nonGaussian variables. First, with respect to the former, it is worth noting that if we seek a modal decomposition of the form (15) for the Gaussian case, an infinite number of terms must be involved: the modal decomposition takes the form

$$P_{X,Y}(x, y) = P_X(x) P_Y(y) \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\sigma}_i \tilde{f}_i^*(x) \tilde{g}_i^*(y) \right), \quad (296a)$$

with

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}_i^*(\tilde{X})] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_i^*(\tilde{Y})] = 0, \quad i=1, 2, \dots \\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{f}_i^*(\tilde{X}) \tilde{f}_j^*(\tilde{X})] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}_i^*(\tilde{Y}) \tilde{g}_j^*(\tilde{Y})] = \mathbb{1}_{i=j}, \quad i, j=1, 2, \dots, \quad (296b)$$

⁵⁵Note that $\Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*}$ so-defined is a valid cross covariance matrix, i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_Y & \Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*} \\ (\Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*})^T & \Lambda_X \end{bmatrix}$$

is positive definite, as can be verified using Fact 60.

And in such an expansion, it is important to emphasize that the terms involving linear features need not dominate; a brief discussion is provided in Appendix IX-K.

Second, with respect to nonGaussian distributions, we first emphasize that in Proposition 61 (and, in turn, Proposition 63), only the second-moment properties of the joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$ are required to derive the optimizing linear features. As such, those results obviously apply more broadly. Additionally, when the nonGaussian variables are defined on finite (but real-valued) alphabets, we can equivalently interpret the CCA optimization problem as that of HGR maximal correlation with the features constrained to be linear, i.e., maximizing the vector correlation (35b) over linear f^k and g^k . Such constraints may be practically motivated, for example. In such cases, we can relate the CCM $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ from our Gaussian analysis to the associated CDM \mathbf{B} from our discrete analysis; the details are provided in Appendix IX-L.

Finally, modal decompositions of the form (296) for classes of nonGaussian distributions, generalizing aspects of the results of Appendix IX-K, are developed in, e.g., [97]–[99]; see also the references therein, including the early work of Lancaster [11], [100].

G. Latent Gaussian Attributes and Statistical Model

In this section, we describe useful interpretations of the modal decomposition for Gaussian variables in terms of latent variable analysis, in a manner analogous to that of Section V-A for distributions over finite-alphabets. In this case, our development is more directly related to its roots in factor analysis [101], [102] as introduced by Spearman [27].

We begin with the introduction of latent Gaussian attribute variables. Although our definition includes a correlation constraint, in our Gaussian case analysis we do not limit our attention to the vanishing correlation regime.

Definition 75 (Gaussian ϵ -Attribute): For [cf. (278)]

$$0 < \epsilon \leq \sqrt{\frac{K_W}{K_Z + K_W}}, \quad (297)$$

the variable $W \in \mathbb{R}^{K_W}$ is a Gaussian ϵ -attribute of $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$ if: 1) $K_W \leq K_Z$ and Λ_W is nonsingular; 2) W, Z are jointly Gaussian; 3) W, Z are ϵ -correlated but $\Lambda_{WZ} \neq \mathbf{0}$; and 4) W conditionally independent of all other variables in the model given Z .

Definition 76 (Gaussian ϵ -Attribute Configuration): Given a zero-mean Gaussian variable $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$ with covariance Λ_Z , then for ϵ satisfying (297), an ϵ -attribute W of Z is characterized by its configuration [cf. (278)]

$$\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{K_Z}(\Lambda_Z) = \left\{ K_W, \Lambda_W, \Phi^{Z|W} : \|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_F^2 \leq K_Z + K_W \right\}, \quad (298)$$

with $\Phi^{Z|W}$ as defined in (277).

As in the case of discrete variables, the notion of a multi-attribute is also useful in the Gaussian case.

Definition 77 (Gaussian ϵ -Multi-Attribute): A Gaussian ϵ -multi-attribute is a Gaussian ϵ -attribute satisfying the additional property that

$$\|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_s^2 \leq \frac{K_Z + K_W}{K_W}, \quad (299)$$

with $\Phi^{Z|W}$ as defined in (277).

Note that (299) is a stronger version of the ϵ correlation property, since $\|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_s \leq \|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_F \leq K_W \|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_s$.

Definition 78 (Gaussian ϵ -Multi-Attribute Configuration): Given a zero-mean Gaussian variable $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Z}$ with covariance Λ_Z , then for ϵ satisfying (297), an ϵ -multi-attribute W of Z is characterized by its configuration [cf. (299)]

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathcal{C}}_\epsilon^{K_Z}(\Lambda_Z) \\ &= \left\{ K_W, \Lambda_W, \Phi^{Z|W} : \|\Phi^{Z|W}\|_s^2 \leq \frac{K_Z + K_W}{K_W} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (300)$$

with $\Phi^{Z|W}$ as defined in (277).

For inferences about an attribute W , we consider features of the form

$$h(Z) = \mathbf{H}^T Z = (\Xi)^T \tilde{Z},$$

where Ξ is the associated feature weight matrix. Without loss of generality, we restrict our attention to normalized (zero-mean) $h(Z)$, so that⁵⁶

$$\mathbb{E}[h(Z)h(Z)^T] = \mathbf{H}^T \Lambda_Z \mathbf{H} = (\Xi)^T \Xi = \mathbf{I}.$$

In the context of a given model $P_{X,Y}$, the Gaussian ϵ -attribute variables U and V for X and Y , respectively, are characterized by the (now Gauss-) Markov structure

$$U \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow V, \quad (301)$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{K_U}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{K_V}$ for some dimensions K_U and K_V .

The following familiar fact will be useful, whose short proof we provide for convenience in Appendix IX-M.

Fact 79: Normalized zero-mean Gaussian variables $\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2, \tilde{Z}_3$ form a Markov chain $\tilde{Z}_1 \leftrightarrow \tilde{Z}_2 \leftrightarrow \tilde{Z}_3$ if and only if

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_3} = \Lambda_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_2} \Lambda_{\tilde{Z}_2 \tilde{Z}_3}. \quad (302)$$

As an application of Fact 79, we have, for example,

$$\Phi^{Y|U} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Phi^{X|U} \quad (303a)$$

$$\Phi^{X|V} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \Phi^{Y|V}. \quad (303b)$$

For inferences about attributes U and V , we will generally consider statistics of the form

$$S_{(k)} \triangleq (\mathbf{F}_{(k)})^T X \triangleq [f_1(X) \ \cdots \ f_k(X)]^T \quad (304a)$$

$$T_{(k)} \triangleq (\mathbf{G}_{(k)})^T Y \triangleq [g_1(Y) \ \cdots \ g_k(Y)]^T \quad (304b)$$

for some dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and feature matrices $\mathbf{F}_{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X \times k}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y \times k}$. Without loss of generality we restrict our attention to normalized features, i.e.

⁵⁶Indeed, if they were not, so long as the columns of Ξ are linearly independent, so $(\Xi)^T \Xi$ is invertible, we can transform \mathbf{H} into $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ via

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = \mathbf{H} \left((\Xi)^T \Xi \right)^{-1/2} = \underbrace{\Xi \left((\Xi)^T \Xi \right)^{-1/2}}_{\triangleq \tilde{\Xi}},$$

where we note $(\tilde{\Xi})^T \tilde{\Xi} = \mathbf{I}$.

$(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}$ with \mathcal{L} as defined in (264). As we will develop, the particular choices $S_{(k)}^*, T_{(k)}^*$ defined in (261) play a special role.

For arbitrary jointly Gaussian W and Z , we use $\lambda_e^{W|Z}$ to denote the MSE in the MMSE estimate of W based on Z , so with respect to our specific variables of interest, $\lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)})$, $\lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)})$, $\lambda_e^{U|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)})$, and $\lambda_e^{V|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)})$ denote the associated MSEs, with their dependencies on $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}$ made explicit.

H. MMSE Universal Features

In this formulation, we seek to determine optimum k -dimensional features for estimating a pair of unknown Gaussian attributes (U, V) for (X, Y) in the Gauss-Markov model (301), where $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$.

As in the finite-alphabet setting, we view the configurations of attributes U and V as randomly drawn by nature from a RIE. In this case, this ensemble is also defined via the spherical symmetry of Definition 24.

Definition 80 (Gaussian Rotation Invariant Ensemble): Given ϵ satisfying (297), the Gaussian rotationally invariant ensemble (RIE) for an attribute W of a Gaussian variable Z is the collection of all jointly Gaussian attribute configurations of the form (298) together with a probability measure over the collection such that $\Phi^{Z|W}$ is spherically symmetric.

Let $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y)$ denote configurations for attributes U and V , respectively, in the sense of Definition 76, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X) = \left\{ K_U, \Lambda_U, \Phi^{X|U} : \|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq K_U + K_X \right\} \quad (305a)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y) = \left\{ K_V, \Lambda_V, \Phi^{Y|V} : \|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq K_V + K_Y \right\}. \quad (305b)$$

where [cf. (297)]

$$0 < \epsilon_X^2 \leq \frac{K_U}{K_U + K_X} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \epsilon_Y^2 \leq \frac{K_V}{K_V + K_Y}. \quad (306)$$

In what follows, we denote the MSE in the MMSE estimates U and V based on $S_{(k)}$ as defined in (304a), respectively, via

$$\lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}), \quad (307a)$$

and those for the MMSE estimates based on $T_{(k)}$ as defined in (304b) via, respectively,

$$\lambda_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{G}_{(k)}). \quad (307b)$$

In turn, we let

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{U|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)})] \quad (308a)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{V|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)})] \quad (308b)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{U|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{G}_{(k)})] \quad (308c)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{V|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{G}_{(k)})], \quad (308d)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\cdot]$ denotes expectation with respect to the Gaussian RIEs for $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y)$.

For this scenario, we have following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-N.

Proposition 81: Given zero-mean jointly Gaussian $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , and attributes U and V of X and Y , respectively, each drawn from a Gaussian RIE for some ϵ_X and ϵ_Y , respectively, satisfying (306), then for any dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the multi-objective minimization

$$\min_{(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}} \left(\bar{\lambda}_e^{U|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}), \bar{\lambda}_e^{V|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}), \bar{\lambda}_e^{U|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}), \bar{\lambda}_e^{V|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \right) \quad (309)$$

has a unique Pareto optimal solution, which is achieved by $(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)$ as defined in (256). Moreover,

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{U|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*) = \text{tr}(\Lambda_U) \left[1 - \epsilon_X^2 \bar{E}_0^{X|U} k \right] \quad (310a)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{V|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*) = \text{tr}(\Lambda_V) \left[1 - \epsilon_Y^2 \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \right] \quad (310b)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{U|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*) = \text{tr}(\Lambda_U) \left[1 - \epsilon_X^2 \bar{E}_0^{X|U} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \right] \quad (310c)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_e^{V|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*) = \text{tr}(\Lambda_V) \left[1 - \epsilon_Y^2 \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} k \right], \quad (310d)$$

where $\bar{E}_0^{X|U}$ and $\bar{E}_0^{Y|V}$ are nonnegative constants that do not depend on ϵ_X , ϵ_Y , k , or $P_{X,Y}$.

We emphasize that Proposition 81 is not asymptotic: we do not require $\epsilon_X, \epsilon_Y \rightarrow 0$.

I. MMSE Cooperative Game

A characterization of the associated cooperative game for MSE minimization, in which nature chooses the attribute that can be most accurately estimated, is given by the following. A proof is provided in Appendix IX-O.

Proposition 82: Given zero-mean jointly Gaussian $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , parameters ϵ_X, ϵ_Y of multi-attributes U and V , respectively, satisfying (306), and a dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, then the multi-objective minimization

$$\min_{\substack{(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y)) \in \mathcal{C}_{(k)}, \\ (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}}} \left(\lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}), \lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}), \lambda_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{G}_{(k)}), \lambda_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \right), \quad (311)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_{(k)} \triangleq \left\{ (\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y)) : K_U = K_V = k, \|\Lambda_U^{-1}\|_s \leq 1, \|\Lambda_V^{-1}\|_s \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (312)$$

has a unique Pareto optimal solution, which is achieved by $(\mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)})$ as defined in (256), and $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_X, *}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_Y, *}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y))$ characterized by

$$\Lambda_U = \Lambda_V = \mathbf{I} \quad (313a)$$

and

$$\Lambda_{XU} = \epsilon_X \sqrt{\frac{K_X + k}{k}} \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)} \quad (313b)$$

$$\Lambda_{YV} = \epsilon_Y \sqrt{\frac{K_Y + k}{k}} \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}. \quad (313c)$$

Moreover,

$$\lambda_e^{U|S}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_X, *}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}) = k - \epsilon_X^2(K_X + k) \quad (314a)$$

$$\lambda_e^{V|S}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_Y, *}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}) = k - \epsilon_Y^2 \left(\frac{K_Y + k}{k} \right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \quad (314b)$$

$$\lambda_e^{U|T}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_X, *}^{K_X}(\Lambda_X), \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}) = k - \epsilon_X^2 \left(\frac{K_X + k}{k} \right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \quad (314c)$$

$$\lambda_e^{V|T}(\bar{\mathcal{C}}_{\epsilon_Y, *}^{K_Y}(\Lambda_Y), \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}) = k - \epsilon_Y^2(K_Y + k). \quad (314d)$$

Note that Proposition 82 is also not asymptotic: it does not require $\epsilon_X, \epsilon_Y \rightarrow 0$. Note, too, that via Proposition 82 we obtain the multi-attributes U and V for which the features $(\mathbf{F}^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)})$ are sufficient statistics.

J. The Local Gaussian Information Bottleneck

The following result establishes the optimum attributes in the MMSE cooperative game of Section IX-I coincide with those of a Gaussian version of the local information double bottleneck problem. A proof is provided in Appendix IX-P.

Proposition 83: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , and given $\epsilon_X, \epsilon_Y > 0$, let U and V be Gaussian ϵ_X - and ϵ_Y -multi-attributes of X and Y , respectively, with $K_U = K_V = k$. Then

$$I(U; V) \leq \frac{\epsilon_X \epsilon_Y^2}{2} \left(\frac{K_X + k}{k} \right) \left(\frac{K_Y + k}{k} \right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2), \quad (315)$$

where the inequality holds with equality when the configurations of U and V are given by (313), in which case

$$\Lambda_{UV} = \epsilon_X \epsilon_Y \sqrt{\frac{K_X + k}{k}} \sqrt{\frac{K_Y + k}{k}} \Sigma_{(k)}, \quad (316)$$

where $\Sigma_{(k)}$ is as defined in (294b).

Proposition 83 can be equivalently expressed in the form of a solution to a symmetric version of the Gaussian information bottleneck problem [103] in the weak dependence regime. In particular, we have the following corollary, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-Q.

Corollary 84: Let X, Y be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , and let U and V be variables in the Gauss-Markov chain (301) such that we satisfy the independence relations $\Lambda_U = \Lambda_V = \mathbf{I}$, the

conditional independence relations that⁵⁷ $\Lambda_{XU}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{XU}$ and $\Lambda_{YV}^T \Lambda_Y^{-1} \Lambda_{YV}$ are diagonal, and the dependence constraints $\max\{I(U_i; X), I(V_i; Y)\} \leq \epsilon^2/2$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then

$$\max_{U, V} I(U; V) = \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^4). \quad (317)$$

Moreover, the maximum is achieved by the configurations [cf. (313b)–(313c)]

$$\Lambda_{XU} = \epsilon \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)} \quad (318a)$$

$$\Lambda_{YV} = \epsilon \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)}, \quad (318b)$$

in which case

$$\Lambda_{UV} = \epsilon^2 \Sigma_{(k)}. \quad (319)$$

with $\Sigma_{(k)}$ as defined in (294b).

It further follows that $(S^*_{(k)}, T^*_{(k)})$ is a sufficient statistic for inferences about the optimizing (U, V) , i.e., for any dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ we have the Markov chains

$$(U, V) \leftrightarrow (S^*_{(k)}, T^*_{(k)}) \leftrightarrow (X, Y) \quad (320)$$

and

$$U \leftrightarrow S^*_{(k)} \leftrightarrow T^*_{(k)} \leftrightarrow V. \quad (321)$$

In particular, we have the following result; a proof is provided in Appendix IX-R.

Corollary 85: In the solution to the optimization in Proposition 83,

$$p_{U, V|X, Y}(u, v|x, y) = p_{U|X}(u|x) p_{V|Y}(v|y) \quad (322)$$

with

$$p_{U|X}(\cdot|x) = \mathbb{N}(\epsilon s^*_{(k)}, (1 - \epsilon^2) \mathbf{I}) \quad (323a)$$

$$p_{V|Y}(\cdot|y) = \mathbb{N}(\epsilon t^*_{(k)}, (1 - \epsilon^2) \mathbf{I}) \quad (323b)$$

where [cf. (261)] $s^*_{(k)} = \mathbf{F}^*_{(k)} x$ and $t^*_{(k)} = \mathbf{G}^*_{(k)} y$, where we note that (323) depend on (x, y) only through $(s^*_{(k)}, t^*_{(k)})$. Moreover,

$$p_{U|S^*_{(k)}, T^*_{(k)}, V}(u|s^*_{(k)}, t^*_{(k)}, v) = p_{U|S^*_{(k)}}(u|s^*_{(k)}) \quad (324a)$$

$$p_{V|S^*_{(k)}, T^*_{(k)}, U}(v|s^*_{(k)}, t^*_{(k)}, u) = p_{V|T^*_{(k)}}(v|t^*_{(k)}), \quad (324b)$$

and

$$p_{V|X}(\cdot|x) = \mathbb{N}(\epsilon \Sigma_{(k)} s^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Sigma_{(k)}^2) \quad (325a)$$

$$p_{U|Y}(\cdot|y) = \mathbb{N}(\epsilon \Sigma_{(k)} t^*_{(k)}, \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Sigma_{(k)}^2). \quad (325b)$$

We emphasize that the sufficient statistic pair $(S^*_{(k)}, T^*_{(k)})$ involves separate processing of X and Y . We also emphasize that Corollary 85 is not an asymptotic result—it holds for finite ϵ .

The more classical one-sided Gaussian information bottleneck problem [103] can also be analyzed in the weak-dependence regime. For example, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-S.

Proposition 86: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , and

⁵⁷The elements of U are conditionally independent given X when $\Lambda_{U|X} = \Lambda_U - \Lambda_{XU}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{XU}$ is diagonal, and similarly for the V, Y relation.

given $\epsilon > 0$, let U and V be variables in the Gauss-Markov chain (301) such that we satisfy the independence relations $\Lambda_U = \Lambda_V = \mathbf{I}$, the conditional independence relations that $\Lambda_{XU}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{XU}$ and $\Lambda_{YV}^T \Lambda_Y^{-1} \Lambda_{YV}$ are diagonal, and the dependence constraints $\max\{I(U_i; X), I(V_i; Y)\} \leq \epsilon^2/2$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then

$$\max_U I(U; Y) = \max_V I(V; X) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (326)$$

Moreover, the maximum is achieved by the configurations (318).

Note, finally, that (S, T) given by (261a) and (261b) are sufficient statistics for inferences about the resulting (U, V) , which we emphasize are obtained by *separate* processing of X and Y .

K. Gaussian Common Information

We now develop the relationship between the optimizing Gaussian multi-attributes (U, V) in Section IX-J (and Section IX-I), and the common information associated with the pair (X, Y) characterized by a given joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$.

In the Gaussian case, common information can be readily evaluated, without the local restriction of the finite-alphabet case, and takes the following form, as shown in [104, Corollary 1]. For convenience, the proof is provided in Appendix IX-T.

Proposition 87: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} . Then

$$C(X, Y) = \min_{\substack{P_{W|X,Y}: \\ X \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y}} I(W; X, Y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \left(\frac{1 + \sigma_i}{1 - \sigma_i} \right). \quad (327)$$

Moreover, an optimizing $P_{W|X,Y}$ is Gaussian with

$$\Lambda_{XW} = \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}_{(K)}^* \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} \quad (328a)$$

$$\Lambda_{YW} = \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}_{(K)}^* \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2}. \quad (328b)$$

Note that since for $0 < \omega < 1$,

$$\frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1 + \omega}{1 - \omega} \geq \omega,$$

we have

$$C(X; Y) \geq \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i = \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*,$$

where the bound is tight in the limit of weak correlation, i.e.,

$$\frac{C(X; Y)}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* \rightarrow 0.$$

We further have

$$W \leftrightarrow R_{(K)}^* \leftrightarrow (S_{(K)}^*, T_{(K)}^*) \leftrightarrow (X, Y). \quad (329)$$

where

$$R_{(K)}^* \triangleq S_{(K)}^* + T_{(K)}^*, \quad (330)$$

with $S_{(K)}^*$ and $T_{(K)}^*$ as defined in (261). In particular, we have the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-U.

Corollary 88: In the solution to the optimization in Proposition 87

$$\mathbb{E}[W|X, Y] = \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1} R_{(K)}^* \quad (331a)$$

$$\Lambda_{W|X,Y} = (\mathbf{I} - \Sigma_{(K)}) (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1}. \quad (331b)$$

L. Relating Common Information to Dominant Structure

The common information auxiliary variable W of Proposition 87 is naturally related to the unrestricted dominant (i.e., optimizing) multi-attributes (U, V) of Section IX-I (whose restricted form arises in Section IX-J). By restricted, we mean

$$\epsilon_X = \sqrt{\frac{k}{K_X + k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_Y = \sqrt{\frac{k}{K_Y + k}}$$

in Proposition 82, or, equivalently, $\epsilon = 1$ in Proposition 83. In particular, the following result, a proof of which is provided in Appendix IX-V, establishes that common information can be equivalently characterized by

$$C(X, Y) = \min_{\substack{P_{W|X,Y}: \\ X \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y \\ W \leftrightarrow (U,V) \leftrightarrow (X,Y)}} I(W; X, Y). \quad (332)$$

so that the optimizing W satisfies

$$W \leftrightarrow (U, V) \leftrightarrow (S_{(K)}^*, T_{(K)}^*) \leftrightarrow (X, Y). \quad (333)$$

Corollary 89: Let X, Y be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , and let (U, V) be the unrestricted dominant K -dimensional multi-attributes. If \tilde{W} is chosen so that $\tilde{W} \leftrightarrow (U, V) \leftrightarrow (X, Y)$ is a Gauss-Markov chain with

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{W}U} = \Lambda_{\tilde{W}V} = \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2}, \quad (334)$$

and $\Lambda_{\tilde{W}} = \mathbf{I}$, then

$$I(\tilde{W}; X, Y) = C(X, Y), \quad (335)$$

where $C(X, Y)$ is as given in Proposition 87.

When \tilde{W} is constructed according to Corollary 89, we have the additional Markov structure

$$\tilde{W} \leftrightarrow (U + V) \leftrightarrow R_{(K)}^* \leftrightarrow (X, Y). \quad (336)$$

Specifically, we have the following readily verified result.

Corollary 90: With \tilde{W} as constructed in Corollary 89, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}|U, V] = \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1} (U + V) \quad (337)$$

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{W}|U,V} = (\mathbf{I} - \Sigma_{(K)}) (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1}. \quad (338)$$

M. An Interpretation of PCA

PCA [8], [95], [96] can be interpreted as a special case of the preceding results. Specifically, in some important instances, the form of dimensionality reduction realized by PCA corresponds to the optimum k -dimensional statistics $S_* = \mathbf{f}^*(Y)$ and $T_* = \mathbf{g}^*(X)$ as defined in (261a) and (261b), respectively, for the universal estimation of the unknown k -dimensional attributes U and V under any of our formulations.

Example: As an illustration, suppose we have the innovations form

$$Y = X + \nu_{X \rightarrow Y},$$

where X and Y are K -dimensional, and where $\Lambda_\nu = \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I}$ but Λ_X is arbitrary. Moreover, let

$$\Lambda_X = \Upsilon \Lambda \Upsilon^T$$

denote the diagonalization of Λ_X , so the columns of

$$\Upsilon = [\mathbf{v}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{v}_K], \quad (339)$$

are orthonormal, and Λ is diagonal with entries $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_K$. Then it is immediate that Λ_Y has diagonalization

$$\Lambda_Y = \Upsilon (\Lambda + \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I}) \Upsilon^T.$$

In this case, it follows immediately that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ has SVD

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Lambda_X^{1/2} = \underbrace{\Upsilon}_{=\Psi^Y} \underbrace{(\mathbf{I} + \sigma_\nu^2 \Lambda^{-1})^{-1/2}}_{=\Sigma} \underbrace{\Upsilon^T}_{=(\Psi^X)^T}. \quad (340)$$

As a result, we have, for a given $1 \leq k \leq K$, that (261a) specializes to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^* &= (\Upsilon \Lambda^{-1/2} \Upsilon^T) \Upsilon_{(k)} \\ &= \Upsilon_{(k)} \Lambda_{(k)}^{-1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (341)$$

where $\Upsilon_{(k)}$ denotes the $K \times k$ matrix consisting of the first k columns of Υ , i.e.,

$$\Upsilon_{(k)} = [\mathbf{v}_1 \ \cdots \ \mathbf{v}_k],$$

and where $\Lambda_{(k)}$ denotes the $k \times k$ upper left submatrix of Λ , i.e., the matrix whose diagonal entries are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$. Likewise, (261b) specializes to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^* &= \left(\Upsilon (\Lambda + \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1/2} \Upsilon^T \right) \Upsilon_{(k)} \\ &= \Upsilon_{(k)} (\Lambda_{(k)} + \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (342)$$

In turn, it follows from (341) and (342) that the k -dimensional PCA vector

$$S^{\text{PCA}} = \mathbf{f}^{\text{PCA}}(X) \triangleq \Upsilon_{(k)}^T X \quad (343a)$$

is a sufficient statistic for inferences about the unknown U and V based on X , and

$$T^{\text{PCA}} = \mathbf{g}^{\text{PCA}}(Y) \triangleq \Upsilon_{(k)}^T Y \quad (343b)$$

is a sufficient statistic for such inferences based on Y , i.e., we have the Markov structure

$$(U, V) \leftrightarrow S^{\text{PCA}} \leftrightarrow X \quad (344a)$$

$$(U, V) \leftrightarrow T^{\text{PCA}} \leftrightarrow Y. \quad (344b)$$

Beyond this illustrative example, for a general jointly Gaussian pair (X, Y) , the statistics

$$S_{(k)} = (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^T X \quad \text{and} \quad T_{(k)} = (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^T Y$$

specialize to (invertible transformations of) the PCA statistics (343) whenever $K_X = K_Y = K$ and Λ_X and Λ_Y are simultaneously diagonalizable, i.e., when they share the same set of eigenvectors (339), which is equivalent to the condition that Λ_X and Λ_Y commute (see, e.g., [24, Theorem 1.3.12]). In fact, if Λ_X has distinct eigenvalues and commutes with Λ_Y , then there is a polynomial $\pi(\cdot)$ of degree at most $K - 1$ such that $\Lambda_Y = \pi(\Lambda_X)$, which follows from the Cayley-Hamilton theorem (see, e.g., [24, Theorem 2.4.3.2 and Problem 1.3.P4]).

N. Efficient Learning of Covariance Modal Decompositions

The linear features $\mathbf{f}(x)$ and $\mathbf{g}(y)$ in the modal decomposition of covariance Λ_{XY} are readily constructed via an iterative procedure. In particular, a natural approach corresponds to applying orthogonal iteration to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ to generate the dominant modes of its SVD. The resulting procedure has a statistical interpretation as an ACE algorithm.

To obtain the Gaussian version of the ACE algorithm Algorithm 1, it suffices to note that the conditional expectations in this case are all linear—specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T X \mid Y = y] &= \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T \mathbb{E}[X \mid Y = y] \\ &= \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_{XY} \Lambda_Y^{-1} y \end{aligned} \quad (345a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T Y \mid X = x] &= \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T \mathbb{E}[Y \mid X = x] \\ &= \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_{XY}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} x, \end{aligned} \quad (345b)$$

and that [cf. (254)]

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T X (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T Y)^T] = \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T \Lambda_{XY} \mathbf{G}_{(k)}. \quad (345c)$$

The resulting procedure then takes the form of Algorithm 3. Computational complexity behavior is analogous to the corresponding algorithm for discrete data. As in our discussion of Section VI-A2, steps 2f and 2c can be equivalently expressed in their respective variational forms [cf. (173)]

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}_{(k)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^T X - \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{(k)}^T Y\|^2 \right] \quad (346a)$$

$$\bar{\mathbf{G}}_{(k)} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{(k)}^T X - \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^T Y\|^2 \right], \quad (346b)$$

and evaluated iteratively or otherwise.

When the covariance structure Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} is unknown, but we have training data

$$\mathcal{T} \triangleq \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}, \quad (347)$$

Algorithm 3 Gaussian ACE, Multiple Mode Computation

Require: Covariance matrices Λ_{XY} , Λ_X , and Λ_Y ; dimension k

1. Initialization: randomly choose $\bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)}$

repeat

2a. Cholesky factor:

$$\bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)\top} \Lambda_X \bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)} = (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^\top \Theta_{(k)}^X$$

2b. Whiten:

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)} = \bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)} (\Theta_{(k)}^X)^{-1}$$

2c. $\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)} \leftarrow \Lambda_Y^{-1} \Lambda_{YX} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)}$

2d. Cholesky factor:

$$\bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)\top} \Lambda_Y \bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)} = (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^\top \Theta_{(k)}^Y$$

2e. Whiten:

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)} = \bar{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)} (\Theta_{(k)}^Y)^{-1}$$

2f. $\bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)} \leftarrow \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{YX}^\top \hat{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)}$

2g. $\hat{\sigma}^{(k)} \leftarrow \text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}^{(k)\top} \Lambda_{YX} \bar{\mathbf{F}}^{(k)})$

until $\hat{\sigma}^{(k)}$ stops increasing.

drawn i.i.d. from the associated Gaussian distribution, we can use sample covariance matrices in place of the true ones in Algorithm 3, viz.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Lambda}_X &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_X)(x_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_X)^\top \\ \hat{\Lambda}_Y &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_Y)(y_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_Y)^\top \\ \hat{\Lambda}_{XY} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_X)(y_i - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_Y)^\top, \end{aligned}$$

for example, where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_Y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i.$$

Sample complexity analysis of modal estimation in this Gaussian case can be carried out in a manner analogous to that described in Section VI-B.

O. Gaussian Attribute Matching

The preceding analysis can be used to develop the natural Gaussian counterpart of the Bayesian attribute matching formulation of collaborative filtering in Section VII. Our analysis can be interpreted as a formulation of a problem of high-dimensional linear estimation. As such, they can be viewed in a broader context that includes related results on shrinkage-based methods (see, e.g., [105] and the references therein) that generalize James-Stein estimators [106]. Recent work more directly analogous to the analyses of matrix factorization in, e.g., collaborative filtering as discussed in Section VIII include, e.g., [48], [107]. As such, this section provides an additional interpretation of such relationships.

For the purposes of illustration, consider a simple problem of low-level computer vision. Let Y denote a vector representing a (e.g., rasterized) K_Y -pixel target image of some scene of interest, and let X denote a vector representing a (linearly)

distorted K_X -pixel source image of the scene. Such distortions could include, e.g., complex geometric transformations, nonuniform sampling, spatially-varying filtering, and noise. Then $P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$ denotes the probability density for the target image associated with a given source image x .

Given a choice for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, the k -dimensional variables U and V in the Gaussian Markov chain (301) correspond to the dominant attributes of source and target images, respectively, and where $S_{(k)}^*$ and $T_{(k)}^*$ represent sufficient statistics for the estimation of these attributes.

Conceptually, for each target image y , there is an associated target attribute $V(y)$ generated randomly from y according to $P_{V|Y}(\cdot|y)$ that expresses the dominant attribute of the target image. Likewise, for the source image x , there is an associated target attribute $V_o(x)$ generated randomly from x according to $P_{V|X}(\cdot|x)$.

Next, let $\Delta_y(x)$ denote how close the target attribute of target image y is to the target attribute of the source image x , i.e.,

$$\Delta_y(x) \triangleq V(y) - V_o(x),$$

and define the set

$$\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x) \triangleq \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\Delta_y(x)\|^2 \right]. \quad (348)$$

The following characterization of $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ —the collection of target images whose attributes match that of the source image most closely—is useful in our development. A proof is provided in Appendix IX-W.

Lemma 91: Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and zero-mean jointly Gaussian X, Y characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , define k -dimensional Gaussian multi-attributes in the Gauss-Markov structure (301) according to Corollary 84 for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ as defined (348), it follows $y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}$ if and only if the associated (linear) features are related according to

$$g_i^*(y) = \sigma_i f_i^*(x), \quad i = 1, \dots, k. \quad (349)$$

Among the target images y for which the attribute match with x is closest, we seek the most likely, which we denote using $y^*(x)$. We have the following characterization of $y^*(x)$. A proof is provided in Appendix IX-X.

Proposition 92: Given $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and zero-mean jointly Gaussian $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , define k -dimensional Gaussian multi-attributes in the Gauss-Markov chain (301) according to Corollary 84 for some $\epsilon > 0$. Then for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)$ as defined (348), we have that

$$y^*(x) \triangleq \arg \max_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)} p_Y(y), \quad (350)$$

with $p_Y = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Lambda_Y)$ denoting the marginal for Y , satisfies

$$y^*(x) = (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^\dagger \Sigma_{(k)} (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^\top x, \quad (351a)$$

where the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}$ takes the form

$$(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^\dagger = (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^\top \Lambda_Y. \quad (351b)$$

The optimizing $y^*(x)$ in Proposition 92 has the interpretation as an MMSE estimate based not on Λ_{XY} but on the approximation $\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)*}$ of rank k defined in (295). In particular, the following corollary is an immediate consequence of (295).

Corollary 93: An equivalent characterization of (351) in Proposition 92 is

$$y^*(x) = \Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*} \Lambda_X^{-1} x, \quad (352)$$

where $\Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*}$ is as defined in (295).

Connections to PCA: As we now illustrate, PCA naturally arises in special cases of the preceding matching framework. In particular, returning to the scenario of the example in Section IX-M, we first interchange the roles of U and V , and X and Y , obtaining that the optimum target image $x^*(y)$ for a given source image y based on Gaussian attribute matching is

$$x^*(y) = (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^\dagger \Sigma_{(k)} (\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*)^\top y \quad (353a)$$

where

$$(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^\dagger = (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^\top \Lambda_X. \quad (353b)$$

Gaussian attribute matching in this scenario takes a familiar form. In particular, specializing (353) using (340), (341), and (342), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x^*(y) &= \Upsilon_{(k)} \Lambda_{(k)}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I} + \sigma_\nu^2 \Lambda_{(k)}^{-1})^{-1/2} (\Lambda_{(k)} + \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1/2} \Upsilon_{(k)}^\top y \\ &= \Upsilon_{(k)} \Lambda_{(k)} (\Lambda_{(k)} + \sigma_\nu^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \Upsilon_{(k)}^\top y. \end{aligned}$$

The result is, of course, a standard approach to simple (linear) denoising, whereby a signal of interest is expanded in the basis prescribed by PCA, only the dominant modes are retained, and the associated coefficients are appropriately attenuated. As such, our analysis provides an additional interpretation of such processing, further insights into which also arise in the next section.

P. Rank-Constrained Linear Regression

In this section, we develop the counterpart to our softmax regression analysis for jointly Gaussian variables, which is a form of rank-constrained linear regression. Such regression problems have a long history. Indeed, Young [108] recognized the relationship between early factor analysis and low-rank approximation. Subsequent results on the topic appear in, e.g., [109], and, later, in [110, Theorem 10.2.1] [111]. Later still, interpretations of the special case of PCA in terms of neural networks appeared in, e.g., [112]–[114], and the general case of CCA in [115], in which an alternative to the ACE algorithm of Section IX-N is involved in its implementation. The results of this section provide some complementary perspectives.

To begin, the counterpart of Proposition 56 is immediate in the Gaussian case. In particular, the following simple result expresses that the particular exponential family form is not restrictive.

Proposition 94: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} . Furthermore, given a dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let

$S = \mathbf{F}^\top X$ for some $K_X \times k$ matrix \mathbf{F} , so $\Lambda_{YS} = \Lambda_{YX} \mathbf{F}$ and $\Lambda_S = \mathbf{F}^\top \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}$ are the induced covariances. Then the joint probability density for S, Y takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} P_{S,Y}(s, y) &= P_Y(y) P_{S|Y}(s|y) \\ &= \mathcal{N}(y; \mathbf{0}, \Lambda_Y) \mathcal{N}(s; \mathbf{G}^\top y, \Lambda_S - \mathbf{G}^\top \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}), \end{aligned} \quad (354)$$

where

$$\mathbf{G}^\top Y \triangleq \mathbb{E}[S|Y]. \quad (355)$$

Proof: It suffices to exploit that since (355) is the MMSE estimate of S given Y , we have

$$S = \mathbf{G}^\top Y + \nu,$$

where the error ν is independent of Y . Moreover,

$$\Lambda_{S|Y} = \Lambda_S - \Lambda_{SY} \Lambda_Y^{-1} \Lambda_{YS} = \Lambda_S - \mathbf{G}^\top \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G},$$

where to obtain the last equality we have used that

$$\mathbf{G}^\top = \Lambda_{SY} \Lambda_Y^{-1}.$$

since S, Y are jointly Gaussian. ■

In turn, the counterpart to Corollary 57 is the following result optimizing \mathbf{F} , whose proof is provided in Appendix IX-Y.

Proposition 95: Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be ϵ -correlated zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables whose joint density $P_{X,Y}$ is characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} . Furthermore, given a dimension $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^{K_X, K_Y}(\Lambda_X, \Lambda_Y) &\triangleq \\ &\left\{ P: P = \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_X & \tilde{\Lambda}_{XY} \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_{XY}^\top & \Lambda_Y \end{bmatrix}\right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{some } \tilde{\Lambda}_{XY} \text{ with } \text{rank}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{XY}) \leq k \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (356)$$

denote the collection of zero-mean jointly Gaussian distributions with rank-constrained cross-covariance. Then for $\tilde{P}_{X,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k^{K_X, K_Y}(\Lambda_X, \Lambda_Y)$,

$$D(P_{X,Y} \| \tilde{P}_{X,Y}) \geq \sum_{i=k+1}^K \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2),$$

where the inequality holds with equality when $\tilde{P}_{X,Y}$ has cross-covariance $\tilde{\Lambda}_{YX} = \Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*}$, with $\Lambda_{YX}^{(k)*}$ as given by (295).

This result expresses that among all k -dimensional linear restrictions $S = \mathbf{F}^\top X$ of the data, that corresponding to $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*$ is optimum.

In turn, given the choice $S = (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^\top X$, the matrix $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}^*$ defines the weights in the associated estimate of Y ; specifically, [cf. (351)]

$$\hat{Y}^* = (\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)*})^\top \Lambda_X^{-1} X = \Lambda_Y \mathbf{G}_{(k)}^* \Sigma_{(k)} S. \quad (357)$$

We emphasize that the estimate (357), in which $\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)*}$ can be equivalently expressed in the form

$$\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)*} = (\Lambda_X^{1/2} \Psi_{(k)}^X) (\Lambda_X^{1/2} \Psi_{(k)}^X)^\dagger \Lambda_{XY}, \quad (358)$$

is generally different from the MMSE estimator limited to rank k , which can be expressed in the following form [111], a derivation of which is provided in Appendix IX-Z.

Proposition 96: For zero-mean, jointly Gaussian $X \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ characterized by covariance Λ_X , Λ_Y , and Λ_{XY} , then given $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$,

$$\hat{Y}^\circ = \arg \min_{\substack{\hat{Y}: \hat{Y} = \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} X, \\ \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y - \hat{Y}\|^2] = (\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)\circ})^\top \Lambda_X^{-1} X, \quad (359a)$$

where

$$\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)\circ} = (\Lambda_X^{1/2} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X) (\Lambda_X^{1/2} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^\dagger \Lambda_{XY}, \quad (359b)$$

with $\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X$ denoting the first (dominant) k columns of $\tilde{\Psi}^X$ in the (alternative) SVD [cf. (249)]

$$\Lambda_{YX} \Lambda_X^{-1/2} = \Lambda_Y^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \tilde{\Psi}^Y \tilde{\Sigma} (\tilde{\Psi}^X)^\top \quad (359c)$$

in which $\tilde{\Psi}^X$ and $\tilde{\Psi}^Y$ are orthogonal matrices and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is a diagonal matrix.

We note, in particular, that the generally different estimators (359) and (357) coincide when $\Lambda_Y = \mathbf{I}$, since the SVDs (249) and (359c) are identical in this case.

Finally, the implied rank-constrained linear regression procedure is as follows. First, we assume that sufficient unlabeled training data is available that Λ_X and Λ_Y are accurately recovered. Second, from the labeled training data we obtain the empirical covariance $\hat{\Lambda}_{XY}$. We then let $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ denote the distribution of zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and $\hat{\Lambda}_{XY}$ and apply Proposition 95 with $P_{X,Y} = \hat{P}_{X,Y}$ to obtain that the (locally) divergence-minimizing (cross-entropy maximizing) regression parameters are given by

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{YX}^{(k)*} \triangleq \Lambda_Y \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{(k)}^* \hat{\Sigma}_{(k)} (\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{(k)}^*)^\top \Lambda_X, \quad (360)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{(k)}$, $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{(k)}$, and $\hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}$ correspond to the k dominant modes in the modal decomposition of the empirical cross-covariance, viz., [cf. (255)]

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{YX} = \Lambda_Y \hat{\mathbf{G}}^* \hat{\Sigma} (\hat{\mathbf{F}}^*)^\top \Lambda_X. \quad (361)$$

In turn, the quality of the model fit is given by

$$D(\hat{P}_{X,Y} \parallel \hat{P}_{X,Y}^{(k)*}) = \sum_{i=k+1}^K \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (362)$$

where $\hat{P}_{X,Y}^{(k)*}$ denotes the (optimized) distribution of zero-mean jointly Gaussian variables characterized by Λ_X , Λ_Y , and $\hat{\Lambda}_{XY}^{(k)*}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_K$ are the diagonal entries of $\hat{\Sigma}$.

Q. Comments on Nonlinear CCA and PCA

A variety of nonlinear generalizations of CCA and PCA have been developed. Examples include versions of nonlinear CCA as developed in [116]–[119], as well as nonlinear PCA as developed in [120], both of which are expressed via layered neural network architectures. As such, the relationships between the results of Sections VIII and IX-P—and between Sections II and IX-B—may also facilitate interpreting such forms of CCA and PCA and relating them to their linear counterparts in ways that extend existing analyses, examples of which include [96], [121], and particularly the recent work

[122], the analysis of which is perhaps closest in spirit to that of this paper. Additionally, such nonlinear generalizations play a role in the analysis of independent component analysis (ICA), as described in, e.g., [123], [124], and here, too, there is the potential to complement existing information-theoretic analyses, such as those in [125]–[128].

X. SEMI-SUPERVISED LEARNING

There are a wide variety of problems that deviate from the standard supervised learning model on which we have focused by using labeled data in more limited ways, instead relying more on unlabeled data in their training. These are typically referred to as *semi-supervised* learning problems, and there is a rich taxonomy and literature; see, e.g., [129] and the many references therein, including the early work [130]. While a broader development on the topic is beyond the scope of the present paper, in this section we briefly discuss some of the most immediate implications of our analysis to some such problems.

A. Indirect Learning

A problem of significant interest is that of unsupervised learning, in which only unlabeled data is available to train the system. These correspond to clustering problems, and there are a number of classical approaches, originating with the work of Pearson [131]; see, e.g., [132] and the references therein for a summary.

In practice, there can be many valid clusterings of data, some more useful than others for a given target application. For instance, in the case of movies, one could cluster by any number of attributes, including time period, genre, etc. One can view these alternatives as capturing different measures of proximity in carrying out the clustering. But if one is interested in clustering movies according to the way people select movies to watch, then the measure of proximity is less straightforward to quantify.

In such cases, auxiliary labeled data can be used to effectively capture the right notion of distance for such problems, and express them in terms of universal features. To develop this notion of “indirect” learning, which has similarities in spirit to methods such as those described in [133], let

$$X \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow Z$$

denote a Markov chain of discrete variables in which $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ represents the data we seek to cluster (e.g., movies), $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ represents the class index, and $X \in \mathcal{X}$ represents auxiliary data (e.g., people). We assume that in general \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are large alphabets, but that \mathcal{Z} may be comparatively small, and that we have an empirical distribution $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ obtained from i.i.d. training data from $P_{X,Y}$ (e.g., the Netflix database), but no training samples of Z from which to directly estimate $P_{Z|Y}$, or even P_Z .

For this scenario, our universal analysis suggests the following procedure. First, for some suitably small $k \in \{1, \dots, K-1\}$, we extract the k dominant modes in the decomposition (15) from $\hat{P}_{X,Y}$ (via, e.g., the ACE algorithm), then use the resulting estimate of g to define a new variable $T = g(Y) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

In turn, our softmax analysis reveals that the following model for the latent variable Z [cf. (228)]

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{P}_{Z|T}^*(z|t) \\ & \propto P_Z(z) \exp \left\{ (t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_T)^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_T^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{T|Z}(z) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_T) \right\} (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned} \quad (363)$$

is locally universal, and unsupervised learning corresponds to fitting this model to the (induced) samples of T .

Our softmax analysis further implies a rather natural model fitting procedure. In particular, as discussed in Section VIII-A, the resulting distribution P_Y , matches, to first order, that of a Gaussian mixture, where $P_{T|Z}(\cdot|z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ are the Gaussian components. Hence, this suggests that carrying out Gaussian mixture modeling on the estimate of P_T obtained from the training data—e.g., via the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm [134]—to learn the parameters $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{T|Z}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{T|Z}$, and P_Z , and (soft) clustering according to the resulting $P_{Z|T}(\cdot|t)$ is locally optimal. Of course, such soft clustering can be replaced by any of a number of hard-decision alternatives if desired, such as that based on the Lloyd algorithm [135], which correspond to so-called k -means⁵⁸ clustering on the induced samples of $T = g(Y)$.

In practice, this procedure is straightforward to apply and effective. For example, applying it to, e.g., the Netflix database yields meaningful movie clusterings. For related developments and additional insights, see, e.g., [136].

B. Partially-Supervised Learning

Another class of learning system architectures is one in which labeled data is used to design a classifier of interest, but the design of the features themselves for such a classifier is based on unlabeled data. These can be viewed as partially-supervised learning systems, and can provide performance close to that of fully supervised architectures while requiring significantly less labeled training data. In such cases, the feature extraction step corresponds to unsupervised dimensionality reduction, for which there are a variety of well established methods, both linear and nonlinear; see, e.g., [137].

The characterization of common information in terms of universal features, as described in Section V-F, suggests a natural framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction, and, in turn, constructing such partially-supervised learning systems, which we illustrate through an example involving handwritten digit recognition, using the MNIST database [138].

The MNIST database consists of a set of $n = 60\,000$ training images $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}$ and a set of $n' = 10\,000$ test images, each depicting a single handwritten digit from the set $\mathcal{Z} \triangleq \{0, \dots, 9\}$. We let $z^{(i)} \in \mathcal{Z}$ denote the label corresponding to training image $x^{(i)}$, and let $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ denote that for a given test image x , which are all provided in the database. Each training and test image is a black-and-white, 28×28 pixels size, and quantized to 8-bits per pixel (corresponding to intensity levels $\{0, \dots, 255\}$), so $|\mathcal{X}| = 28 \cdot 28 \cdot 256 = 200\,704$ is the image alphabet size.

⁵⁸Note that k refers a different quantity (specifically, $|\mathcal{Z}|$) in this nomenclature than it does in our use.




Fig. 4: Image representation for the preprocessing stage of the semi-supervised handwritten digit classifier. Each 28×28 MNIST database image is decomposed into an array of $6 \times 6 = 36$ subimages, each of size 7×7 pixels, and each overlapping with its immediate neighbors by 3 pixels, horizontally and/or vertically.

Using the labeled data $(x^{(1)}, z^{(1)}), \dots, (x^{(n)}, z^{(n)})$, we seek to train a classifier based on our framework to predict the label z of a test image x as accurately as possible.

1) *Classification Architecture*: The architecture we develop for this application involves three stages in a manner corresponding to a two-layer neural network. The first stage is a preprocessing step that converts the test image x to a representation $y = q(x)$ from a smaller alphabet \mathcal{Y} . In the second stage, we extract a low-dimensional real-valued feature $r = h(y)$ from the image representation y . Finally, in the third stage we classify the image based on this low-dimensional feature using a predictor $\varphi(\cdot)$, generating label $\hat{z} = \varphi(h(q(x)))$.

We restrict our attention to designs based on semi-supervised learning. Specifically, q and h are designed from the unlabeled data $x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(n)}$ in an unsupervised manner, while φ is designed in a supervised manner from the reduced labeled data

$$(r^{(1)}, z^{(1)}), \dots, (r^{(n)}, z^{(n)}), \quad (364a)$$

with

$$r^{(d)} = h(y^{(d)}), \quad d = 1, \dots, n. \quad (364b)$$

The details of our classifier design are as follows

Stage 1 (Preprocessing): As depicted in Fig. 4, we first decompose each MNIST database image into an array of $6 \times 6 = 36$ overlapping subimages, each of size 7×7 pixels, with immediately neighboring subimages overlapping by 3 pixels, horizontally and/or vertically. We denote the (i, j) th subimage by $\tilde{y}_{i,j}$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, 6$, which takes value in an alphabet of size $|\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}| = 7 \cdot 7 \cdot 256 = 12\,544$.

Second, quantize each subimage in a lossy manner to reduce the size of the alphabet $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$. For this purpose, for each (i, j) , we cluster all the subimages $\tilde{y}_{i,j}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{y}_{i,j}^{(n)}$ extracted from the training data using the “balanced iterative reducing and

clustering using hierarchies” (BIRCH) algorithm [139], which is simple and has computationally efficient (linear complexity). In particular, we use the implementation [140] with threshold parameter to $256\sqrt{3}$ and branching factor 1000. Each subimage $\tilde{y}_{i,j}$ is then represented by the cluster to which it maps, which we denote using $y_{i,j}$.⁵⁹ We further use y to denote the resulting composite image presentation, i.e.,

$$y = \begin{bmatrix} y_{1,1} & \cdots & y_{1,6} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ y_{6,1} & \cdots & y_{6,6} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Stage 2: Feature Extraction: We generate a k -dimensional feature from the unlabeled training data that captures as much of the common information among the subimages as possible; in our experiment we choose $k = 500$. In particular, for each of the $m = \binom{36}{2} = 630$ pairs $(y_{i,j}, y_{i',j'})$ of preprocessed subimages, we determine the k' dominant modes of the empirical pairwise distribution $\hat{P}_{Y_{i,j}, Y_{i',j'}}$ generated from the reduced unlabeled training data

$$y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(n)}.$$

In our experiment we choose $k' = 16$, and use Algorithm 1 to obtain these modes. We then order this aggregate list of $k' m = 10\,080$ modes by singular value, and construct our feature set from the subset corresponding to the overall k largest singular values, which we denote using $\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_k$.

Specifically, with $\{(i_l, j_l), (i'_l, j'_l)\}$ denoting the indices of the subimage pair whose m_l th mode has singular value $\hat{\sigma}_l$, and with $\hat{f}_{(i_l, j_l), (i'_l, j'_l), m_l}^*$ and $\hat{g}_{(i_l, j_l), (i'_l, j'_l), m_l}^*$ denoting the corresponding feature functions in the decomposition of $\hat{P}_{Y_{i_l, j_l}, Y_{i'_l, j'_l}}$, for a test image with representation y , we choose as our k -dimensional feature

$$r = h(y) = (h_1(y), \dots, h_k(y)) \quad (365a)$$

with

$$h_l(y) = \hat{f}_{(i_l, j_l), (i'_l, j'_l), m_l}^*(y_{i_l, j_l}) + \hat{g}_{(i_l, j_l), (i'_l, j'_l), m_l}^*(y_{i'_l, j'_l}). \quad (365b)$$

We emphasize that, in accordance with our development in Section V-F that leads to (164), the elements of (365) are sufficient statistics for the relevant components of the common information between the associated subimage pairs.

Stage 3 (Feature Classification): The final stage implements a low-dimensional feature classifier generated from the reduced labeled training data (364), with h as defined in (365). In particular, we choose a linear support vector machine (SVM) [141] for this purpose.

2) *Performance Evaluation:* When we evaluate the performance of the classifier of Section X-B1 on the full the set of 10 000 MNIST test images, we achieve an digit recognition error probability of 3.02%.

Our classifier, which is characterized by its $k = 500$ scalar features, is naturally compared to alternatives with similar

⁵⁹The resulting alphabets $\mathcal{Y}_{i,j}$ differ in size, ranging from roughly 10 for subimages at the perimeter of the image, to roughly 500 for subimages in the middle.

numbers of features. For example, one such alternative classifier would omit the preprocessing and feature extraction stages, and apply a linear SVM directly to the original representation of image data, corresponding to $28 \cdot 28 = 784$ scalar features. This involves training parameters of the linear classifier in fully-supervised manner, yet only achieves an error probability of 8.17% based on our experimental analysis. This reflects the importance of nonlinearities inherent in the feature formation stages of our architecture.

As another alternative, we can compare our achitecture to a deep neural network (DNN) with two hidden layers and using sigmoidal activation functions [83], and trained in a fully supervised manner. For instance, using 300 units in the first layer and 100 units in the second corresponds to a total of $300 + 100 = 400$ scalar features, and yields an error probability of 3.05% [138], [142], which is comparable to that of our classifier, which is effectively a network with a *single* hidden layer. As such, this reflects the effectiveness of the universal features extracted via our methodology, which we further emphasize are designed in an unsupervised manner—without taking into account the inference task.

As a final evaluation, in Stage 3 of our architecture, we reduced the amount of (labeled) data used to train the classifier from $n = 60\,000$ to $n/2 = 30\,000$, while still using all n *unlabeled* training samples for Stages 1 and 2. In this case, we obtain an only mildly degraded error probability of 3.4%, which is a reflection of the efficiency with which our architecture uses labeled training data, by restricting its use to the final stage.

XI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In recent years, there has been rapid growth in activity in the area of statistical inference and machine learning, largely motivated by the increasingly abundant computational resources available for implementing the associated methods, which in turn has led to an ever-expanding set of rich application domains. In turn, the literature on these topics has expanded commensurately, both in depth and breadth. As such, beyond its specific contributions, this paper can be viewed as a constrained effort to identify meaningful connections and relationships between lines of research—and the corresponding results—that have often been somewhat distinct, using a convenient local information-theoretic analysis. From this perspective, there are abundant opportunities for further research, and the broader challenge of a unifying treatment remains.

APPENDIX II

APPENDICES FOR SECTION II

A. Proof of Proposition 1

It suffices to show that the maximum eigenvalue of $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T$ is at most unity. To this end, note that via (10) and (11) we have

$$\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^T = \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{Y|X} \mathbf{P}_{X|Y} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y}. \quad (366)$$

Now $\mathbf{P}_{Y|X}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}$ are both column-stochastic matrices, so their product $\mathbf{P}_{Y|X} \mathbf{P}_{X|Y}$ is as well. As such, this product

has maximum eigenvalue of unity, which follows from, e.g., [24, Theorem 8.3.4] and the fact that by definition a matrix \mathbf{A} is column stochastic if $\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}^T$. Finally, since (366) is a similarity transformation of $\mathbf{P}_{Y|X} \mathbf{P}_{X|Y}$, it has the same eigenvalues.

Finally, (14b) can be verified by direct calculation using (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} B(x, y) \sqrt{P_X(x)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \\ \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \bar{B}(y, x) \sqrt{P_Y(y)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X,Y}(x, y) = \sqrt{P_X(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

■

B. DTM Characterization

As notation, let $\mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})$ denote the $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$ dimensional DTM associated with joint distribution $P_{X,Y}$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ denote the set of all DTMs, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} = \mathbf{B}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}), \quad (367)$$

and let $\mathcal{B}_\circ^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ denote the set of all DTMs corresponding to distributions with strictly positive probabilities, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B}_\circ^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} = \mathbf{B}(\text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})). \quad (368)$$

As further notation, for a matrix \mathbf{A} , we use $\mathbf{A} > \mathbf{0}$ to denote that every entry of \mathbf{A} is positive, and, likewise $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{0}$ when all entries are nonnegative.

The following proposition characterizes $\mathcal{B}_\circ^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ in (368).

Proposition 97: A matrix \mathbf{M} is a DTM corresponding to a joint distribution in $\text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}})$ if and only if $\mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B}_\circ^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} = \{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|} : \mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1\}, \quad (369)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_s$ denotes the spectral norm of its argument.

Proof: The ‘‘only if’’ part of the claim is immediate. Indeed, since $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})$ for some strictly positive $P_{X,Y}$, it follows that $\mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0}$. Moreover, as developed in Section II, $\|\mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})\|_s = 1$.

For the ‘‘if’’ part of the claim, consider any matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ satisfying $\mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1$. We can construct a $P_{X,Y}$ for which \mathbf{M} is its DTM. To see this, first note that $\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^T > \mathbf{0}$, and $\lambda(\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M}) = \|\mathbf{M}\|_s^2 = 1$, where $\lambda(\cdot)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of its argument. Then, applying the Perron-Frobenius theorem [24, Theorem 8.2.2], it follows that there exist unit-norm vectors $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ with strictly positive elements such that

$$\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^T \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}).$$

In turn, this implies that $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ are the right and left singular vectors corresponding to the unit principal singular value of \mathbf{M} , respectively, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{M} \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}^T \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^X(\mathbf{M}). \quad (370)$$

We now define a $P_{X,Y}$ lying on the simplex, and show that its DTM is \mathbf{M} . In particular, we let

$$P_{X,Y}(x, y) \triangleq [\mathbf{P}_{Y,X}]_{y,x}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y},$$

where

$$\mathbf{P}_{Y,X} \triangleq \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M} \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})), \quad (371)$$

with $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ denoting a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries specified by its (vector) argument.

That $P_{X,Y}$ is strictly positive follows by construction, since the quantities forming $\mathbf{P}_{Y,X}$ are all strictly positive. To verify that it sums to unity, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x,y} P_{X,Y}(x, y) &= \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{1} \\ &= \mathbf{1}^T \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M} \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{1} \\ &= \psi^Y(\mathbf{M})^T \mathbf{M} \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= \psi^Y(\mathbf{M})^T \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, applying (370), we obtain that the marginals take the form

$$\begin{aligned} P_Y(y) &= \mathbf{P} \mathbf{1} \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M} \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{1} \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M} \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= \psi^Y(\mathbf{M})^2 \end{aligned} \quad (372a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_X(x) &= \mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{1} \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M}^T \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{1} \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M}^T \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})) \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) \\ &= \psi^X(\mathbf{M})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (372b)$$

where $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})^2$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})^2$ are vectors whose elements are the squares of the elements of $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$, respectively.

Hence, using (372) in (371) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M} &= \left[\sqrt{\text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M}))} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{Y,X} \left[\sqrt{\text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M}))} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{Y,X} \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \right]^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (373)$$

where \mathbf{P}_X and \mathbf{P}_Y are diagonal matrices whose diagonal elements are the elements of P_X and P_Y , respectively, which are all strictly positive. Hence, \mathbf{M} is the DTM corresponding to the $P_{X,Y}$ we have constructed, i.e., $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})$. ■

The following generalization of Proposition 97 characterizes $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ in (367).

Proposition 98: A matrix \mathbf{M} is a DTM corresponding to a joint distribution in $\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ if and only if $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1$, and each of $\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^T$ have a strictly positive eigenvector corresponding to their unit eigenvalue, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} &= \left\{ \mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|} : \mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}, \|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1, \right. \\ &\quad \exists \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) > \mathbf{0} \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M} \psi^X(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^X(\mathbf{M}), \\ &\quad \left. \exists \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) > \mathbf{0} \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^T \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) = \psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: For the “only if” part, since $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})$ for some $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, it follows by construction that $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}$, and as developed in Section II, $\|\mathbf{B}\|_s = 1$ with corresponding right and left principal singular vectors $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ whose elements are $\{\sqrt{P_X}, x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\{\sqrt{P_Y}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$, respectively, which are strictly positive according to our assumption at the outset of this appendix. As such, these strictly positive $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ must be eigenvectors of $\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^T$ corresponding to the unit eigenvalue.

The “if” part follows from the same proof as that for Proposition 97 mutatis mutandis. However, we must be careful when applying the Perron-Frobenius theorem [24, Theorem 8.3.1] to $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}$ as it only guarantees that the eigenvectors $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ are entrywise nonnegative. If an entry of $\psi^X(\mathbf{M})$ or $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})$ were zero, then the corresponding column or row of

$$\mathbf{P}_{Y,X} = \text{diag}(\psi^Y(\mathbf{M})) \mathbf{M} \text{diag}(\psi^X(\mathbf{M})),$$

which defines $P_{X,Y}$, would be zero. In turn, this would imply that $P_X(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \mathcal{X}$ or $P_Y(y) = 0$ for some $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, which would mean that $P_{X,Y} \notin \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$, so that \mathbf{M} could not be a DTM. Accordingly, we add the $\psi^X(\mathbf{M}) > \mathbf{0}$ and $\psi^Y(\mathbf{M}) > \mathbf{0}$ conditions in the statement of the proposition. ■

Remark 99: It is worth noting that a nonnegative square matrix $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{0}$ has strictly positive left and right eigenvectors corresponding to its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue (or spectral radius) $\rho(\mathbf{A})$ if and only if the triangular block form of \mathbf{A} is a direct sum of irreducible nonnegative square matrices whose spectral radii are also $\rho(\mathbf{A})$ —see Theorem 3.14 and the preceding discussion in [143, Chapter 2, Section 3]. This means that $\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}^T$ have strictly positive eigenvectors corresponding to their spectral radius of unity if and only if they have the aforementioned direct form structure after suitable similarity transformations using permutation matrices.

Finally, we establish the following.

Proposition 100: The DTM function $\mathbf{B}: \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mapsto \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is bijective and continuous.

Proof: The DTM function $\mathbf{B}: \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mapsto \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is bijective because: 1) its range is defined to be $\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$; and 2) the proof of Proposition 97 (and, in turn, its extension Proposition 98) delineates the inverse function.

To prove that $\mathbf{B}: \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \mapsto \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}$ is continuous, consider any sequence of distributions $\{P_{X,Y}^n \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}, n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{X,Y}^n(x, y) = P_{X,Y}(x, y).$$

By the triangle inequality, we have, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |P_X^n(x) - P_X(x)| &= \left| \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X,Y}^n(x, y) - P_{X,Y}(x, y) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |P_{X,Y}^n(x, y) - P_{X,Y}(x, y)|, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $P_X^n(x) \rightarrow P_X(x)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Likewise, $P_Y^n(y) \rightarrow P_Y(y)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Hence, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{X,Y}^n(x, y)}{\sqrt{P_X^n(x) P_Y^n(y)}} = \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}}$$

for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, which means that the elements of $\mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y}^n)$ converge to the elements of $\mathbf{B}(P_{X,Y})$, and where we note that the denominator terms are strictly positive according to our assumption at the outset of this appendix. Therefore, the DTM function is continuous. ■

C. Conditional Expectation Operator Representations

It is reasonable to ask why it is natural to focus on the SVD of the CDM $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ corresponding to \tilde{B} , as opposed to other commonly used representations of the conditional expectation operator $P_{X|Y}$, such as simply

$$B_0(x, y) \triangleq P_{X,Y}(x, y),$$

or

$$B_1(x, y) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{P_X(x) P_Y(y)},$$

whose logarithm is the pointwise mutual information [73] (also referred to as the information density [74]). While fulling addressing this question is beyond the scope of the present development, we can show that \tilde{B} generates inner product spaces with the “right” properties, and that it does so uniquely over a reasonable class of candidates.

Our characterization takes the form of the following proposition, in which $\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}$ is the representation of the conditional expectation operator $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|Y=y]$ defined in (11). In particular, expressing a function f as a length- $|\mathcal{X}|$ (column) vector \mathbf{f} ,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X)|Y=y] = \mathbf{P}_{X|Y}^T \mathbf{f}.$$

Proposition 101: Define an inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ using a distribution Q_X

$$\langle \mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \rangle_{Q_X} \triangleq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) f_1(x) f_2(x),$$

yielding $\ell^2(\mathcal{X}, Q_X)$, and similarly use P_Y to convert $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}|}$ into $\ell^2(\mathcal{Y}, P_Y)$, i.e.,

$$\langle \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \rangle_{P_Y} \triangleq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_Y(y) g_1(y) g_2(y).$$

Then

$$\min_{Q_X} \max_{\mathbf{f} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{X}, Q_X)} \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}^T \mathbf{f}\|_{P_Y}}{\|\mathbf{f}\|_{Q_X}} = 1,$$

and, moreover,

$$Q_X^* = P_X = P_Y P_{X|Y}$$

is the unique minimizer.

Proof: Note that for all Q_X we have $\mathbf{1} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{X}, Q_X)$ with $\|\mathbf{1}\|_{Q_X} = 1$. Also, $\|\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}^T \mathbf{1}\|_{P_Y} = \|\mathbf{1}\|_{P_Y} = 1$. Hence,

$$\max_{\mathbf{f} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{X}, Q_X)} \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_{X|Y}^T \mathbf{f}\|_{P_Y}}{\|\mathbf{f}\|_{Q_X}} \geq 1, \quad \text{for all } P_Y \text{ and } Q_X.$$

But we know that $Q_X = P_X$ achieves the lower bound, which proves the minimum. In particular, via Jensen’s inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[f(X)|Y]^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[f(X)^2|Y] \right] = \mathbb{E} [f(X)^2].$$

To prove that P_X is the unique minimizer, suppose we use $Q_X \neq P_X$ for the inner product. Then consider the adjoint operator, which for $\mathbf{f} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{X}, Q_X)$ and $\mathbf{g} \in \ell^2(\mathcal{Y}, P_Y)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\mathbb{E}[f(X)|Y] g(Y)] &= \mathbb{E}_{P_{X,Y}} [f(X) g(Y)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_X} [f(X) \mathbb{E}[g(Y)|X]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_X} \left[f(X) \mathbb{E}[g(Y)|X] \frac{P_X(X)}{Q_X(X)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

So the adjoint operator is

$$(P_{X|Y}^* g)(x) = \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)} \mathbb{E}_{P_{Y|X}} [g(Y)|X = x].$$

Now observe that

$$(P_{X|Y}^* 1)(x) = \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)},$$

so $\|1\|_{P_Y} = 1$ and

$$\|P_{X|Y}^* 1\|_{Q_X}^2 = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} Q_X(x) \frac{P_X(x)^2}{Q_X(x)^2} = 1 + D_{\chi^2}(Q\|P) > 1,$$

where the last inequality follows because $P_X \neq Q_X$. Hence the largest singular value of $P_{X|Y}^*$ is strictly greater than unity. Hence, $Q_X^* = P_X$ is the unique minimizer. ■

Note that Proposition 101 shows that given $P_{X,Y}$, the *only* choice of inner products that make $P_{Y|X}$ and $P_{X|Y}$ adjoints and contractive operators (so that the data processing inequality is satisfied locally) are those with respect to P_X and P_Y . It also establishes that if we are given only $P_{X|Y}$, we are free to choose P_Y , but we must choose the corresponding P_X for the other inner product to obtain the required contraction property.

We comment that the restriction in Proposition 101 to inner products corresponding to weighting by distribution is natural. In general, each inner product corresponds to a positive semidefinite matrix \mathbf{A} , i.e., $\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{g}$. For simplicity, we neglect the orthogonal matrices in the spectral decomposition of \mathbf{A} , and only consider diagonal matrices \mathbf{A} with strictly positive diagonal entries, which correspond to weighted inner products. Moreover, we restrict the diagonal entries to sum to unity to have a “well-defined” problem (indeed, allowing arbitrary scaling would make the infimum in our proposition zero).

APPENDIX IV APPENDICES FOR SECTION IV

A. Proof of Proposition 7

The first part of the proposition is immediate: from (51) we obtain both

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_0} [h(Z)] = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) h(z) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (P(z) - P_0(z)) = 0,$$

and

$$\xi(z) = \sqrt{P_0(z)} h(z) = \frac{P(z) - P_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)}} = \phi(z), \quad (374)$$

where we have further used (50), and where to obtain the last equality we have used (46). The second part of the proposition is trivially true when $h \equiv 0$. When $h \neq 0$, it suffices to note that P in (54) satisfies

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) + \epsilon \mathbb{E}_{P_0} [h(Z)] = 1,$$

and that $P(z) \in [0, 1]$ whenever

$$\epsilon \leq \min \left\{ \frac{-1}{\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z)}, \frac{1 - \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z)}{\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z)} \right\},$$

where we have used that since $h \neq 0$,

$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) > 0,$$

and that since $P_0 \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}})$,

$$\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) < 1.$$

Finally, using, in turn, (46), (54), and (50), we obtain

$$\phi(z) = \frac{P(z) - P_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)}} = \sqrt{P_0(z)} h(z) = \xi(z). \quad \blacksquare$$

B. Proof of Corollary 8

To obtain the first part of the corollary, we have that given P there exists h such that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{P(z)}{P_0(z)} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \log(1 + \epsilon h(z)) = h(z) + h_{\epsilon}(z), \quad (375)$$

with $h_{\epsilon}(z)$ denoting an $o(1)$ term, where to obtain the first equality we have used (51), and to obtain the second equality we have used the first-order Taylor series approximation $\log(1 + \omega) = \omega + o(\omega)$. In turn, using (52) it follows that

$$h_{LL}(z) = h(z) + \tilde{h}_{\epsilon}(z) \quad (376)$$

where \tilde{h}_{ϵ} is a function such that

$$\tilde{h}_{\epsilon}(z) = o(1), \quad \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{P_0} [\tilde{h}_{\epsilon}(Z)] = 0. \quad (377)$$

Multiplying both sides of (376) by $\sqrt{P_0(z)}$ yields the (57).

To obtain the second part of the corollary, we use from (54) that given h satisfying (52) there exists P such that (375) holds for sufficiently small ϵ . Subtracting the mean with respect to P_0 from (375) then yields (58). ■

C. Proof of Lemma 9

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_P [h(Z)] &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P(z) h(z) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (P_0(z) + \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \phi(z)) \frac{\xi(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}} \quad (378) \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sqrt{P_0(z)} \xi(z) + \epsilon \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \phi(z) \xi(z) \quad (379) \\ &= \epsilon \langle \phi, \xi \rangle, \quad (380) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (378) we have used (46) and (50), and to obtain (380) we have used that (52), i.e., $\xi \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}(P_0)$, implies that the first term in (379) is zero in accordance with (49). ■

D. Proof of Lemma 10

With the feature functions

$$L_i(z) \triangleq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{P_i(z)}{P_0(z)} - 1 \right)$$

we have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{P_i(z)}{P_0(z)} &= \log(1 + \epsilon L_i(z)) \\ &= \epsilon L_i(z) - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 L_i(z)^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (381)$$

$$= \epsilon \frac{\phi_i(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \frac{\phi_i(z)^2}{P_0(z)} + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (382)$$

where to obtain (381) we have used the second-order Taylor series approximation

$$\log(1 + \omega) = \omega - \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 + o(\omega^2), \quad \text{as } \omega \rightarrow 0,$$

and where to obtain (382) we have used (53) from the first part of Proposition 7. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} &= \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_0(z)} - \log \frac{P_2(z)}{P_0(z)} \\ &= \epsilon \frac{\phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \frac{\phi_1(z)^2 - \phi_2(z)^2}{P_0(z)} + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

and, in turn,

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_1 \| P_2) &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_1(z) \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} + \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (P_1(z) - P_0(z)) \log \frac{P_1(z)}{P_2(z)} \\ &= \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) \epsilon \frac{\phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_0(z) \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \frac{\phi_1(z)^2 - \phi_2(z)^2}{P_0(z)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \phi_1(z) \epsilon \frac{\phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \phi_1(z) \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \frac{\phi_1(z)^2 - \phi_2(z)^2}{P_0(z)} \\ &\quad + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= 0 - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (\phi_1(z)^2 - \phi_2(z)^2) \\ &\quad + \epsilon^2 \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \phi_1(z) (\phi_1(z) - \phi_2(z)) + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 [\|\phi_2\|^2 - \|\phi_1\|^2 + 2\|\phi_1\|^2 - 2\langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle] + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

E. Proof of Lemma 11

To obtain (63), it suffices to note that since

$$\tilde{P}_0(z) = P_0(z) + \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \tilde{\phi}_0(z)$$

for some $\tilde{\phi}_0(z)$ such that $\|\tilde{\phi}_0\| \leq 1$, we have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_i(z) &= \frac{P_i(z) - (P_0(z) + \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \tilde{\phi}_0(z))}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z) + \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \tilde{\phi}_0(z)}} \\ &= \frac{(P_i(z) - P_0(z)) - \epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \tilde{\phi}_0(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_0(z)} \sqrt{1 + \epsilon \frac{\tilde{\phi}_0(z)}{\sqrt{P_0(z)}}}} \\ &= (\phi_i(z) - \tilde{\phi}_0(z)) (1 + o(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the last equality we have used that $(1 + \omega)^{-1/2} = 1 + o(1)$ as $\omega \rightarrow 0$. ■

F. Proof of Lemma 13

It suffices to note that since

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z,W} \| P_Z P_W) &= \mathbb{E}_{P_Z} \left[D_{\chi^2}(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|Z) \| P_W) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_W} \left[D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \| P_Z) \right], \end{aligned}$$

we have for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\chi^2}(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z) \| P_W) &\min_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z') \\ &\leq D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z,W} \| P_Z P_W) \\ &\leq \max_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} D_{\chi^2}(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z') \| P_W), \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly, for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \| P_Z) &\min_{w' \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w') \\ &\leq D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z,W} \| P_Z P_W) \\ &\leq \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}} D_{\chi^2}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w') \| P_Z), \end{aligned}$$

where both the constituent minima are finite and nonzero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to (67). ■

G. Proof of Lemma 14

The ‘‘if’’ part of the lemma follows from using $O(\epsilon)$ -dependence between Z and W in the form (68c) with Lemma 10 to obtain

$$D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \| P_Z) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\phi_w^{Z|W}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (383)$$

where for each $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\phi_w^{Z|W}(z) \triangleq \frac{P_{Z|W}(z|w) - P_Z(z)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Z(z)}}, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}$$

is the information vector associated with $P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w)$, and for which $\|\phi_w^{Z|W}\| \leq 1$. Alternatively, the inequality

$$D(p \| q) \leq \ln(1 + D_{\chi^2}(p \| q)) \leq D_{\chi^2}(p \| q),$$

■

valid for all finite \mathcal{Z} and $p, q \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, which is derived in, e.g., [144, Theorem 5], is sufficient to obtain this part of the lemma, using $p = P_{Z,W}$ and $q = P_Z P_W$.

To obtain the ‘‘only if’’ part of the lemma, note that for any finite \mathcal{Z} and $p, q \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, we have, using Pinsker’s inequality [145],

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\chi^2}(p||q) &\leq \frac{1}{\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z)} \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (p(z) - q(z))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z)} \left(\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |p(z) - q(z)| \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2D(p||q)}{\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (384)$$

The result then follows setting, again, $p = P_{Z,W}$ and $q = P_Z P_W$, since the minimum in (384) is finite and nonzero due to (67). ■

H. Proof of Lemma 15

It suffices to note that since

$$\begin{aligned} I(Z; W) &\triangleq D(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_Z} [D(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|Z) \parallel P_W)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_W} [D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)], \end{aligned}$$

we have for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z) \parallel P_W) &\min_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z') \\ &\leq I(Z; W) \leq \max_{z' \in \mathcal{Z}} D(P_{W|Z}(\cdot|z') \parallel P_W), \end{aligned}$$

and, similarly, for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) &\min_{w' \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w') \\ &\leq I(Z; W) \leq \max_{w' \in \mathcal{W}} D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w') \parallel P_Z), \end{aligned}$$

where both the constituent minima are finite and nonzero as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ due to (67). ■

I. Proof of Lemma 17

Since the rule is to decide based on comparing the projection

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \ell_i \left(\mathbb{E}_{P_1} [h_i(Z)] - \mathbb{E}_{P_2} [h_i(Z)] \right)$$

to a threshold, via Cramér’s Theorem [146] the error exponent under P_i is

$$E_i(\lambda) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{S}(\lambda)} D(P||P_i), \quad (385)$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}(\lambda) \triangleq \{P \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}:$$

$$\mathbb{E}_P [h^k(Z)] = \lambda \mathbb{E}_{P_1} [h^k(Z)] + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{P_2} [h^k(Z)]\}. \quad (386)$$

Now since (75a) holds, from Lemma 9 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_i} [h_l(Z)] = \epsilon \langle \phi_i, \xi_l \rangle, \quad i = 1, 2 \text{ and } l = 1, \dots, k,$$

which we express compactly as

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_i} [h^k(Z)] = \epsilon \langle \phi_i, \xi^k \rangle, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Hence, the constraint (386) is expressed in information space as

$$\langle \phi, \xi_l \rangle = \langle \lambda \phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \phi_2, \xi_l \rangle, \quad l = 1, \dots, k,$$

i.e.,

$$\langle \phi, \xi^k \rangle = \langle \lambda \phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \phi_2, \xi^k \rangle. \quad (387)$$

In turn, the optimizing P in (385), which we denote by P^* , lies in the exponential family through P_i with natural statistic $h^k(z)$, i.e., the k -dimensional family whose members are of the form

$$\log \tilde{P}_{\theta^k}(z) = \sum_{l=1}^k \theta_l h_l(z) + \log P_i(z) - \alpha(\theta^k),$$

for which the associated information vector is

$$\epsilon \tilde{\phi}_{\theta^k}(z) = \sum_{l=1}^k \theta_l \xi_l(z) + \epsilon \phi_i(z) - \alpha(\theta^k) \sqrt{P_0(z)} + o(\epsilon),$$

so

$$\epsilon \langle \tilde{\phi}_{\theta^k}, \xi_l \rangle = \theta_l + \epsilon \langle \phi_i, \xi_l \rangle + o(\epsilon),$$

where we have used (75b). Hence, via (387) we obtain that the intersection with the linear family (386) is at $P^* = P_{\theta^{k*}}$ with

$$\theta_l^* = \epsilon \langle \lambda \phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \phi_2 - \phi_i, \xi_l \rangle + o(\epsilon),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} E_i(\lambda) &= D(P^*||P_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^k \theta_l^* \xi_l \right\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha(\theta^{k*})^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^k (\theta_l^*)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha(\theta^{k*})^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{l=1}^k \langle \lambda \phi_1 + (1 - \lambda) \phi_2 - \phi_i, \xi_l \rangle^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (388)$$

where to obtain the second equality we have again exploited (75b), and where to obtain the last equality we have used that

$$\alpha(\theta^{k*}) = o(\epsilon^2)$$

since $\theta^{k*} = O(\epsilon)$ and

$$\alpha(0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \alpha(0) = \mathbb{E}_{P_i} [h^k(Z)] = \epsilon \langle \phi_i, \xi^k \rangle = O(\epsilon).$$

Finally, $E_1(\lambda) = E_2(\lambda)$ when $\lambda = 1/2$, so the overall error probability has exponent (77). ■

APPENDIX V
APPENDICES FOR SECTION V

A. Proof of Lemma 21

Via (92), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i}(z) \phi_{w_j}^{Z|W_j}(z) \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left[\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i) P_{Z|W_j}(z|w_j)}{P_Z(z)} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i) + P_{Z|W_j}(z|w_j)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} P_Z(z) \right] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first sum within the brackets is 1 since, using the pairwise marginal and conditional independencies,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i) P_{Z|W_j}(z|w_j)}{P_Z(z)} \\ &= \frac{P_{W_i|Z}(w_i|z) P_{W_j|Z}(w_j|z) P_Z(z)}{P_{W_i}(w_i) P_{W_j}(w_j)} \\ &= \frac{P_{W_i, W_j|Z}(w_i, w_j|z) P_Z(z)}{P_{W_i, W_j}(w_i, w_j)} \\ &= P_{Z|W_i, W_j}(z|w_i, w_j). \end{aligned}$$

B. Proof of Lemma 22

Due to the conditional independence among the W^k ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z|W^k}(z|w^k) &= \frac{P_Z(z)}{P_{W^k}(w^k)} \prod_{i=1}^k P_{W_i|Z}(w_i|z) \\ &= \frac{P_Z(z)}{\pi(w^k)} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i)}{P_Z(z)}, \end{aligned} \quad (389)$$

with

$$\pi(w^k) = \frac{P_{W^k}(w^k)}{\prod_{i=1}^k P_{W_i}(w_i)} = \sum_{z'} P_Z(z') \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z'|w_i)}{P_Z(z')}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_Z(z) \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{P_{Z|W_i}(z|w_i)}{P_Z(z)} \\ &= P_Z(z) \prod_{i=1}^k \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{P_Z(z)}} \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i} \right) \\ &= P_Z(z) + \epsilon \sqrt{P_Z(z)} \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i} + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (390)$$

where to obtain (390) we have used Fact 23. In turn, summing (390) over z we obtain

$$\pi(w^k) = 1 + o(\epsilon), \quad (391)$$

where we have used that since $\phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i} \in \mathcal{J}^{\mathcal{Z}}$,

$$\sum_z \sqrt{P_Z(z)} \phi_{w_i}^{Z|W_i}(z) = 0.$$

Hence, using (390) and (391) with (93) in (389), we obtain (94). ■

C. Proof of Lemma 25

First, note that the (i, j) th entry of $\mathbf{A}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}_2$ is $\mathbf{a}_{1,i}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{a}_{2,j}$, where $\mathbf{a}_{1,i}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{2,j}$ denote the i th and j th columns of \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 , respectively. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{A}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}_2\|_F^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i,j} (\mathbf{a}_{1,i}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{a}_{2,j})^2 \right] \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{a}_{1,i}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{a}_{2,j})^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (392)$$

Next, with Z_{ij} denoting the (i, j) th element of \mathbf{Z} , note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{a}_{1,i}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{a}_{2,j})^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{(\mathbf{a}_{1,i}^T \mathbf{Q}_{1,i}^T)}_{\triangleq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{1,i}^T} \mathbf{Z} \underbrace{\mathbf{Q}_{2,j} \mathbf{a}_{2,j}}_{\triangleq \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{2,j}} \right] \\ &= \|\mathbf{a}_{1,i}\|^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{2,j}\|^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{(\mathbf{e}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{e}_1)}_{=Z_{11}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (394)$$

where to obtain (393) we have used Definition 24 with orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{Q}_{1,i}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{2,j}$, and to obtain (394) we have chosen $\mathbf{Q}_{1,i}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_{2,j}$ so that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{1,i} = \|\mathbf{a}_{1,i}\| \mathbf{e}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{2,j} = \|\mathbf{a}_{2,j}\| \mathbf{e}_1.$$

In turn, substituting (394) into (392) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{A}_1^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{A}_2\|_F^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{11}^2 \sum_{i,j} \|\mathbf{a}_{1,i}\|^2 \|\mathbf{a}_{2,j}\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{11}^2 \sum_i \|\mathbf{a}_{1,i}\|^2 \sum_j \|\mathbf{a}_{2,j}\|^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{11}^2 \right] \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{A}_2\|_F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (395)$$

Finally, with $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ denoting the permutation matrix that interchanges the first and l th columns of the identity matrix, it follows from Definition 24 with $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_i$ and $\mathbf{Q}_2 = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}_j$ that $Z_{ij} \stackrel{d}{=} Z_{11}$, and thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{Z}\|_F^2 \right] = k_1 k_2 \mathbb{E} \left[Z_{11}^2 \right],$$

which when used in conjunction with (395) yields (107). ■

D. Proof of Proposition 27

Without loss of generality, as discussed in Section IV-D we assume that f^k and g^k are normalized according to (35c) and (35d), so the associated feature vectors Ξ^X and Ξ^Y , respectively, satisfy (42).

We first analyze the error probability in decisions about the value of V based on S^k . To begin, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{E}^{V|S}(f^k) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\log p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k) \right]}{m} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v_*, v'_*)}{m} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (396)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} [E^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v_*, v'_*)], \quad (397)$$

where to obtain the (396) we have used standard pairwise exponent analysis. Specifically, (with slight abuse of notation) $p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v')$ denotes the pairwise error probability distinguishing distinct v and v' in \mathcal{V} based on S^k , and

$$(v_*, v'_*) = \arg \min_{\{v, v' \in \mathcal{V}: v \neq v'\}} p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v'), \quad (398)$$

whose dependence on f^k and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^X(P_X)$ we leave implicit in our notation. Finally, in (397) we have used the notation

$$\begin{aligned} E^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v') \\ \triangleq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log p_e^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v')}{m} \end{aligned}$$

for any distinct v and v' .

Now

$$\begin{aligned} E^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v') \\ = \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \sum_{i=1}^k \left((\phi_v^{X|V} - \phi_{v'}^{X|V})^T \xi_i^X \right)^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (399)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|(\Xi^X)^T \mathbf{B}^T (\phi_v^{Y|V} - \phi_{v'}^{Y|V})\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (400)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|(\Xi^X)^T \mathbf{B}^T \Phi^{Y|V} (\mathbf{e}_v - \mathbf{e}_{v'})\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (401)$$

where to obtain (399) we have used Lemma 17 with $\phi_v^{Y|V}$ and $\phi_{v'}^{Y|V}$ as defined in (102a), to obtain (400) we have used (103), and in (401) we have exploited elementary vector notation (with an abuse of notation as discussed in footnote 25). Moreover, for fixed v and v' ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} [E^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v, v')] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \|(\Xi^X)^T \mathbf{B}^T \Phi^{Y|V} (\mathbf{e}_v - \mathbf{e}_{v'})\|^2 \right] + o(\epsilon^2) \\ = \frac{\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right]}{4|\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{V}|} \|\mathbf{B} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (402)$$

where to obtain (402) we have used Lemma 25.

Then since (402) does not depend on v or v' , it follows from the law of total expectation that (397) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} [E^{V|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), f^k, v_*, v'_*)] \\ = \epsilon^2 \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right]}{4|\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{V}|} \|\mathbf{B} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (403)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \leq \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (404)$$

where to obtain (404) we have used Lemma 3 with the relevant constraint in (42) induced by our choice of normalization (35c). Moreover, the inequality in (404) holds with equality when we choose Ξ^X according to (43a), i.e., the optimal features are $f^k = f_*^k$.

We analyze the error probability in decisions about V based on T^k similarly. In particular, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{E}^{V|T}(g^k) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\log p_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y), g^k) \right]}{m} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right]}{4|\mathcal{Y}||\mathcal{V}|} \|\Xi^Y\|_{\text{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (405)$$

$$= \bar{E}_0^{Y|V} \epsilon^2 k + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (406)$$

for any Ξ^Y satisfying (42), i.e., any choice of (normalized) g^k .

We obtain the error probability in decisions about the value of U from symmetry considerations. In particular, it suffices to interchange the roles of U and V , and X and Y —so B is replaced with its adjoint—in the preceding analysis, which yields that

$$\bar{E}^{U|T}(g^k) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}} \left[\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right]}{4|\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{U}|} \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2),$$

$\triangleq \bar{E}_0^{X|U}$

with equality when $g^k = g_*^k$, and

$$\bar{E}^{U|S}(f^k) = \bar{E}_0^{X|U} \epsilon^2 k + o(\epsilon^2),$$

for any choice of (normalized) f^k .

It follows that the inequalities in (111) simultaneously all hold with equality for the choices $f^k = f_*^k$ and $g^k = g_*^k$. ■

E. Proof of Proposition 30

Without loss of generality, as discussed in Section IV-D we assume that f^k and g^k are normalized according to (35c) and (35d), so the associated feature vectors Ξ^X and Ξ^Y , respectively, satisfy (42).

We first analyze the error probability in decisions about the value of V^k based on S^k . To begin, the error exponent in decisions about V_i satisfies

$$E^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k) \leq E^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k, v_i, v'_i) \quad (407)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} \left\| (\Xi^X)^T \mathbf{B}^T (\phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} - \phi_{v'_i}^{Y|V_i}) \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (408)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i} \left\| (\Xi^X)^T \mathbf{B}^T \phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (409)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \Xi^X \right\|_s^2 \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (410)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (411)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 (\delta_{v_i}^{Y|V_i})^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (412)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \max_{v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (413)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_*^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (414)$$

where (407) follows from standard pairwise error analysis with $E^{V_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k, v_i, v'_i)$ denoting the pairwise error exponent in distinguishing distinct v_i and v'_i in \mathcal{V}_i , to obtain (408) we have adapted (400) in the proof of Proposition 27, to obtain (409) we have used the triangle inequality, to obtain (410) we have used Fact 29, to obtain (411) we have used that $\left\| \Xi^X \right\|_s = \left\| \Xi^Y \right\|_s = 1$, and to obtain (412) and (413) we have used the decomposition

$$\phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} = \tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \delta_{v_i}^{Y|V_i}$$

where $\left\| \tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\| = 1$ and $|\delta_{v_i}^{Y|V_i}| \leq 1$. In (414), we have introduced the notation

$$\tilde{\phi}_*^{Y|V_i} \triangleq \arg \max_{\{\tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} : v_i \in \mathcal{V}_i\}} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right\|^2,$$

and note that since V^k is a multi-attribute, by Lemma 21 the matrix

$$\tilde{\Phi}_*^{Y|V^k} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_*^{Y|V_1} & \dots & \tilde{\phi}_*^{Y|V_k} \end{bmatrix} \quad (415a)$$

has orthogonal columns, so

$$(\tilde{\Phi}_*^{Y|V^k})^T \tilde{\Phi}_*^{Y|V^k} = \mathbf{I}. \quad (415b)$$

Hence, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k} \min_{j \leq i} E^{V_j|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k) \\ \leq \max_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), f^k} \min_{j \leq i} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Y|V_j} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (416)$$

$$= \max_{\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Y|V^i} : (\tilde{\Phi}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Y|V^i})^T \tilde{\Phi}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Y|V^i} = \mathbf{I}} \min_{j \leq i} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Y|V_j} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (417)$$

$$= \max_{\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K_Y} : \dim(\mathcal{S})=i} \min_{\tilde{\phi} \in \mathcal{S} : \|\tilde{\phi}\|=1} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \mathbf{B}^T \tilde{\phi} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (418)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (419)$$

where to obtain (416) we have used (414), to obtain (417) we have used (415), to obtain (418) we have used the definition of a subspace, and to obtain (419) we have used Lemma 28.

We further note that the inequalities leading to the right-hand side of (419) hold with equality for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ when we choose

$$\mathcal{V}_i = \{+1, -1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{+1}^{Y|V_i} = -\phi_{-1}^{Y|V_i} = \psi_i^Y,$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$ (so $p_{V_i}(+1) = p_{V_i}(-1) = 1/2$), and

$$\Xi^X = \Psi_{(k)}^X,$$

with $\Psi_{(k)}^X$ as defined in (44). In particular, the equalities leading to (414) all hold with equality with these choices so (416) holds with equality, and, via Lemma 28, (419) holds when \mathcal{S} is the space spanned by the columns of $\Psi_{(i)}^Y$ and $\tilde{\phi} = \psi_i^Y$.

We similarly analyze the error probability in decisions about U^k based on S^k . In particular, the error exponent in decisions about U_i satisfies

$$E^{U_i|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{x,k}(P_X), f^k) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \left\| \tilde{\phi}_*^{X|U_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (420)$$

where we have used the decomposition

$$\phi_{u_i}^{X|U_i} = \tilde{\phi}_{u_i}^{X|U_i} \delta_{u_i}^{X|U_i}$$

with $\left\| \tilde{\phi}_{u_i}^{X|U_i} \right\| = 1$ and $|\delta_{u_i}^{X|U_i}| \leq 1$, and where

$$\tilde{\phi}_*^{X|U_i} \triangleq \arg \max_{\{\tilde{\phi}_{u_i}^{X|U_i} : u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i\}} \left\| \tilde{\phi}_{u_i}^{X|U_i} \right\|^2.$$

Analogously, we note that since U^k is a multi-attribute, by Lemma 21 the matrix

$$\tilde{\Phi}_*^{X|U^k} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_*^{X|U_1} & \dots & \tilde{\phi}_*^{X|U_k} \end{bmatrix} \quad (421a)$$

has orthogonal columns, so

$$(\tilde{\Phi}_*^{X|U^k})^T \tilde{\Phi}_*^{X|U^k} = \mathbf{I}. \quad (421b)$$

Hence, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{x,k}(P_X), f^k} \min_{j \leq i} E^{U_j|S}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{x,k}(P_X), f^k) \\ & \leq \max_{S \subset \mathbb{R}^{kY} : \dim(S)=i} \min_{\tilde{\phi} \in S : \|\tilde{\phi}\|=1} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\tilde{\phi}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (422)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + o(\epsilon^2). \quad (423)$$

In this case, it is straightforward to verify that the corresponding inequalities leading to (423)—and so to (420) as well—all hold with equality when

$$\mathcal{U}_i = \{+1, -1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{+1}^{X|U_i} = -\phi_{-1}^{X|U_i} = \tilde{\phi}_*^{X|U_i},$$

for any $\tilde{\Phi}_*^{X|U^k}$ satisfying (421b), and when $\Xi^X = \tilde{\Phi}_*^{X|U^k}$.

The associated error probabilities for decisions about U^k and V^k based on T^k follow from symmetry considerations. In particular, it suffices to interchange the roles of U and V , and X and Y —so B is replaced with its adjoint—in the preceding analysis. This immediately yields that for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\max_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{x,k}(P_X), g^k} \min_{j \leq i} E^{U_j|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{x,k}(P_X), g^k) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (424)$$

which is achieved by the choices

$$\mathcal{U}_i = \{+1, -1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{+1}^{X|U_i} = -\phi_{-1}^{X|U_i} = \psi_i^X,$$

for $i = 1, \dots, k$ (so $p_{U_i}(+1) = p_{U_i}(-1) = 1/2$), and

$$\Xi^Y = \Psi_{(k)}^Y,$$

with $\Psi_{(k)}^Y$ as defined in (44).

And it likewise yields, also for $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, that

$$\max_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), g^k} \min_{j \leq i} E^{V_j|T}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^{y,k}(P_Y), g^k) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (425)$$

which is achieved by the choices

$$\mathcal{V}_i = \{+1, -1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{+1}^{Y|V_i} = -\phi_{-1}^{Y|V_i} = \tilde{\phi}_*^{Y|V_i},$$

for any $\tilde{\Phi}_*^{Y|V^k}$ satisfying (415b), and when $\Xi^Y = \tilde{\Phi}_*^{Y|V^k}$.

It follows that the inequalities in (115) simultaneously all hold with equality for the choices $f^k = f_*^k$ and $g^k = g_*^k$, and (116). ■

F. Proof of Corollary 32

First, note that

$$P_{U^k|X^m, Y^m}(u^k|x^m, y^m) = P_{U^k|X^m}(u^k|x^m) \quad (426)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i|X^m}(u_i|x^m) \quad (427)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i}(u_i) \frac{P_{X^m|U_i}(x^m|u_i)}{P_{X^m}(x^m)} = \prod_{i=1}^k P_{U_i}(u_i) \prod_{j=1}^m \frac{P_{X|U_i}(x_j|u_i)}{P_X(x_j)} \quad (428)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m (1 + \epsilon u_i f_i^*(x_j)) \quad (429)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \left(1 + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \sum_{j=1}^m f_i^*(x_j)\right) + o(\epsilon) \quad (430)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k u_i s_i^*\right) + o(\epsilon), \quad (431)$$

where to obtain (426) we have used the Markov structure (87a), to obtain (427) we have used that U^k is a multi-attribute of X^m , to obtain (428) we have used (87b) and (87d) with (97b), to obtain (429) we have used (116a), and to obtain (430) we have used Fact 23.

Next, from symmetry considerations, we obtain the analogous result

$$P_{V^k|X^m, Y^m}(v^k|x^m, y^m) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \left(1 + \epsilon m \sum_{i=1}^k v_i t_i^*\right) + o(\epsilon), \quad (432)$$

We then obtain (120) by substituting (431) and (432) into

$$P_{U^k, V^k|X^m, Y^m}(u^k, v^k|x^m, y^m) = P_{U^k|X^m, Y^m}(u^k|x^m, y^m) P_{V^k|X^m, Y^m}(v^k|x^m, y^m),$$

which is a consequence of the Markov structure (87a).

Finally, using the preceding results we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{U^k|S_*^k, T_*^k, V^k}(u^k|s_*^k, t_*^k, v^k) \\ & = \frac{P_{U^k, V^k|S_*^k, T_*^k}(u^k, v^k|s_*^k, t_*^k)}{P_{V^k|S_*^k, T_*^k}(v^k|s_*^k, t_*^k)} \\ & = \frac{P_{U^k, V^k|X^m, Y^m}(u^k, v^k|x^m, y^m) + o(\epsilon)}{P_{V^k|Y^m}(v^k|y^m) + o(\epsilon)} \\ & = \frac{P_{U^k|X^m}(u^k|x^m) P_{V^k|Y^m}(v^k|y^m) + o(\epsilon)}{P_{V^k|Y^m}(v^k|y^m) + o(\epsilon)} \\ & = P_{U^k|X^m}(u^k|x^m) + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (431) verifies (122a), and (122b) follows from symmetry considerations. ■

G. Proof of Proposition 33

The following lemma is useful in our proof.

Lemma 102: Given $\epsilon > 0$ and configurations $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^X(P_X)$ and $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon^Y(P_Y)$ for ϵ -attributes U and V , respectively, we have

$$\frac{P_{U,V}(u,v)}{P_U(u)P_V(v)} = 1 + \epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u,v), \quad (433)$$

and

$$I(U;V) = \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_U(u) P_V(v) \tilde{\sigma}(u,v)^2 + o(\epsilon^4), \quad (434)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}(u,v) \triangleq (\phi_v^{Y|V})^T \mathbf{B} \phi_u^{X|U}. \quad (435)$$

Proof of Lemma 102: First, we obtain (433) via

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{P_{U,V}(u,v)}{P_U(u)P_V(v)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{P_{Y|V}(y|v) P_{Y|X}(y|x) P_{X|U}(x|u)}{P_Y(y)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{Y,X|U}(y,x|u) + P_{X,Y|V}(x,y|v) - P_{X,Y}(x,y) \\ & \quad + \frac{P_{Y|V}(y|v) - P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{P_{X,Y}(x,y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_Y(y)}} \\ & \quad \cdot \frac{P_{X|U}(x|u) - P_X(x)}{\sqrt{P_X(x)}} \\ &= 1 + \epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u,v), \end{aligned} \quad (436)$$

with $\tilde{\sigma}(u,v)$ as defined in (435). In turn, we obtain (434) via

$$\begin{aligned} & I(U;V) \\ &= D(P_{U,V} \| P_U P_V) \\ &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_{U,V}(u,v) \log \frac{P_{U,V}(u,v)}{P_U(u)P_V(v)} \\ &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_{U,V}(u,v) \left[\epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u,v) - \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \tilde{\sigma}(u,v)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \right] \\ &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_U(u) P_V(v) [1 + \epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u,v)] \\ & \quad \cdot \left[\epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u,v) - \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \tilde{\sigma}(u,v)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \right] \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_U(u) P_V(v) \tilde{\sigma}(u,v)^2 + o(\epsilon^4), \end{aligned} \quad (437)$$

where to obtain (437) we have used (433) and the Taylor series expansion $\log(1 + \omega) = \omega - \omega^2/2 + o(\omega^2)$, where to obtain (438) we have again used (433), and where to obtain (439) we have used that

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}} P_U(u) P_V(v) \tilde{\sigma}(u,v) = 0$$

as a consequence of (104), since $\tilde{\sigma}(u,v)$ takes the form (435). \blacksquare

Proceeding to the proof of Proposition 33, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(U^k; V^k) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{u^k, v^k} P_{U^k}(u^k) P_{V^k}(v^k) \tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned} \quad (440)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \max_{u^k, v^k} \tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \left((\phi^{Y|V^k})^T \mathbf{B} \phi^{X|U^k} \right)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned} \quad (441)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k (\phi^{Y|V_i})^T \mathbf{B} \phi^{X|U_j} \right)^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \quad (442)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \left\| (\Phi^{Y|V^k})^T \mathbf{B} \Phi^{X|U^k} \right\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \quad (443)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \left\| (\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V^k} \Delta^{Y|V^k})^T \mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} \Delta^{X|U^k} \right\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \quad (444)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \left(\max_i \|\phi^{Y|V_i}\|^2 \right) \left(\max_i \|\phi^{X|U_i}\|^2 \right) \\ & \quad \cdot \|\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V^k}\|_s^2 \|\mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned} \quad (445)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \|\mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^4) \quad (446)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^4), \quad (447)$$

where to obtain (440) we have used (434) of Lemma 102 with $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ so

$$\tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k) \triangleq (\phi_v^{Y|V^k})^T \mathbf{B} \phi_u^{X|U^k}, \quad (448)$$

in (441) we have introduced the notation

$$\phi^{X|U^k} \triangleq \phi_{u_{\max}^k}^{X|U^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^{Y|V^k} \triangleq \phi_{v_{\max}^k}^{Y|V^k}$$

where

$$(u_{\max}^k, v_{\max}^k) \triangleq \arg \max_{u^k, v^k} \tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k)^2.$$

To obtain (442) we have used Lemma 22 together with the notation

$$\phi^{X|U_i} \triangleq \phi_{u_i^{\max}}^{X|U_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi^{Y|V_i} \triangleq \phi_{v_i^{\max}}^{Y|V_i}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\max}^k &= (u_1^{\max}, \dots, u_k^{\max}) \\ v_{\max}^k &= (v_1^{\max}, \dots, v_k^{\max}), \end{aligned}$$

and in (443) we have introduced the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{X|U^k} &\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \phi^{X|U_1} & \dots & \phi^{X|U_k} \end{bmatrix} \\ \Phi^{Y|V^k} &\triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \phi^{Y|V_1} & \dots & \phi^{Y|V_k} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain (444) we have used the factorizations

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{X|U^k} &= \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} \Delta^{X|U^k} \\ \Phi^{Y|V^k} &= \tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V^k} \Delta^{Y|V^k} \end{aligned}$$

where, due to Lemma 21,

$$(\tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k})^T \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} = (\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V^k})^T \tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V^k} = \mathbf{I}$$

and where $\Delta^{X|U^k}$ and $\Delta^{Y|V^k}$ are diagonal matrices, to obtain (445) we have repeatedly used Fact 29, to obtain (446) we have used the properties of the factorization, and to obtain (447) we have used Lemma 3. Finally, it is straightforward to verify that the inequalities leading to (447) all hold with equality when we choose the particular configurations (116), i.e., when

$$\phi_{u_i}^{X|U_i} = u_i \psi_i^X, \quad u_i \in \{+1, -1\} \quad (449a)$$

$$\phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} = v_i \psi_i^Y, \quad v_i \in \{+1, -1\}. \quad (449b)$$

To obtain (125), first note that, starting from (448),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k) &= (\phi_{v^k}^{Y|V^k})^T \mathbf{B} \phi_{u^k}^{X|U^k} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{v_i}^{Y|V_i} \right)^T \mathbf{B} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{u_j}^{X|U_j} \right) + o(1) \quad (450) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=1}^k v_i \psi_i^Y \right)^T \mathbf{B} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k u_j \psi_j^X \right) + o(1) \quad (451)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k u_j v_i (\psi_i^Y)^T \mathbf{B} \psi_j^X + o(1) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k u_i v_i \sigma_i + o(1), \quad (452) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (450) we have used Lemma 22 to obtain (451) we have used (449), and to obtain (452) we have used (12a).

Hence, using (433) in Lemma 102 with $U = U^k$ and $V = V^k$ and substituting (452), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{U^k, V^k}(u^k, v^k) &= P_{U^k}(u^k) P_{V^k}(v^k) (1 + \epsilon^2 \tilde{\sigma}(u^k, v^k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{4^k} \left(1 + \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k u_i v_i \sigma_i \right) + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

viz., (125).

H. Proof of Proposition 35

First, we note that, in accordance with the discussion of Section IV-B, the conditions of the proposition imply that U^k

has a configuration of the form $\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon(1+o(1))}^X$. Next, we have

$$I(U^k; Y) = \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{u^k} D(P_{Y|U^k}(\cdot|u^k) \| P_Y) \quad (453)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{u^k} \|\phi_{u^k}^{Y|U^k}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (454)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{u^k} \|\mathbf{B} \phi_{u^k}^{X|U^k}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (455)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{u^k} \left\| \mathbf{B} \sum_{i=1}^k \phi_{u_i}^{X|U_i} \right\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (456)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \|\mathbf{B} \phi^{X|U_i}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (457)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\mathbf{B} \Phi^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} \Delta^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (458) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 \|\Delta^{X|U^k}\|_s^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (459)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\mathbf{B} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (460)$$

where to obtain (453) we have used that all configurations u^k are equiprobable due to condition 1, to obtain (454) we have used Lemma 10, to obtain (455) we have used (101) with $U = U^k$, to obtain (456) we have used Lemma 22, and to obtain (457) we have used that constraint 2 implies that

$$\phi_{+1}^{X|U_i} = -\phi_{-1}^{X|U_i} \triangleq \phi^{X|U_i}, \quad (461)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, K-1$, since

$$\sum_x P_{U_i}(u) \phi_u^{X|U_i} = 0.$$

To obtain (458) we have used the notation

$$\Phi^{X|U^k} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \phi^{X|U_1} & \dots & \phi^{X|U_k} \end{bmatrix}$$

with factorization

$$\Phi^{X|U^k} = \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} \Delta^{X|U^k}$$

where, due to Lemma 21,

$$(\tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k})^T \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U^k} = \mathbf{I} \quad (462)$$

and $\Delta^{X|U^k}$ is a diagonal matrix whose i th diagonal entry is $\|\phi^{X|U_i}\| \leq 1 + o(1)$. To obtain (459) we have used Fact 29, and to obtain (460) we have used Lemma 3 with the constraint (462). Furthermore, the inequalities leading to (460) hold with equality when we choose

$$\Phi^{X|U^k} = \Psi_{(k)}^X,$$

with $\Psi_{(k)}^X$ as defined in (44), so the optimum configuration is (116a).

The corresponding result, including (116b), for the maximization of $I(V^k; X)$ subject to $I(V_i; Y) \leq \epsilon^2/2$ and the other corresponding constraints follows immediately from symmetry considerations. ■

I. Proof of Proposition 38

First, without loss of generality let us choose $\delta(\cdot)$ such that

$$\delta(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon, \quad (463)$$

in which case, we have, for all ϵ sufficiently small,

$$P_{X,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y) \quad (464)$$

$$\subset \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y) \quad (465)$$

$$\subset \mathcal{N}_{\delta(\epsilon)}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y) \quad (466)$$

$$\subset \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)}}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y). \quad (467)$$

where (464) is given, where (465) follows from (132), where (466) follows from (463), and where (467) holds when $\epsilon \leq 2$.

Next, from (143) and (142) it follows that for $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\tilde{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) = \check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) + o(1), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}, \quad (468)$$

wherein

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y} \left(\sqrt{P_Y(y)} \phi_w^{X|W}(x) + \sqrt{P_X(x)} \phi_w^{Y|W}(y) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{x,y} P_Y(y) \phi_w^{X|W}(x)^2 + \sum_{x,y} P_X(x) \phi_w^{Y|W}(y)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\phi_w^{X|W}\|^2 + \|\phi_w^{Y|W}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (469)$$

Hence,

$$P_{X,Y|W}(\cdot, \cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)}(1+o(1))}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (471)$$

Furthermore, due to (467) and (471), we may apply Lemma 11 with $P_1 = P_{X,Y|W}(\cdot, \cdot|w)$, $P_2 = P_X$, $P_0 = P_X P_Y$, and $\tilde{P}_0 = P_X$ to

$$\phi_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|w) - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)} \sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}} \quad (472)$$

yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) &= \tilde{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) - \frac{\tilde{B}(y, x)}{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)}} + o(1) \\ &= \check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}(x, y) + o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (473)$$

where to obtain (473) we have used both (468) and that (466) implies $|\tilde{B}(y, x)| \leq \delta(\epsilon)$. Combining (473) with (470), we conclude

$$P_{X,Y|W}(\cdot, \cdot|w) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{2\delta(\epsilon)}(1+o(1))}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y), \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (474)$$

As a result, for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & D(P_{X,Y|W}(\cdot, \cdot|w) \| P_{X,Y}) \\ &= \delta(\epsilon) \|\phi_w^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\delta(\epsilon)) \end{aligned} \quad (475)$$

$$= \delta(\epsilon) \|\check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\delta(\epsilon)), \quad (476)$$

where to obtain (475) we have used the special case of Lemma 10, and to obtain (476) we have used (473). In turn,

$$\begin{aligned} & I(W; X, Y) \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) D(P_{X,Y|W}(\cdot, \cdot|w) \| P_{X,Y}) \\ &= \delta(\epsilon) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \|\check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\delta(\epsilon)) \\ &= \frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{2} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \left(\|\phi_w^{X|W}\|^2 + \|\phi_w^{Y|W}\|^2 \right) + o(\delta(\epsilon)), \end{aligned} \quad (477)$$

where to obtain (477) we have used (476), and where to obtain (478) we have used (469).

Hence, we seek to minimize (478) subject to the constraint (144). To this end, let us define

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{X|W} \triangleq \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \Phi^{X|W} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_W} \quad (479)$$

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|W} \triangleq \sqrt{\delta(\epsilon)} \Phi^{Y|W} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_W}, \quad (480)$$

where, consistent with the notation and terminology in Definition 26, $\Phi^{X|W}$ is a $|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{W}|$ matrix whose w th column is $\phi_w^{X|W}$, where $\Phi^{Y|W}$ is a $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{W}|$ matrix whose w th column is $\phi_w^{Y|W}$, and where \mathbf{P}_W is a $|\mathcal{W}| \times |\mathcal{W}|$ diagonal matrix whose w th diagonal entry is $P_W(w)$. Then we can equivalently express the constraint (144) in the form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \tilde{\Phi}^{Y|W} (\tilde{\Phi}^{X|W})^T, \quad (481)$$

and the objective function (478) as

$$\begin{aligned} I(W; X, Y) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\|\tilde{\Phi}^{X|W}\|_{\text{F}}^2 + \|\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|W}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right) + o(\delta(\epsilon)) \\ &\geq \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* + o(\delta(\epsilon)), \end{aligned} \quad (482)$$

where to obtain the inequality we have used Lemma 37 with (481).

It is straightforward to verify that the inequality in (482) holds with equality subject to the constraints in (141) when we choose the configuration for W according to

$$W = \{\pm 1, \dots, \pm(K-1)\} \quad (483a)$$

$$\phi_i^{X|W} = -\phi_{-i}^{X|W} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i \delta(\epsilon)}} \psi_i^X, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1 \quad (483b)$$

$$\phi_i^{Y|W} = -\phi_{-i}^{Y|W} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i \delta(\epsilon)}} \psi_i^Y, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1 \quad (483c)$$

$$P_W(i) = P_W(-i) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\sigma}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, K-1, \quad (483d)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i \triangleq \frac{\sigma_i}{\sum_{i'=1}^{K-1} \sigma_{i'}}. \quad (483e)$$

Specifically, with the choices (483) we have

$$\|\phi_w^{X|W}\| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi_w^{Y|W}\| \leq 1$$

since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i = \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* \leq \epsilon \leq \delta(\epsilon)$$

from $P_{X,Y} \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_X P_Y)$ as given and the choice (463), so the constraints (142) are satisfied. Moreover, we satisfy constraints (145) by the symmetric construction of our information vector sets. And we satisfy the constraint (144) by construction since

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\epsilon) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) \phi_w^{Y|W} (\phi_w^{X|W})^\top \\ = \delta(\epsilon) \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{\sigma_i}{\delta(\epsilon)} \psi_i^Y (\psi_i^X)^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \end{aligned}$$

where last equality follows from (29). Finally, evaluating the leading term in (478) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{2} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} P_W(w) (\|\phi_w^{X|W}\|^2 + \|\phi_w^{Y|W}\|^2) \\ = \frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{2} \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \frac{\sigma_i}{\delta(\epsilon)} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{K-1} \sigma_i, \end{aligned}$$

so the inequality in (482) is achieved with equality.

It remains only to choose $\delta(\cdot)$ satisfying (463) and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta(\epsilon) = 0$. The leading term in (478) with the configuration (483) does not depend on this choice, so we focus on the $o(\delta(\epsilon))$ term, which is minimized by the choice $\delta(\epsilon) = \epsilon$, yielding (151). In turn, (152) is obtained by rewriting (483) using (140a)–(140b) and (17). ■

J. Proof of Corollary 39

We have, for the extended model (153),

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X^m, Y^m|W}(x^m, y^m|w) \\ = P_{X^m}(x^m) P_{Y^m}(y^m) \\ \cdot \prod_{l=1}^m \left(1 + \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} f_{|w|}^*(x_l) \right) \\ \cdot \left(1 + \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} g_{|w|}^*(y_l) \right) \quad (484) \\ = P_{X^m}(x^m) P_{Y^m}(y^m) \\ \cdot \left(1 + m \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} r_{|w|}^* \right) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}) \quad (485) \\ = P_{X^m, Y^m}(x^m, y^m) \\ \cdot \left(1 + m \text{sgn}(w) \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_*^{1/2} r_{|w|}^* \right) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}), \quad (486) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (484) we have used (152) and (153), to obtain (485) we have used that X, Y are sub- ϵ dependent so (130) holds, together with Fact 23 and (157), and to obtain (486) we have used that since sub- ϵ dependence implies $|\tilde{B}(y, x)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$P_{X,Y}(x, y) = P_X(x) P_Y(y) + O(\epsilon) = P_X(x) P_Y(y) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}),$$

whence

$$P_{X^m, Y^m}(x^m, y^m) = P_{X^m}(x^m) P_{Y^m}(y^m) + o(\sqrt{\epsilon}).$$

Finally, substituting P_W from (152) and using (486) in

$$P_{W|X^m, Y^m}(w|x^m, y^m) = \frac{P_{X^m, Y^m|W}(x^m, y^m|w) P_W(w)}{P_{X^m, Y^m}(x^m, y^m)}$$

yields (156). ■

K. Proof of Corollary 40

For the first part of the corollary, note that (162) and (151) together imply (161). To show (162), we begin by defining

$$\phi_{w_i}^{X,Y|W_i} \triangleq \frac{P_{X,Y|W_i}(x, y|w_i) - P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{\sqrt{2\epsilon} \sqrt{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}}, \quad w_i \in \mathcal{W}_o. \quad (487)$$

Then, since

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X,Y|W_i}(x, y|+1) &= P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|i) \\ P_{X,Y|W_i}(x, y|-1) &= P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|-i). \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\phi_{+1}^{X,Y|W_i} = \phi_i^{X,Y|W} = \check{\phi}_i^{X,Y|W} + o(1) \quad (488a)$$

$$\phi_{-1}^{X,Y|W_i} = \phi_{-i}^{X,Y|W} = \check{\phi}_{-i}^{X,Y|W} + o(1), \quad (488b)$$

where $\phi_w^{X,Y|W}$ and $\check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}$ are as defined in (472) (setting $\delta(\epsilon) = \epsilon$) and (143b), respectively.

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X,Y|W_i}(x, y|0) \\ = \frac{1}{P_{W_i}(0)} \sum_{\{j: j \neq i\}} (1 - P_{W_j}(0)) P_{X,Y|\{W_j \neq 0\}}(x, y) \quad (489) \\ = \frac{1}{(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i)} \sum_{\{j: j \neq i\}} \tilde{\sigma}_j P_{X,Y|\{W_j \neq 0\}}(x, y) \quad (490) \\ = \frac{1}{2(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i)} \sum_{\{j: j \neq i\}} \tilde{\sigma}_j \left(P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|j) \right. \\ \left. + P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|-j) \right), \quad (491) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (489) we have used that the events $\{W_i \neq 0\}$, $i = 1, \dots, K-1$ form a partition of sample space, to obtain (490) we have used (483d), and to obtain (491) we have used that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{X,Y|\{W_j \neq 0\}}(x, y) \\ = \frac{P_{X,Y|W_j}(x, y|+1) P_W(j) + P_{X,Y|W_j}(x, y|-1) P_W(-j)}{P_W(j) + P_W(-j)} \\ = \frac{1}{2} (P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|j) + P_{X,Y|W}(x, y|-j)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_0^{X,Y|W_i} \\ = \frac{1}{2(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i)} \sum_{\{j: j \neq i\}} \tilde{\sigma}_j \left(\phi_j^{X,Y|W} + \phi_{-j}^{X,Y|W} \right) \quad (492) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} = \frac{1}{2(1 - \tilde{\sigma}_i)} \sum_{\{j: j \neq i\}} \tilde{\sigma}_j \left(\check{\phi}_j^{X,Y|W} + \check{\phi}_{-j}^{X,Y|W} \right) + o(1) \quad (493) \end{aligned}$$

$$= o(1), \quad (494)$$

where to obtain (492) we have used (491) with (472) (setting $\delta(\epsilon) = \epsilon$) and (487), to obtain (493) we have used (488), and

to obtain (494) we have used (143b) with (483b)–(483c) to conclude that the term in parentheses is zero, since for $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W} \\ &= \text{sgn}(w) \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{|w|}}{2\tilde{\sigma}_{|w|}\epsilon}} \left(\sqrt{P_Y(y)} \psi_{|w|}^Y + \sqrt{P_X(x)} \psi_{|w|}^X \right). \end{aligned} \quad (495)$$

From (488) with (470), and from (494), we conclude

$$P_{X,Y|W_i}(\cdot, \cdot | w_i) \in \mathcal{N}_{\sqrt{2\epsilon(1+o(1))}}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_{X,Y}), \quad w_i \in \mathcal{W}_o,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} & D(P_{X,Y|W_i}(\cdot, \cdot | j) \| P_{X,Y}) \\ &= \epsilon \|\check{\phi}_j^{X,Y|W_i}\|^2 + o(\epsilon) \\ &= \begin{cases} \epsilon \|\check{\phi}_i^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\epsilon) & j = +1 \\ \epsilon \|\check{\phi}_{-i}^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\epsilon) & j = -1 \\ o(\epsilon) & j = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (496)$$

where to obtain the first equality we have used the special case of Lemma 10, and to obtain the second equality we have used (488) and (494). In turn, we obtain (162) via

$$\begin{aligned} I(W_i; X, Y) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{W}_o} P_{W_i}(j) D(P_{X,Y|W_i}(\cdot, \cdot | j) \| P_{X,Y}) \\ &= 2\epsilon P_W(i) \|\check{\phi}_i^{X,Y|W}\|^2 + o(\epsilon) \\ &= \sigma_i + o(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (497) \quad (498)$$

where to obtain the (497) we have used the first equality in (483d), and to obtain (498) we have used the second equality in (483d) and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\check{\phi}_w^{X,Y|W}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma_{|w|}}{2\tilde{\sigma}_{|w|}\epsilon} \sum_{x,y} \left(\sqrt{P_Y(y)} \psi_{|w|}^X(x) + \sqrt{P_X(x)} \psi_{|w|}^Y(y) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\sigma_{|w|}}{\tilde{\sigma}_{|w|}\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (499) \quad (500)$$

To obtain (499) we have used (495), and to obtain (500) we have used (142).

Turning now to the second part of the corollary, consistent with Definition 36,

$$C_\epsilon(U_i, V_i) = \min_{P_{\tilde{W}_i|U_i, V_i}: U_i \leftrightarrow \tilde{W}_i \leftrightarrow V_i} I(\tilde{W}_i; U_i, V_i). \quad (501)$$

by adapting the analysis of Proposition 38 we used to obtain $C_\epsilon(X, Y)$. In particular, from (126) we have that the counterpart to (3) is

$$B_i(u_i, v_i) \triangleq \frac{P_{U_i, V_i}(u_i, v_i)}{\sqrt{P_{U_i}(u_i)} \sqrt{P_{V_i}(v_i)}} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \sigma_i u_i v_i) + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2)$$

for $u_i, v_i \in \{-1, +1\}$, and that to (8) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_i &\triangleq \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_{V_i}} \right]^{-1} \mathbf{P}_{V_i, U_i} \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_{U_i}} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}}_{\triangleq \Psi^{V_i}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \sigma_i \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}}_{\triangleq (\Psi^{U_i})^T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note too that the counterpart to (28), i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_i \triangleq \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_{V_i}} \right]^{-1} [\mathbf{P}_{V_i, U_i} - \mathbf{P}_{V_i} \mathbf{P}_{U_i}] \left[\sqrt{\mathbf{P}_{U_i}} \right]^{-1}$$

satisfies

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_i\|_* = \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \sigma_i + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_* + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2) \leq \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \epsilon + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2),$$

so

$$P_{U_i, V_i} \in \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{\tilde{\epsilon}^2 \epsilon + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2)}^{U_i \times V_i}(P_{U_i} P_{V_i}).$$

Hence, the counterpart of (151) in Proposition 38 for the new variables (U_i, V_i) is

$$C_\epsilon(U_i, V_i) = \tilde{\epsilon}^2 \sigma_i + o(\tilde{\epsilon}^2 \epsilon).$$

as $\epsilon, \tilde{\epsilon} \rightarrow 0$, and thus (163) follows. \blacksquare

L. Proof of Corollary 41

Since the event $W_i = j$ is the event $W = ji$ for $j \in \{-1, +1\}$, the cases $w_i = \pm 1$ in (165) follow immediately from Corollary 39. The case $w_i = 0$ in (165) is then determined by the constraint that the result is a distribution. \blacksquare

M. Proof of Corollary 42

First note that (167b) is readily obtained from (123b), exploiting that u_i and v_i are uniquely determined in the cases $z_i = \pm 2$. Second, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\tilde{W}_i|Z_i, X^m, Y^m}(\tilde{w}_i | z_i, x^m, y^m) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\{u_i, v_i\}: \\ u_i + v_i = z_i}} P_{\tilde{W}_i|U_i, V_i}(\tilde{w}_i | u_i, v_i) \\ &\quad \cdot P_{U_i, V_i|Z_i, X^m, Y^m}(u_i, v_i | z_i, x^m, y^m), \end{aligned} \quad (502)$$

which is obtained by exploiting (166) and the structure in \tilde{W}_i implicit in (159). To obtain (167a) from (502) we use that

$$P_{\tilde{W}_i|U_i, V_i}(\tilde{w}_i | u_i, v_i) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \text{sgn}(\tilde{w}_i z_i) \sqrt{\sigma_i}) + o(\tilde{\epsilon} \sqrt{\epsilon}),$$

which is obtained by adapting Corollary 39, and that the second factor in the summation in (502) is unity when $z_i = \pm 2$ since u_i and v_i are uniquely determined in these cases. \blacksquare

APPENDIX VI

APPENDICES FOR SECTION VI

A. Proof of Proposition 43

Our proof makes use of two lemmas. The first is the following vector generalization of Bernstein's inequality [147, Theorem 2.4].

Lemma 103 (Bernstein Inequality (Vector Version)): For some dimension d , let $\tilde{Z}_1, \dots, \tilde{Z}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be independent zero-mean random vectors such that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\tilde{Z}_i\| \leq c \right\} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, let $\bar{c} \in (0, c^2]$ be a constant such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{Z}_i\|^2 \right] \leq \bar{c}.$$

Then, for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \bar{c}/c$,⁶⁰

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \right\| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\delta^2 n}{8\bar{c}} \right\}.$$

The second lemma is the following.

Lemma 104: Given dimensions k_1 and k_2 and any two matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$, we have, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq \sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_{\text{F}}. \quad (503)$$

Proof of Lemma 104: We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \quad (504)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{k} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2)^2} \quad (505)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{k} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{\min\{k_1, k_2\}} \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2)^2} \\ = \sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_{\text{F}}, \quad (506)$$

where to obtain (504) we use the following standard inequality (see, e.g., [148, Theorem 3.4.5]):

Lemma 105 (Lidskii Inequality): Given dimensions k_1 and k_2 and any matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$, we have, for every $k \in \{1, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$ and $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq \min\{k_1, k_2\}$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |\sigma_{i_j}(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_{i_j}(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_{(k)},$$

where $\sigma_1(\cdot) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_{\min\{k_1, k_2\}}(\cdot)$ denote the ordered singular values of its (matrix) argument.

In turn, to obtain (505) we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and to obtain (506) we use the definition of the Frobenius norm. ■

Our proof of Proposition 43 proceeds as follows. First, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let \mathbf{Z}_i denote a random $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ matrix with (y, x) th element

$$Z_i(x, y) \triangleq \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x, Y_i=y\}} - P_X(x) P_Y(y)}{\sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}}, \quad x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Accordingly, the $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ are i.i.d. and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_i] = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. Now

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \triangleq \mathbf{Z}_i - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_i] = \mathbf{Z}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \quad (507)$$

satisfies

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i\|_{\text{F}}^2 = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{(\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x, Y_i=y\}} - P_{X,Y}(x, y))^2}{P_X(x) P_Y(y)} \\ \leq \frac{1}{p_0} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} (\mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x, Y_i=y\}} - P_{X,Y}(x, y))^2 \quad (508)$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_0} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x, Y_i=y\}} - 2 \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_i=x, Y_i=y\}} P_{X,Y}(x, y) + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X,Y}(x, y)^2 \right] \\ \leq \frac{2}{p_0} \triangleq c^2 \quad (510)$$

where to obtain (508) we have used (183), and where to obtain (510) we have used that in (509) the first term within the brackets is unity, the second is upper bounded by zero, and the third term is upper bounded by unity since

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z)^2 \leq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z) = 1, \quad \text{any (countable) } \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } q \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}. \quad (511)$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_1\|_{\text{F}}^2 \right] \quad (512)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p_0} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \text{var} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1=x, Y_1=y\}} \right] \quad (513)$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_0} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left[P_{X,Y}(x, y) - P_{X,Y}(x, y)^2 \right] \quad (514)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p_0} \triangleq \bar{c}, \quad (515)$$

where to obtain (512) we have used that $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n$ are i.i.d., to obtain (513) we take the expectation of (508), to obtain (514) we have used that

$$\text{var} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1=x, Y_1=y\}} \right] = P_{X,Y}(x, y) - P_{X,Y}(x, y)^2$$

since $\mathbb{1}_{\{X_1=x, Y_1=y\}}$ is a Bernoulli random variable, and to obtain (515) we have used that the second term in (514) is upper bounded by zero.

Finally, for $0 \leq \delta \leq \sqrt{k/2}/p_0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{F}} \geq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{k}} \right\} \quad (516)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \right\|_{\text{F}} \geq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{k}} \right\} \quad (517)$$

$$\leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}, \quad (518)$$

⁶⁰As noted in [147], this bound does not depend on d .

where to obtain (516) we have used Lemma 104, to obtain (517) we have used that

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i, \quad (519)$$

and to obtain (518) we have used Lemma 103 with [cf. (510)] $c = \sqrt{2}/p_0$ and [cf. (515)] $\bar{c} = 1/p_0^2$ (and construed the associated $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i$ as vectors). ■

B. Proof of Corollary 44

First, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i + \sigma_i) \quad (520)$$

$$= \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_{(k)} + \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{(k)} \\ \leq k \left(1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_s\right) \quad (521)$$

$$\leq k \left(1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_F\right), \quad (522)$$

where to obtain (520) we have used the triangle inequality, to obtain (521) we have used that $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{(k)} \leq k\|\mathbf{A}\|_s$ for any matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$, and to obtain (522) we have used the standard inequality

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_s \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F \quad \text{for any matrix } \mathbf{A}. \quad (523)$$

In turn,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_F^2 = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \frac{(\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x,y) - P_X(x)P_Y(y))^2}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)} \\ \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left[\frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x,y)^2}{P_X(x)P_Y(y)} + P_X(x)P_Y(y) \right] \\ \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \left[\frac{\hat{P}_{X,Y}(x,y)^2}{p_0^2} + P_X(x)P_Y(y) \right] \quad (524)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p_0^2} + 1 \quad (525)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{p_0^2}, \quad (526)$$

where to obtain (524) we have used (183), and to obtain (525) we have used (511).

Next, with the event

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\}, \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq \frac{1}{p_0} \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}},$$

we have⁶¹

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{E}_\delta^c \right] \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_\delta^c\} \\ + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{E}_\delta \right] \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_\delta\} \\ \leq \delta^2 + k^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0}\right)^2 \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\}, \quad (527)$$

where to obtain the inequality we have used that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_\delta^c\} \leq 1$, (522) with (526), and (184) in Proposition 43.

To obtain the tightest bound, we optimize (527) over δ , yielding (185). In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \right] \\ \leq \min_{\delta} \left(\delta^2 + k^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0}\right)^2 \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\} \right) \\ = \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \left(1 + \ln \left[k^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0}\right)^2 e^{1/4} \frac{p_0^2 n}{8k} \right] \right) \quad (528)$$

$$\leq \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \left(\frac{3}{4} + \ln(kn) \right) \quad (529)$$

$$= \frac{6k + 8k \ln(kn)}{p_0^2 n}, \quad (530)$$

where to obtain (528) we recognize that the right-hand side of (527) takes the form of (186) with the mappings

$$a = k^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0}\right)^2 e^{1/4}, \quad b = \frac{np_0^2}{8k}, \quad \omega = \delta^2, \quad (531)$$

and apply Lemma 45, and to obtain (529) we have used that $p_0 + \sqrt{2} \leq 2$ since $p_0 \leq 1/2$ as $\min\{|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}|\} \geq 2$, and that $\ln(2) \geq 1/2$.

It remains to determine conditions under which

$$\omega_* \triangleq \delta_*^2 = \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \ln \left[k^2 \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0}\right)^2 e^{1/4} \frac{p_0^2 n}{8k} \right] \quad (532)$$

satisfies the conditions of Proposition 43, viz.,

$$0 \leq \omega_* \leq \frac{k}{2p_0^2}. \quad (533)$$

Proceeding, since from (532) we have

$$\omega_* \leq \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \left(\ln(4kn) + \underbrace{\frac{1}{4} - \ln(8)}_{< 0} \right) < \frac{k}{2p_0^2} \left[\frac{16}{n} \ln(4kn) \right]$$

⁶¹We use $(\cdot)^c$ to denote set complement.

where to obtain the first inequality we have again used that $p_0 + \sqrt{2} \leq 2$. Hence, the second inequality in (533) is satisfied when n is sufficiently large that $n \geq 16 \ln(4kn)$.

Moreover, since from (532) we also have

$$\omega_* = \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \ln \left[k(p_0 + \sqrt{2})^2 e^{1/4} \frac{n}{8} \right] > \frac{8k}{p_0^2 n} \ln \left(\frac{n}{4} \right),$$

where to obtain the inequality we have used that $k \geq 1$, $p_0 > 0$, and $e^{1/4} > 1$. Hence, the first inequality in (533) is satisfied when $n \geq 4$, which we note is satisfied when our condition for satisfying the second inequality in (533) is. Indeed, satisfying $n \geq 16 \ln(4kn)$ even for $k = 1$ requires $n \geq 96$. ■

C. Proof of Corollary 46

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| (\hat{\sigma}_i + \sigma_i) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_1 + \sigma_1) \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 + \hat{\sigma}_1 &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_s + \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_s \\ &\leq 1 + \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_F \end{aligned} \quad (534)$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p_0} \quad (535)$$

$$= \frac{p_0 + \sqrt{2}}{p_0} \leq \frac{2}{p_0}, \quad (536)$$

whence

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right| \leq \frac{1}{p_0} \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i|. \quad (537)$$

To obtain (534) we have used (523) and that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is contractive, and to obtain (535) we have used (526) in the proof of Corollary 44, and to obtain (536) we have used that $p_0 \leq 1/2$ as $\min\{|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}|\} \geq 2$.

Hence, we obtain (192) from (537) via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right| \geq \delta \right\} &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{1}{p_0} \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq p_0 \delta \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^4 \delta^2 n}{8k} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the final inequality we have used (184), which holds for $0 \leq p_0 \delta \leq \sqrt{k/2}/p_0$. Moreover, we obtain (193) from (537) via

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2) \right|^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{p_0^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{6k + 8k \ln(nk)}{p_0^4 n}, \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the final equality we have used (185). ■

D. Proof of Proposition 47

Our proof makes use of two lemmas. The first is the following matrix generalization of Bernstein's inequality [149, Theorem 1.6].

Lemma 106 (Bernstein Inequality (Matrix Version)): For some dimensions d_1 and d_2 , let $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2}$ be independent, zero-mean random matrices such that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i\|_s \leq c \right\} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Moreover, let $\bar{c} \in (0, c^2]$ be a constant such that

$$\max \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i) \right\|_s, \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i^T) \right\|_s \right\} \leq \bar{c},$$

where for an arbitrary random matrix \mathbf{W}

$$\text{cov}(\mathbf{W}) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbf{W} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{W}]) (\mathbf{W} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{W}])^T \right].$$

Then, for all $0 \leq \delta \leq \bar{c}/c$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \right\|_s \geq \delta \right\} \leq (d_1 + d_2) \exp \left\{ -\frac{3\delta^2 n}{8\bar{c}} \right\}.$$

The second of these lemmas is as follows.

Lemma 107: Given $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$, we have

$$0 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_F^2 \leq 4k \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_s \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_s, \quad (538)$$

where $\psi_i^{\mathbf{A}}$ denotes the right singular vector of \mathbf{A} corresponding to $\sigma_i(\mathbf{A})$, and

$$\Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}} \triangleq [\psi_1^{\mathbf{A}} \quad \dots \quad \psi_k^{\mathbf{A}}],$$

which has orthonormal columns.

Proof of Lemma 107: The left-hand inequality follows immediately from Lemma 3. For the right-hand inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|_{\text{F}}^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|^2 \right| \quad (539) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\| - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right| \left(\|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\| + \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2 \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}} \sum_{i=1}^k \left| \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\| - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right| \quad (540)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2 \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\left| \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\| - \|\mathbf{A}_2 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left| \|\mathbf{A}_2 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right| \right) \quad (541) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2 \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(|\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| + \|(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right) \quad (542)$$

$$\leq 2 \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(|\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| + \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_{\text{s}} \right) \quad (543)$$

$$\leq 4k \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}} \|\mathbf{A}_2 - \mathbf{A}_1\|_{\text{s}}, \quad (544)$$

where to obtain (539) we have used the triangle inequality, to obtain (540) we have used Fact 29, to obtain (541) we have again used the triangle inequality, to obtain (542) we have used that $\|\mathbf{A}_1 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_1}\| = \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1)$ and $\|\mathbf{A}_2 \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| = \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)$, and the (reverse) triangle inequality, to obtain (543) we have again used Fact 29, and to obtain (544) we have used the following standard inequality [24, Corollary 7.3.5(a)] [150, Theorem 1]:

Lemma 108 (Weyl Inequality): For every $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$, we have, with $K \triangleq \min\{k_1, k_2\}$,

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq K} |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_{\text{s}}. \quad (545)$$

Our proof of Proposition 47 proceeds as follows. First, with \check{f}_i as defined in (177a) and $\hat{\psi}_i^X$ as defined via (181a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left| \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)]\|^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)]\|^2 \right| \right] \\ &= \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 - \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \quad (546) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 4k \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{s}} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{s}} \quad (547)$$

$$\leq 4k \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{s}}, \quad (548)$$

where to obtain (546) we have used (195), to obtain (547) we have used Lemma 107, and to obtain (548) we have used that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{s}} \leq 1$.

Now let $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_i$ denote an $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|$ matrix with (y, x) th entry

$$\hat{B}_i(x, y) \triangleq \frac{\mathbb{1}_{X_i=x, Y_i=y}}{\sqrt{P_X(x) P_Y(y)}},$$

and let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{B}}_i - \mathbf{B},$$

which we note is consistent with the definition (507) in the proof of Proposition 43 and thus $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i] = \mathbf{0}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i\|_{\text{s}} &= \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}_i - \mathbf{B}\|_{\text{s}} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{s}} + \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}_i\|_{\text{s}} \quad (549) \end{aligned}$$

$$= 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_X(X_i) P_Y(Y_i)}} \quad (550)$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{1}{p_0} \triangleq c, \quad (551)$$

where to obtain (549) we have used the spectral norm triangle inequality, to obtain (550) we have used that $\|\mathbf{B}\|_{\text{s}} = 1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_i$ has a single nonzero entry so (with the usual abuse of notation as discussed in footnote 25) \mathbf{e}_{Y_i} and \mathbf{e}_{X_i} are its principal left and right singular vectors, respectively, and to obtain (551) we have used the definition of p_0 .

Next, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i) \right\|_{\text{s}} = \|\text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_1)\|_{\text{s}} \quad (552)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \|\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 - \mathbf{B})(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 - \mathbf{B})^{\text{T}}]\|_{\text{s}} \\ &= \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1^{\text{T}}] - \mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^{\text{T}}\|_{\text{s}} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^{\text{T}}\|_{\text{s}} + \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1^{\text{T}}]\|_{\text{s}} \quad (553) \end{aligned}$$

$$= 1 + \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{P_{X|Y}(x|y)}{P_X(x)} \quad (554)$$

$$\leq 1 + \frac{1}{p_0} \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Y}(x|y) \quad (555)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{1}{p_0}, \quad (556)$$

where to obtain (552) we have used that the $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n$ are identically distributed, to obtain (553) we have again used the triangle inequality, to obtain (554) we have used that $\sigma_0^2 = 1$ is the principal singular value of $\mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^{\text{T}}$, and that $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1^{\text{T}}$ is a diagonal matrix whose (y, y) th entry is $\mathbb{1}_{Y_1=y} / (P_X(X_1) P_Y(y))$, so $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{B}}_1 \hat{\mathbf{B}}_1^{\text{T}}]$ has (y, y) th entry

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}_{Y_1=y}}{P_X(X_1) P_Y(y)} \right] &= \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}, y' \in \mathcal{Y}} P_{X,Y}(x', y') \frac{\mathbb{1}_{y'=y}}{P_X(x') P_Y(y')} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{P_{X,Y}(x, y)}{P_X(x) P_Y(y)} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{P_{X|Y}(x|y)}{P_X(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

and to obtain (555) we have again used the definition of p_0 . Moreover, interchanging the roles of x and y , we have, by symmetry,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i^{\text{T}}) \right\|_{\text{s}} = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i) \right\|_{\text{s}} = 1 + \frac{1}{p_0} \triangleq \bar{c}, \quad (557)$$

where to obtain the second equality we have used (556).

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \geq \delta \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_s \geq \frac{\delta}{4k} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (558)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \right\|_s \geq \frac{\delta}{4k} \right\} \quad (559)$$

$$\leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{3n}{8} \left(\frac{1}{1+1/p_0} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{4k} \right)^2 \right\} \quad (560)$$

$$\leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{64 k^2} \right\}, \quad (561)$$

where to obtain (558) we have used (548), to obtain (559) we have used (519), to obtain (560) we have used Lemma 106, and to obtain (561) we have again used that $p_0 \leq 1/2$ since $\min\{|\mathcal{X}|, |\mathcal{Y}|\} \geq 2$. ■

E. Proof of Corollary 48

First, adapting our notation from (194) for convenience,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k) & \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \\ & = \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 - \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (562)$$

$$\leq \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 \quad (563)$$

$$\leq \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_s^2 \left\| \Psi_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 \quad (564)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \left\| \psi_i^X \right\|^2 \quad (565)$$

$$= k,$$

where to obtain (562) we have used (546), to obtain (563) we have used Fact 29, to obtain (564) we have used that $\left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_s \leq 1$, and to obtain (565) we have used that the singular vectors have unit norm.

Next, with the event

$$\mathcal{E}_\delta \triangleq \left\{ \tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k) \geq \delta \right\}, \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq 4k,$$

we have that the left-hand side of (199) is bounded according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left[\tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k)^2 \right] & = \mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left[\tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k)^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_\delta^c \right] \mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{E}_\delta^c \} \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left[\tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k)^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_\delta \right] \mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{E}_\delta \} \\ & \leq \delta^2 + k^2 (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{64 k^2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (566)$$

where to obtain the inequality we have used that $\mathbb{P} \{ \mathcal{E}_\delta^c \} \leq 1$, (565), and Proposition 47.

To obtain the tightest bound, we optimize (566) over δ , yielding (199). In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left[\tilde{\mu}_2(\check{f}_*^k)^2 \right] & \leq \min_{\delta} \left(\delta^2 + k^2 (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{64 k^2} \right\} \right) \\ & = \frac{64 k^2}{p_0 n} \left[1 + \ln \left(k^2 (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \frac{p_0 n}{64 k^2} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (567)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{64 k^2}{p_0 n} \left(\ln [(|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) p_0 n] + [1 - \ln(64)] \right) \\ & \leq \frac{64 k^2}{p_0 n} \left(\ln [(|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) p_0 n] - 3 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (568)$$

where to obtain (567) we recognize that the right-hand side of (566) takes the form of (186) with the mappings

$$a = k^2 (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|), \quad b = \frac{p_0 n}{64 k^2}, \quad \omega = \delta^2, \quad (569)$$

and apply Lemma 45, and to obtain the last inequality we have used that $\ln(64) \geq 4$.

It remains to impose the constraints $0 \leq \delta_* \leq 4k$ on the minimizer δ_* , which we equivalently express in the form $0 \leq \omega_* \leq 16k^2$ using (569). Substituting (187) from Lemma 45 for ω_* and using a and b from (569), the constraint $\omega_* \geq 0$ imposes (198a), viz.,

$$\frac{p_0 n}{64} \geq \frac{1}{(|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|)}.$$

Meanwhile, the constraint $\omega_* \leq 16k^2$ imposes (198b), viz.,

$$\frac{p_0 n}{4} \geq \ln \left(\frac{p_0 n}{64} (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \right).$$

■

F. Proof of Proposition 49

To obtain Proposition 49, we adapt the proof of Proposition 43, replacing the use of the Frobenius norm of Lemma 104 with the following spectral norm bound:

Lemma 109: Given dimensions k_1 and k_2 and any two matrices $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$, we have, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq k \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_s. \quad (570)$$

Proof of Lemma 109: We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \leq k \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_s,$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 105. ■

In particular, to establish Proposition 49, we replace (516)–(518) in Appendix VI-A with

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k |\hat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \geq \delta \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{\mathbf{B}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_s \geq \frac{\delta}{k} \right\} \quad (571)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \right\|_s \geq \frac{\delta}{k} \right\} \quad (572)$$

$$\leq (|\mathcal{X}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) \exp \left\{ -\frac{p_0 \delta^2 n}{4k^2} \right\}, \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq k, \quad (573)$$

where to obtain (571) we use Lemma 109, then, as in the proof of Proposition 47, to obtain (572) we use (519), and to obtain (573) we use Lemma 106 with (551) and (557) providing c and \bar{c} , respectively, and that $p_0 \leq 1/2$. ■

G. Proof of Proposition 50

We adapt the proof of Proposition 47, replacing the use of the spectral norm bound of Lemma 107 with the following Frobenius norm bound:

Lemma 110: Given $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k_1 \times k_2}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}\}$, we have

$$0 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_F^2 \leq 4\sqrt{k} \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_s \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_F, \quad (574)$$

where $\Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}}$ is as defined in Lemma 107.

Proof of Lemma 110: First, reproducing (542) from the proof of Lemma 107, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_1}\|_F^2 - \|\mathbf{A}_1 \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_F^2 \\ & \leq 2 \|\mathbf{A}_1\|_s \left(\sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_1) - \sigma_i(\mathbf{A}_2)| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^k \|(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (575)$$

For the second sum in (575), we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^k \|(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\| \right)^2 \leq k \sum_{i=1}^k \|(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \psi_i^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_F^2 \quad (576)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = k \|(\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2) \Psi_{(k)}^{\mathbf{A}_2}\|_F^2 \\ & \leq k \|\mathbf{A}_1 - \mathbf{A}_2\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (577)$$

where to obtain (576) we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and to obtain (577) we use Lemma 3, recognizing that the right-hand side of (30) is upper bounded by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2$. Hence, using Lemma 104 to bound the first term in (575), and (577) to bound the second, we obtain (574). ■

To establish Proposition 50, starting from (546) in Appendix VI-D, but using Lemma 110 instead of Lemma 107, the bound (548) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \\ & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X\|_F^2 - \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X\|_F^2 \\ & \leq 4\sqrt{k} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (578)$$

In turn, (558)–(561) then becomes [cf. (196)]

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\check{f}_*^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\check{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \geq \delta \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_F \geq \frac{\delta}{4\sqrt{k}} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (579)$$

$$= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i \right\|_s \geq \frac{\delta}{4\sqrt{k}} \right\} \quad (580)$$

$$\leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{p_0^2 \delta^2 n}{128k} \right\}, \quad 0 \leq \delta \leq (4/p_0) \sqrt{k/2}, \quad (581)$$

where, as in the proof of Proposition 43, to obtain (580) we use (519), and to obtain (581) we use Lemma 103, with (510) and (515) again providing c and \bar{c} , respectively. ■

H. Analysis of Feature Quality Measure (202)

To begin, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbb{E} [f_*^k(X) g_*^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E} [\check{f}_*^k(X) \check{g}_*^k(Y)^T] \right\|_F \\ & = \left\| (\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X - (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F \\ & = \left\| (\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Psi_{(k)}^X - (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X + (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F \\ & = \left\| (\Sigma_{(k)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}) - (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F, \end{aligned} \quad (582)$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $\hat{\sigma}_1, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_k$.

This measure exhibits similar sample complexity behavior to that obtained in Section VI-B2. To see this, note that in this case we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\Sigma_{(k)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}) - (\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F \\ & \leq \|\Sigma_{(k)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}\|_F + \underbrace{\|(\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y)^T\|_s}_{=1} \|(\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X\|_F, \end{aligned} \quad (583)$$

where we have used, in turn, the triangle inequality for the Frobenius norm, and Fact 29, and where the spectral norm is unity because $\hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y$ has orthonormal columns. Moreover, the first term in (583) satisfies, using Lemma 109,

$$\|\Sigma_{(k)} - \hat{\Sigma}_{(k)}\|_F \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i - \hat{\sigma}_i| \leq k \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_s, \quad (584)$$

while the remaining term satisfies

$$\|(\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X\|_F \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i (\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}})^2} \quad (585)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i (\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \quad (586)$$

$$\leq k \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_s, \quad (587)$$

where to obtain (585) we have used Lemma 3, and to obtain (586) we have used (190). Using (584) and (587) in (583), and, in turn, (582) yields

$$\left\| \mathbb{E} [f_*^k(X) g_*^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E} [\check{f}_*^k(X) \check{g}_*^k(Y)^T] \right\|_F \leq 2k \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}\|_s. \quad (588)$$

Thus, we obtain a bound of the same form (to within a factor of two) as that for the measure (194), for which we obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\tilde{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \\ \leq 4k \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_s. \end{aligned} \quad (589)$$

As such analogous sample complexity bounds follow.

Finally, as in Section VI-B3, we can similarly replace the use of the spectral norm with the Frobenius norm. In particular, (584) can be replaced with

$$\left\| \Sigma^{(k)} - \hat{\Sigma}^{(k)} \right\|_F \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |\sigma_i - \hat{\sigma}_i| \leq \sqrt{k} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F, \quad (590)$$

where we now use Lemma 104 instead of Lemma 109. Using (590), and the simple upper bound

$$\left\| (\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}}) \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F \leq \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F \underbrace{\left\| \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_s}_{=1} \leq \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F \quad (591)$$

instead of (587), in (583) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{E} [f_*^k(X) g_*^k(Y)^T] - \mathbb{E} [\tilde{f}_*^k(X) \tilde{g}_*^k(Y)^T] \right\|_F \\ \leq (1 + \sqrt{k}) \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F \\ \leq 2\sqrt{k} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F, \end{aligned} \quad (592)$$

the second (looser) inequality of which matches (to within a factor of two) that for the measure (194), for which we obtained

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [f_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 - \left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{X|Y}} [\tilde{f}_*^k(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \\ \leq 4\sqrt{k} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (593)$$

As such analogous sample complexity bounds follow in this form too.

I. Proof of Proposition 51

First, note that \mathcal{S}_δ^F , \mathcal{S}_δ^s , and \mathcal{S}_δ^k are non-empty as they contain $P_{X,Y}$, and bounded since $\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|}$. In addition, our proof makes use of the following lemma.

Lemma 111: For any $P_{X,Y} \in \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y})$ and $\delta > 0$, let $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$, $\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$, and $\mathcal{S}_\delta^k(P_{X,Y})$ be as defined in (206). Then

- P1) $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}), \mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y})$ are compact sets for every $0 < \delta < B_{\min}(P_{X,Y})$, with $B_{\min}(\cdot)$ as defined in (208).
- P2) $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k(P_{X,Y})$ for every $\delta > 0$.
- P3) $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k(P_{X,Y})$ for every $\delta > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 111: To establish property P1 for $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$, fix any $0 < \delta < B_{\min}(P_{X,Y})$, and consider the set⁶²

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}) \\ \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|} : \mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}, \|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1, \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{B}\|_s \leq \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We first show that $\mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ is closed. To this end, take any sequence $\{\mathbf{M}_n \in \mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}), n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $\mathbf{M}_n \rightarrow$

⁶²As in Appendix II-B, we use $\mathbf{A} \geq \mathbf{0}$ to denote that all the entries of \mathbf{A} are nonnegative.

$\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, clearly $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1$ (by continuity of the spectral norm). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{B}\|_s &\leq \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}_n\|_s + \|\mathbf{M}_n - \mathbf{B}\|_s \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{M}_n\|_s + \delta \\ &\leq \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is the triangle inequality, the second inequality follows from using the fact that $\mathbf{M}_n \in \mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ and then letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the final inequality holds because $\mathbf{M}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ is closed.

Next, we show that $\mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\delta^{X \times Y}$, with $\mathcal{B}_\delta^{X \times Y}$ as defined in (368). Due to (369), it suffices to show that $\mathbf{M} > \mathbf{0}$ for every $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$, which we obtain by noting that for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have, with $M(x, y)$ denoting the (y, x) th entry of \mathbf{M} ,

$$M(x, y) \geq B(x, y) - |M(x, y) - B(x, y)| \quad (594)$$

$$\geq B(x, y) - \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{B}\|_s \quad (595)$$

$$\geq B_{\min}(P_{X,Y}) - \delta \quad (596)$$

$$> 0, \quad (597)$$

where to obtain (594) we have used the triangle inequality, to obtain (595) we have used that for an arbitrary matrix \mathbf{A} with entries $a_{i,j}$,

$$|a_{i,j}| = |\mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_j| \leq \|\mathbf{e}_i\| \|\mathbf{A}\|_s \|\mathbf{e}_j\| = \|\mathbf{A}\|_s, \quad \text{all } i, j,$$

with the inequality due to Lemma 4, where to obtain (596) we have used that $\mathbf{M} \in \mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ and (208), and where to obtain (597) we have used the given constraint on δ .

Now via Proposition 97 it follows that $\mathcal{S}_\delta(P_{X,Y})$ is the preimage of $\mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\delta^{X \times Y}$ under the DTM function $\mathbf{B}(\cdot)$, so $\mathcal{S}_\delta(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y})$. Furthermore, since, as shown in Proposition 100, the restricted DTM function $\mathbf{B}: \text{relint}(\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y}) \mapsto \mathcal{B}_\delta^{X \times Y}$ is continuous, $\mathcal{S}_\delta(P_{X,Y})$ is closed because $\mathcal{M}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ is closed [151, Corollary, p. 87]. Since $\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ is also bounded, it is compact [151, Theorem 2.41].

Property P1 for $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$ is obtained in a directly analogous manner. In particular, since the Frobenius norm is also continuous and satisfies the triangle inequality, it suffices to follow the same analysis, but now with respect to the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \\ \triangleq \left\{ \mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{X}|} : \mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}, \|\mathbf{M}\|_s = 1, \|\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{B}\|_F \leq \delta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain property P2, we use the fact that [cf. (578)]

$$\left\| \mathbf{B} \Psi_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 - \left\| \mathbf{B} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 \leq 4\sqrt{k} \left\| \mathbf{B} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_F,$$

which is obtained in precisely the same manner as (578), from which it follows immediately that $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k(P_{X,Y})$.

Analogously, to obtain property P3, we use the fact that [cf. (548)]

$$\left\| \mathbf{B} \Psi_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 - \left\| \mathbf{B} \hat{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \right\|_F^2 \leq 4k \left\| \mathbf{B} - \hat{\mathbf{B}} \right\|_s,$$

which is obtained in precisely the same manner as (548), from which it follows immediately that $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k(P_{X,Y})$. Finally, for the remaining part of property P3, we use the

standard norm inequality $\|\mathbf{A}\|_s \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F$, for any matrix \mathbf{A} , obtaining $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$. ■

Proceeding to the proof of Proposition 51, with the notation (210)–(212) we have, via Sanov's theorem [146, Theorem 2.1.10],

$$E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})) = E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})) \quad (598)$$

$$E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})) = E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})) \quad (599)$$

$$E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^k(P_{X,Y})) \leq E(\mathcal{S}_\delta^k(P_{X,Y})), \quad (600)$$

for $0 < \delta < B_{\min}(P_{X,Y})$ with $B_{\min}(\cdot)$ as defined in (208), where to obtain (598) and (599) we have used that $\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$ and $\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$, respectively, are open sets (with respect to $\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y}$), since $\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})$ and $\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})$ are closed according to property P1 of Lemma 111. Hence, (209a) follows according to

$$E(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k(P_{X,Y})) \geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k(P_{X,Y})) \quad (601)$$

$$\geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})) \quad (602)$$

$$= E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})), \quad (603)$$

where to obtain (601) we have used (600), to obtain (602) we have used that

$$\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{4\delta\sqrt{k}}^k \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_\delta^F,$$

which follows from property P2 of Lemma 111, and to obtain (603) we have used (598). Analogously, (209b) follows according to

$$E(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k(P_{X,Y})) \geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k(P_{X,Y})) \quad (604)$$

$$\geq E_-(\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})) \quad (605)$$

$$= E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^s(P_{X,Y})) \quad (606)$$

$$\geq E_*(\mathcal{S}_\delta^F(P_{X,Y})), \quad (607)$$

where to obtain (604) we have used (600), to obtain (605) we have used the first subset relation in

$$\mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{4\delta k}^k \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_\delta^s \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{X \times Y} \setminus \mathcal{S}_\delta^F, \quad (608)$$

which follows from property P3 of Lemma 111, to obtain (606) we have used (599), and to obtain (607) we have used (598) and the second subset relation in (608). ■

J. Proof of Lemma 52

Our proof makes use of the following special case of Sanov's Theorem [146, Theorem 2.1.10, Exercise 2.1.19], [152, Theorem 2.1]:

Lemma 112: For every distribution $P_Z \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$, and every closed and convex subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ of probability distributions that has non-empty interior, we have that the empirical distribution \hat{P}_Z formed from n i.i.d. samples of P_Z satisfies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S} \right\} = - \min_{Q_Z \in \mathcal{S}} D(Q_Z \| P_Z),$$

where the minimum is achieved by a unique distribution.

Without loss of generality we may restrict our attention to the case in which $\mathbb{E}[h(Z)] > 0$. For any $\gamma > 0$, define the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma^+ \triangleq \left\{ Q_Z \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z}[h(Z)] \geq (1 + \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)] \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma^- \triangleq \left\{ Q_Z \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathcal{Z}} : \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z}[h(Z)] \leq (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)] \right\}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_Z}[h(Z)] \triangleq \sum_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} Q_Z(z) h(z).$$

Furthermore, since we will eventually let $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, we may assume that

$$0 < \gamma < \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z)}{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]} - 1 \right), \left(1 - \frac{\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z)}{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]} \right) \right\},$$

so that

$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) < (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)] < (1 + \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)] < \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z),$$

where $\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z) < \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} h(z)$ because $\text{var}[h(Z)] > 0$. Hence, \mathcal{S}_γ^+ and \mathcal{S}_γ^- are closed and convex sets that have non-empty interiors. Using Lemma 112, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^+ \right\} &= - \min_{Q_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^+} D(Q_Z \| P_Z) \\ &= -D(Q_Z^+ \| P_Z) \end{aligned} \quad (609)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^- \right\} &= - \min_{Q_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^-} D(Q_Z \| P_Z) \\ &= -D(Q_Z^- \| P_Z), \end{aligned} \quad (610)$$

where the (unique) minimizing distributions $Q_Z^+ \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^+$ and $Q_Z^- \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^-$ are members of the exponential family

$$Q_Z(z; \theta) = P_Z(z) \exp \{ \theta h(z) - \alpha(\theta) \}, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z},$$

with natural parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Recall that the (infinitely differentiable) log-partition function

$$\alpha(\theta) \triangleq \log(\mathbb{E}[\exp \{ \theta h(Z) \}])$$

has derivatives

$$\alpha'(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z(\cdot; \theta)}[h(Z)]$$

$$\alpha''(\theta) = \text{var}_{Q_Z(\cdot; \theta)}[h(Z)] > 0,$$

where the second derivative is strictly positive because every element of \mathcal{Z} has positive probability under $Q_Z(\cdot; \theta)$. The minimizing distributions are $Q_Z^+ = Q_Z(\cdot; \theta_+)$ and $Q_Z^- = Q_Z(\cdot; \theta_-)$, where the optimal parameters $\theta_+ > 0$ and $\theta_- < 0$ are chosen to satisfy (cf. [152, Example 2.1])

$$\alpha'(\theta_+) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z(\cdot; \theta_+)}[h(Z)] = (1 + \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)],$$

$$\alpha'(\theta_-) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z(\cdot; \theta_-)}[h(Z)] = (1 - \gamma) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)].$$

Now assume that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{D(Q_Z^+ \| P_Z)}{\gamma^2} = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{D(Q_Z^- \| P_Z)}{\gamma^2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\mathbb{E}[h(Z)])^2}{\text{var}[h(Z)]} \quad (611)$$

and define

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma^\pm \triangleq \mathcal{S}_\gamma^+ \cup \mathcal{S}_\gamma^- = \left\{ Q_Z \in \mathcal{P}^Z : \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q_Z}[h(Z)]}{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]} - 1 \right| \geq \gamma \right\}. \quad (612)$$

Since \mathcal{S}_γ^+ and \mathcal{S}_γ^- are disjoint, we have $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^\pm\} = \mathbb{P}\{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^+\} + \mathbb{P}\{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^-\}$. Hence, via the Laplace principle it follows that

$$-\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\{\hat{P}_Z \in \mathcal{S}_\gamma^\pm\} = \min \left\{ D(Q_Z^+ \| P_Z), D(Q_Z^- \| P_Z) \right\}, \quad (613)$$

where we have used (609) and (610). Applying (611) to (613), and recognizing (612), we obtain (213) as desired.

Thus, it remains only to show (611). To this end, consider the function

$$d(\theta) \triangleq D(Q_Z(\cdot; \theta) \| P_Z), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} d(\theta) &= \theta \alpha'(\theta) - \alpha(\theta) \\ d'(\theta) &= \theta \alpha''(\theta) \\ d''(\theta) &= \alpha''(\theta) + \theta \alpha'''(\theta), \end{aligned}$$

which means that $d(0) = d'(0) = 0$, and $d''(0) = \alpha''(0) = \text{var}[h(Z)]$. Hence, by Taylor's theorem we have

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(\theta)}{\theta^2} = \frac{1}{2} \text{var}[h(Z)]. \quad (614)$$

Now given any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique θ_τ such that

$$\alpha'(\theta_\tau) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_Z(\cdot; \theta_\tau)}[h(Z)] = (1 + \tau) \mathbb{E}[h(Z)],$$

since α' is strictly increasing (since α'' is strictly positive). Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(\theta_\tau)}{\tau^2} &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(\theta_\tau)}{\theta_\tau^2} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\theta_\tau^2}{\tau^2} \\ &= \frac{\text{var}[h(Z)]}{2} \left(\lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\theta_\tau}{\tau} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\text{var}[h(Z)]}{2} \left(\left. \frac{d\theta_\tau}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\text{var}[h(Z)]}{2} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]}{\alpha''(0)} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]^2}{2 \text{var}[h(Z)]}, \end{aligned} \quad (615)$$

where the second equality follows from (614), the fact that $\theta_\tau \rightarrow 0$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$ (by the continuity of the inverse of $\alpha'(\cdot)$), and the continuity of $t \mapsto t^2$, where the third equality follows from the definition of derivative and the fact that $\theta_0 = 0$ (since $\alpha'(0) = \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]$), where the fourth equality holds because

$$\left. \frac{d\theta_\tau}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = \left(\left. \frac{d\tau_\theta}{d\theta} \right|_{\theta=0} \right)^{-1}$$

with

$$\tau_\theta = \frac{\alpha'(\theta)}{\mathbb{E}[h(Z)]} - 1,$$

and where the fifth equality holds because $\alpha''(0) = \text{var}[h(Z)]$.

In turn, setting $\tau = \gamma > 0$ and $\theta_\tau = \theta_+ > 0$ yields

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{D(Q_Z^+ \| P_Z)}{\gamma^2} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d(\theta_\tau)}{\tau^2}, \quad (616a)$$

and setting $\tau = -\gamma < 0$ and $\theta_\tau = \theta_- < 0$ yields

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{D(Q_Z^- \| P_Z)}{\gamma^2} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0^-} \frac{d(\theta_\tau)}{\tau^2}. \quad (616b)$$

Finally, replacing the right-hand sides of (616) with (615) yields (611). \blacksquare

APPENDIX VII

APPENDICES FOR SECTION VII

A. Proof of Proposition 53

From (216), it follows immediately that

$$\mathbb{E}[M] = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}(x)} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\} \quad (617)$$

$$\leq \max_{\{\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x) \subset \mathcal{Y} : |\hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)|=l\}} \sum_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}(x)} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\} \quad (618)$$

$$= \sum_{y \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}^*(x)} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\}, \quad (619)$$

where

$$y_1^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\} \quad (620a)$$

$$y_i^*(x) = \arg \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_1^*(x), \dots, y_{i-1}^*(x)\}} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\}, \quad i = 2, \dots, l. \quad (620b)$$

It remains only to evaluate the constituent event probabilities, which are obtained as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\} &= \mathbb{P}\{V^k(y) = V_\circ^k(x)\} \\ &= \sum_{\{v^k, v_\circ^k : v^k = v_\circ^k\}} P_{V^k|Y}(v^k|y) P_{V^k|X}(v_\circ^k|x) \\ &= \sum_{v^k} P_{V^k|Y}(v^k|y) P_{V^k|X}(v^k|x), \end{aligned}$$

wherein, using (116b) and (117a),

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{V^k|Y}(v^k|y) P_{V^k|X}(v^k|x) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k (P_{V_i|Y}(v_i|y) P_{V_i|X}(v_i|x)) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{P_{Y|V_i}(y|v_i) P_{V_i}(v_i)}{P_Y(y)} \frac{P_{X|V_i}(x|v_i) P_{V_i}(v_i)}{P_X(x)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{2k}} \prod_{i=1}^k \left((1 + \epsilon v_i g_i^*(y)) (1 + \epsilon v_i \sigma_i f_i^*(x)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{2k}} \prod_{i=1}^k \left(1 + \epsilon v_i (\sigma_i f_i^*(x) + g_i^*(y)) + \epsilon^2 \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{E}_y(x)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{2k}} \prod_{i=1}^k \sum_{v_i} \left(1 + \epsilon v_i (\sigma_i f_i^*(x) + g_i^*(y)) + \epsilon^2 \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^k} \prod_{i=1}^k (1 + \epsilon^2 \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^k} \left(1 + \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i f_i^*(x) g_i^*(y)\right) + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

the nonvanishing term of which we note is a monotonic function of the quantity being maximized in (220). ■

APPENDIX VIII APPENDICES FOR SECTION VIII

A. Proof of Proposition 56

First, without loss of generality we impose the constraints

$$\mathbb{E}[g(Y)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\beta(y)] = 0, \quad (621)$$

since other solutions are simple reparameterizations.

It is convenient to first establish the following special case of Proposition 56.

Lemma 113: Let the hypotheses of Proposition 56 be satisfied, together with the further constraints

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_S = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S = \mathbf{I}. \quad (622)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tilde{P}_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_s^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_S(s) D(P_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|S}(\cdot|s)) \\ &= I(Y; S) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(Y)\|^2 \right] + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (623) \end{aligned}$$

and is achieved by the parameters

$$g(y) = g_{*,S}(y) \triangleq \boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(y) + o(\epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(y) = \beta_{*,S}(y) \triangleq o(\epsilon), \quad (624a)$$

i.e.,

$$\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^*(y|s) \propto P_Y(y) e^{s^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(y)} (1 + o(1)). \quad (624b)$$

Using Lemma 113, we establish Proposition 56 as follows. First, let us assume $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S$ is nonsingular, and let

$$\tilde{s} \triangleq \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S^{-1/2} (s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_S) \quad (625)$$

so

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\tilde{S}} = \mathbf{I}.$$

Then we may rewrite $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(y|s)$ in the form

$$\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(y|s) = P_Y(y) \exp \left\{ \tilde{s}^T \tilde{g}(y) + \tilde{\beta}(y) - \tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{s}) \right\} \quad (626)$$

$$\triangleq \tilde{P}_{Y|\tilde{S}}^{\tilde{g},\tilde{\beta}}(y|\tilde{s}) \quad (627)$$

where

$$\tilde{g}(y) \triangleq \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S^{1/2} g(y) \quad (628)$$

$$\tilde{\beta}(y) \triangleq \boldsymbol{\mu}_S^T g(y) + \beta(y) \quad (629)$$

$$\tilde{\alpha}(\tilde{s}) \triangleq \alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}_S + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S^{1/2} \tilde{s}), \quad (630)$$

and for which $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(Y)] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\beta}(Y)] = 0$.

Using these definitions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}_{*,S}(y) &= \mathbb{E}_{P_{\tilde{S}|Y}(\cdot|y)}[\tilde{S}] + o(\epsilon) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S^{-1/2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(y) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_S) + o(\epsilon) \quad (631) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the first equality we have used Lemma 113, and to obtain (631) we have used (625). Combining (631) with (628) yields (228a). Similarly, via Lemma 113 we obtain

$$\tilde{\beta}_{*,S}(y) = o(\epsilon),$$

which when combined with (629) yields (228b). In turn, we obtain (226) via

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tilde{P}_{Y|\tilde{S}}(\cdot|\tilde{s}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\tilde{s}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)} \sum_{\tilde{s} \in \mathcal{S}} P_{\tilde{S}}(\tilde{s}) D(P_{Y|\tilde{S}}(\cdot|\tilde{s}) \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|\tilde{S}}(\cdot|\tilde{s})) \\ &= I(Y; \tilde{S}) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\tilde{S}|Y}(Y)\|^2 \right] + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= I(Y; S) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S^{-1/2} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(Y) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_S)\|^2 \right] + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the first equality we have used Lemma 113, and to obtain the second we have used (625) and the invariance of mutual information to coordinate transformations.

It remains only to establish Lemma 113.

Proof of Lemma 113: First, note that

$$D(P_{Y,S} \parallel \tilde{P}_{Y|S} P_S) = I(Y; S) - \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[S^T g(Y) - \alpha(S) \right]}_{\triangleq \tilde{\ell}(g,\beta)}, \quad (632)$$

so we seek to maximize $\tilde{\ell}(g,\beta)$. Moreover, note that since χ^2 -divergence is an f -divergence, it satisfies a data processing inequality [153], so S, Y are ϵ -dependent for any choice of f that induces S .

Fixing $s \in \mathcal{S}$, note that $P_{Y|S}(\cdot|s) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)$ and, moreover, $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{0,0}(\cdot|s) = P_Y$. Hence, it follows that the optimizing $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(\cdot|s)$ is such that $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(\cdot|s) \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{Y}}(P_Y)$, and thus we may restrict our search to parameters (g,β) in this neighborhood.

In turn, defining

$$\tilde{\phi}_s^{Y|S}(y) \triangleq \frac{\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g,\beta}(y|s) - P_Y(y)}{\epsilon \sqrt{P_Y(y)}},$$

it follows from (225) that

$$\epsilon^2 \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\phi}_s^{Y|S}(y)^2 = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_Y(y) (e^{s^T g(y) + \beta(y) - \alpha(s)} - 1)^2 \leq \epsilon^2,$$

so

$$s^T g(y) + \beta(y) - \alpha(s) = o(1).$$

Hence, for the Taylor series expansions⁶³ (in ϵ)

$$g(y) = \sum_{i=0}^2 \epsilon^i g^{(i)}(y) + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (633a)$$

$$\beta(y) = \sum_{i=0}^2 \epsilon^i \beta^{(i)}(y) + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (633b)$$

$$\alpha(s) = \sum_{i=0}^2 \epsilon^i \alpha^{(i)}(s) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (633c)$$

⁶³In this analysis we assume the existence of these Taylor series.

wherein $g^{(i)}(y)$, $\beta^{(i)}(y)$, and $\alpha^{(i)}(s)$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ do not depend on ϵ , it follows that

$$s^T g^{(0)}(y) + \beta^{(0)}(y) = \alpha^{(0)}(s). \quad (634)$$

But due to (621), in the Taylor series (633) we must also have

$$\mathbb{E}[g^{(i)}(Y)] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\beta^{(i)}(Y)] = 0, \quad i \in \{0, 1, 2\}. \quad (635)$$

Taking the expectation of both sides of (634) with respect to P_Y then yields that

$$\alpha^{(0)}(s) = 0. \quad (636)$$

Next, with

$$\tau_s^{(i)}(y) \triangleq s^T g^{(i)}(y) + \beta^{(i)}(y), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (637)$$

and using the Taylor series

$$e^\omega = \sum_{j=0}^l \frac{1}{j!} \omega^j + o(\omega^l),$$

we obtain that $Z(s) \triangleq e^{\alpha(s)}$, via (225), can be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z(s) &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} P_Y(y) e^{s^T g(y) + \beta(y)} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^2 \epsilon^i \tau_s^{(i)}(Y) + o(\epsilon^2) \right\} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left(\sum_{j=0}^2 \epsilon^j \frac{1}{j!} \tau_s^{(1)}(Y)^j + o(\epsilon^2) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \cdot \left. \left(\sum_{j=0}^1 \epsilon^{2j} \frac{1}{j!} \tau_s^{(2)}(Y)^j + o(\epsilon^2) \right) (1 + o(\epsilon^2)) \right] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^2 \epsilon^i v_i(s) + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$v_1(s) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\tau_s^{(1)}(Y)] = 0 \quad (638a)$$

$$v_2(s) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\frac{1}{2} \tau_s^{(1)}(Y)^2 + \tau_s^{(2)}(Y) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\tau_s^{(1)}(Y)^2], \quad (638b)$$

where we have used (634) with (636) to conclude $\tau_s^{(0)} = 0$, and that

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\tau_s^{(i)}(Y)] = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

due to (635).

Next, using the Taylor series

$$\ln(1 + \omega) = \omega - \frac{1}{2} \omega^2 + o(\omega^2),$$

we obtain that $\alpha(s) = \ln Z(s)$ is of the form

$$\alpha(s) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \epsilon^i v_i(s) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 \epsilon^i v_i(s) \right)^2 + o(\epsilon^2).$$

So in the Taylor series (633c) for $\alpha(s)$, we obtain

$$\alpha^{(1)}(s) = v_1(s) = 0 \quad (639a)$$

$$\alpha^{(2)}(s) = v_2(s) - \frac{1}{2} v_1(s)^2 = v_2(s). \quad (639b)$$

We write $\tilde{\ell}(g, \beta)$ in (632), which we seek to maximize, in the form

$$\tilde{\ell}(g, \beta) = \sum_{i=0}^2 \epsilon^i \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(i)}(Y) - \alpha^{(i)}(S)] + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (640)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^2 \epsilon^i \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(i)}(Y) - \alpha^{(i)}(S)] + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (641)$$

$$= \epsilon \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(1)}(Y)] + \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(2)}(Y)] - \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} [\alpha^{(2)}(S)] + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (642)$$

$$= \epsilon \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(1)}(Y)] - \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} [\alpha^{(2)}(S)] + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (643)$$

where to obtain (640) we have used (633), to obtain (641) we have used that

$$\mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(0)}(Y) - \alpha^{(0)}(S)] = -\mathbb{E} [\beta^{(0)}(Y)] = 0,$$

due to (634) and (635), to obtain (642) we have used (639a), and to obtain (643) we have used that the second term in (642) is $o(\epsilon^2)$, which follows from the fact that for any i

$$\mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(i)}(Y)] = \mathbb{E} [S^T] \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [g^{(i)}(Y)]}_{=0} + O(\epsilon) \in O(\epsilon),$$

since $P_{S,Y} \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(P_S P_Y)$.

Hence, we write (643) in the form

$$\tilde{\ell}(g, \beta) = \tilde{\ell}_2(g^{(1)}, \beta^{(1)}) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (644a)$$

with

$$\tilde{\ell}_2(g^{(1)}, \beta^{(1)}) \triangleq \epsilon \mathbb{E} [S^T g^{(1)}(Y)] - \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E} [\alpha^{(2)}(S)], \quad (644b)$$

where we note $\tilde{\ell}_2(g^{(1)}, \beta^{(1)}) \in O(\epsilon^2)$. In addition, we note that there is no dependence on $g^{(0)}$ and $\beta^{(0)}$ in (644b). Indeed, they can be freely chosen subject to the constraints (635), and those choices have no effect on the resulting $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}^{g, \beta}(\cdot|s)$; for example, we may choose

$$g^{(0)}(y) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^{(0)}(y) = 0, \quad \text{all } y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

Proceeding, to express the second term in (644b) in terms of $g^{(1)}(y)$ and $\beta^{(1)}(y)$, note that, using (638b) and (637),

$$\begin{aligned} v_2(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\tau_s^{(1)}(Y)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [(s^T g^{(1)}(Y) + \beta^{(1)}(Y))^2], \end{aligned} \quad (645)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}_{P_S} [\alpha^{(2)}(S)] &= \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}_{P_S} [v_2(S)] \end{aligned} \quad (646)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\mathbb{E}_{P_S} [(S^T g^{(1)}(Y))^2] + \beta^{(1)}(Y)^2] \quad (647)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\|g^{(1)}(Y)\|^2] + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} [\beta^{(1)}(Y)^2], \quad (648)$$

where to obtain (646) we have used (639b), to obtain (647) we have used (645) and (622), and where to obtain (648) we have used Lemma 25 with (622) (and $k_1 = k$ and $k_2 = 1$).

Since $\beta^{(1)}(y)$ only appears in (644b) through the second term in (648), we conclude that its optimum value is

$$\beta_{*,S}^{(1)}(y) \equiv 0. \quad (649)$$

Combining the remainder of (648) with the first term in (644b), we then have, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\ell}_2(g^{(1)}, \beta_{*,S}^{(1)}) &= \epsilon \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} \left[\left(S - \frac{\epsilon}{2} g^{(1)}(Y) \right)^T g^{(1)}(Y) \right] \\ &= \epsilon \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} \left[S - \frac{\epsilon}{2} g^{(1)}(Y) \right]^T g^{(1)}(Y) \right] \\ &\leq \epsilon \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} \left[S - \frac{\epsilon}{2} g^{(1)}(Y) \right] \right\|^2 \right]} \\ &\quad \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\|g^{(1)}(Y)\|^2 \right]} \end{aligned} \quad (650)$$

where the inequality holds with equality when

$$g^{(1)}(Y) \propto \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} \left[S - \frac{\epsilon}{2} g^{(1)}(Y) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} [S] - \frac{\epsilon}{2} g^{(1)}(Y), \quad (651)$$

for some nonnegative constant of proportionality, i.e., when

$$g^{(1)}(Y) = c \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} [S] \quad (652)$$

for $0 \leq c \leq 2/\epsilon$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\ell}_2(g^{(1)}, \beta_{*,S}^{(1)}) &= \epsilon c \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} c \right) \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} [S] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - (1 - \epsilon c)^2) \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} [S] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{P_{S|Y}} [S] \right\|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (653)$$

where equality is achieved when $c = 1/\epsilon$. Hence, the optimum value of $g^{(1)}(y)$ is

$$g_{*,S}^{(1)}(y) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{S|Y}(y), \quad (654)$$

which we note has $\mathbb{E}[g_{*,S}^{(1)}(Y)] = 0$, as our constraints (635) dictate. In turn, substituting the right-hand side of (653) into (632) via (644), we obtain (623) as desired.

Moreover, the corresponding $g_{*,S}(y)$ and $\beta_{*,S}(y)$ satisfy (624a) as desired, i.e., $\tilde{P}_{Y|S}(y|s)$ takes the form (624b). ■

B. Proof of Corollary 57

First, without loss of generality we impose on f the constraints (35c), so

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_S = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_S = \mathbf{I}, \quad (655)$$

Next, note that since f is injective, by the invariance of mutual information to coordinate transformations, the first term on the right-hand side of (226) is $I(X; Y)$, which doesn't depend on f . Accordingly, we have, specializing the second term on the right-hand side of (226) to the case (655),

$$\begin{aligned} f_* &= \arg \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} \mathbb{E}_{P_Y} \left[\left\| \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{P}_{X|Y}} [f(X)] \right\|^2 \right] \\ &= \arg \max_{\Xi^X} \left\| \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X \right\|_{\mathbf{F}}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is as defined in (28), Ξ^X is the $|\mathcal{X}| \times k$ matrix whose i th column is the feature vector associated with f_i , the i th element of f , and the maximization with respect to Ξ^X is subject to the constraint

$$(\Xi^X)^T \Xi^X = \mathbf{I},$$

which corresponds to (35c). Accordingly, applying Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\Xi^X = \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{(k)}^X,$$

i.e.,

$$f_i(x) = f_i^*(x), \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

Finally, to obtain (234a) we use (25b) in (228a) with (655), and (234b) follows immediately via (228b). ■

APPENDIX IX

APPENDICES FOR SECTION IX

A. Proof of Fact 60

Suppose \mathbf{M} is $k_1 \times k_2$. Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^L$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^R$ denote the left and right singular vectors of \mathbf{M} corresponding to $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$, for $i = 1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}$. Then

$$\left[(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^L)^T \quad (\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^R)^T \right]^T \quad \text{and} \quad \left[(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^L)^T \quad -(\boldsymbol{\psi}_i^R)^T \right]^T$$

are eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ with eigenvalues $1 + \sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$ and $1 - \sigma_i(\mathbf{M})$, respectively. The remaining $\max\{k_1, k_2\} - \min\{k_1, k_2\}$ eigenvalues are 1 and, if $k_2 > k_1$, correspond to eigenvectors

$$\left[\mathbf{0} \quad (\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^R)^T \right]^T,$$

for $j = k_1 + 1, \dots, k_2$. Likewise, if $k_1 > k_2$ these unity eigenvalues correspond to eigenvectors

$$\left[(\boldsymbol{\psi}_j^L)^T \quad \mathbf{0} \right]^T,$$

for $j = k_2 + 1, \dots, k_1$. Hence, we conclude that the eigenvalues are nonnegative if and only if $\sigma_i(\mathbf{M}) \leq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, \min\{k_1, k_2\}$. ■

B. Proof of Corollary 62

Applying (255) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}^*(Y) | X] &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{G}^*)^T Y | X] \\ &= (\mathbf{G}^*)^T \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{Y|X} X \\ &= (\mathbf{G}^*)^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{YX} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_X^{-1} X \\ &= (\mathbf{G}^*)^T (\mathbf{G}^*)^{-T} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\mathbf{F}^*)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_X^{-1} X \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\boldsymbol{\Psi}^X)^T \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_X^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_X^{-1} X \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma} (\mathbf{F}^*)^T X \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{f}^*(X) \end{aligned}$$

and, analogously,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}^*(X) | Y] &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{F}^*)^\top X | Y] \\
&= (\mathbf{F}^*)^\top \mathbf{\Gamma}_{X|Y} Y \\
&= (\mathbf{F}^*)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_{XY} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1} Y \\
&= (\mathbf{F}^*)^\top (\mathbf{F}^*)^{-\top} \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{G}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1} Y \\
&= \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{\Psi}^Y)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1} Y \\
&= \mathbf{\Sigma} (\mathbf{G}^*)^\top Y \\
&= \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{g}^*(Y).
\end{aligned}$$

C. Proof of Lemma 65

First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathbf{A}\mu_P + \mathbf{c} - (\mathbf{A}\mu_Q + \mathbf{c}))^\top \\
&\quad \cdot (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} (\mathbf{A}\mu_P + \mathbf{c} - (\mathbf{A}\mu_Q + \mathbf{c})) \\
&= (\mu_P - \mu_Q)^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}^{-\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mu_P - \mu_Q) \\
&= (\mu_P - \mu_Q)^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mu_P - \mu_Q). \tag{656}
\end{aligned}$$

Second, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_P \mathbf{A}^\top - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top) (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \text{tr}\left((\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{A}^\top \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cdot (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{A}^\top\right) \tag{657}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{tr}\left(\mathbf{A}^{-\top} \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{A}^\top\right) \\
&= \text{tr}\left(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q)\right) \tag{658}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1/2} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_P - \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q) \mathbf{\Lambda}_Q^{-1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \tag{659}$$

where to obtain (657) we have used Lemma 66, to obtain (658) we have used the invariance of the trace operator to cyclic permutations, and to obtain (659) we have again used Lemma 66. Combining (656) and (659) with (272b), we obtain (273). ■

D. Proof of Lemma 68

With

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{W}} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{660}$$

via (240), we have

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\tilde{\mathbf{C}}^\top] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \epsilon \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \\ \epsilon \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{D}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}}) \parallel \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})) &= \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}}} - \mathbf{I}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \epsilon \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \\ \epsilon (\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W})^\top & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2. \tag{661}
\end{aligned}$$

E. Proof of Lemma 69

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) \\
&= \bar{D}(P_{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}}(\cdot|\tilde{w}) \parallel P_{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}}) \tag{662}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \epsilon^2 \tilde{w}^\top (\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W})^\top \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \tilde{w} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \left(\mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} (\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W})^\top \right) - \mathbf{I} \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \tag{663}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \tilde{w}\|^2 + \frac{\epsilon^4}{2} \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} (\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W})^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\
&= \epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \tilde{w}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (662) we have used Lemma 65, and to obtain (663) we have used (272b) and the fact that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = \epsilon \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \tilde{\mathbf{W}} + \nu_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}},$$

where $\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W}$ is as defined in (277) and

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}} \nu_{\tilde{\mathbf{W}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}}^\top] = \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} (\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W})^\top.$$

F. Proof of Lemma 70

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{P_W}[\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)] \\
&= \epsilon^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}\|^2] + o(\epsilon^2) \tag{664}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{Z|W}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \tag{665}$$

$$= \bar{D}(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W) (1 + o(1)), \tag{666}$$

where to obtain (664) we have used Lemma 69, to obtain (665) we have used Lemma 25 (with $k_1 = K_W$ and $k_2 = 1$) since $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}$ is spherically symmetric, and to obtain (666) we have used Lemma 68. ■

G. Proof of Fact 71

Let the i th singular value of \mathbf{A} be λ_i . Then it suffices to note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln|\mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top| &= \ln \prod_i (1 - \epsilon^2 \lambda_i^2) \\
&= \ln \left(1 - \epsilon^2 \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \right) \\
&= -\epsilon^2 \sum_i \lambda_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \\
&= -\epsilon^2 \|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2).
\end{aligned}$$

H. Proof of Lemma 72

We have

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) &= D(P_{\tilde{Z}|\tilde{W}}(\cdot|\tilde{w}) \parallel P_{\tilde{Z}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\epsilon^2 \|\Phi^{Z|W} \tilde{w}\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{tr} \left(\left(\mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Phi^{Z|W} (\Phi^{Z|W})^T \right) - \mathbf{I} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \ln \left| \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Phi^{Z|W} (\Phi^{Z|W})^T \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (667)$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \|\Phi^{Z|W} \tilde{w}\|^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (668)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|w) \parallel P_Z) + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (669)$$

where to obtain (667) we have used the coordinate invariance of KL divergence, to obtain (668) we have used Fact 71, and to obtain (669) we have used Lemma 69. ■

I. Proof of Corollary 73

We have

$$\begin{aligned} I(Z; W) &= \mathbb{E}_{P_W} [D(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{P_W} [\bar{D}(P_{Z|W}(\cdot|W) \parallel P_Z)] + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (670)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \bar{D}(P_{Z,W} \parallel P_Z P_W) + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (671)$$

where to obtain (670) we have used Lemma 72, and to obtain (671) we have used Lemma 70. ■

J. Proof of Lemma 74

First, via (283) and the invariance of divergence to coordinate transformations we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{X,Y} \parallel Q_{X,Y}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{tr} \left(\left(\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q \right)^{-1} \Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P - \mathbf{I} \right) - \ln \left| \Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P \left(\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q \right)^{-1} \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (672)$$

where

$$\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (673)$$

Next, using (673) with (291) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q \right)^{-1} \Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q & -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q & \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P) & (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q)^T \\ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q & \mathbf{I} + \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P)^T \end{bmatrix} + o(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} \left(\left(\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q \right)^{-1} \Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P - \mathbf{I} \right) &= 2 \text{tr} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P)^T \right) + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= 2 \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q\|_F^2 - 2 \text{tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P^T) + o(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (674)$$

Finally, using Fact 71 and the block matrix determinant identity we obtain

$$\ln |\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^P| = \ln |\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P| = -\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_P\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (675a)$$

$$\ln |\Lambda_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}^Q| = \ln |\mathbf{I} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q| = -\|\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_Q\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (675b)$$

so substituting (674) and (675) in (672) yields (286). ■

K. Nonlinear Features of Gaussian Distributions

For the Gaussian case, in a modal decomposition of the form (296), only some of the features $\tilde{f}_1^*, \tilde{g}_1^*, \tilde{f}_2^*, \tilde{g}_2^*, \dots$ are linear, which is implied by expanding the exponentiation operator in (293) using a Taylor Series. For instance, when $K_X = K_Y = 1$, one obtains Mehler's decomposition [154]

$$P_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = P_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{x}) P_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{y}) \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho^i \pi_i(\tilde{x}) \pi_i(\tilde{y}) \right], \quad (676a)$$

where $\rho = \lambda_{\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}\tilde{Y}]$, and where π_i is the (scaled) i th-order Hermite polynomial

$$\pi_i(\tilde{x}) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{i!}} (-1)^i e^{\tilde{x}^2/2} \frac{d^i}{d\tilde{x}^i} e^{-\tilde{x}^2/2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (676b)$$

Note that $\tilde{f}_i^* = \tilde{g}_i^* = \pi_i$ satisfy (296b) as required, and that the features corresponding to the dominant mode ($i = 1$) are linear: $\pi_1(v) = v$.

For $K > 1$ [with (250)], the modal decomposition of the form (296) is straightforward to derive as a generalization of (676), and involves the corresponding multivariate Hermite polynomials—see, e.g., [155], [156]. However, it is important to emphasize that if $K > 1$ and $k > 1$, then the k dominant modes need not, in general, be linear, as the following example shows.

Example: Suppose $K_X = K_Y = k = 2$, $(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{Y}_1)$ and $(\tilde{X}_2, \tilde{Y}_2)$ are independent, and $\rho_l = \lambda_{\tilde{X}_l \tilde{Y}_l} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_l \tilde{Y}_l]$ for $l = 1, 2$. Then we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\tilde{X},\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) &= P_{\tilde{X}_1}(\tilde{x}_1) P_{\tilde{X}_2}(\tilde{x}_2) P_{\tilde{Y}_1}(\tilde{y}_1) P_{\tilde{Y}_2}(\tilde{y}_2) \\ &\quad \cdot \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_1^i \pi_i(\tilde{x}_1) \pi_i(\tilde{y}_1) \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_2^i \pi_i(\tilde{x}_2) \pi_i(\tilde{y}_2) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which when expanded is of the form (296). But if $\rho_1^2 > \rho_2$, then the dominant feature pair is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_1^*(\tilde{x}) &= \pi_1(\tilde{x}_1) = \tilde{x}_1 \\ \tilde{g}_1^*(\tilde{y}) &= \pi_1(\tilde{y}_1) = \tilde{y}_1, \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to singular value $\tilde{\sigma}_1 = \rho_1$, while the features for the next largest singular value are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_2^*(\tilde{x}) &= \pi_2(\tilde{x}_1) = (\tilde{x}_1^2 - 1)/\sqrt{2} \\ \tilde{g}_2^*(\tilde{y}) &= \pi_2(\tilde{y}_1) = (\tilde{y}_1^2 - 1)/\sqrt{2}, \end{aligned}$$

corresponding to singular value ρ_1^2 , rather than the linear features corresponding to singular value ρ_2 .

L. Linear Features for NonGaussian Distributions

The following proposition directly relates the CCM $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ from our Gaussian analysis to the associated CDM \mathbf{B} from our discrete analysis.

Proposition 114: Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$ be finite sets with probability mass function $P_{X,Y}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y] = 0$, and let \mathbf{B} be as defined in (8). Then

$$\mathbf{\Pi}^Y \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{\Pi}^X)^T = \mathbf{B}_G, \quad (677)$$

where \mathbf{B}_G is as defined in (248) (with the notation refined to distinguish it from \mathbf{B}), and where

$$\mathbf{\Pi}^X = \mathbf{X} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Pi}^Y = \mathbf{Y} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y}, \quad (678)$$

with \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} denoting $K_X \times |\mathcal{X}|$ and $K_Y \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ matrices whose columns are the vectors in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively.

Proof: Given $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_{|\mathcal{X}|}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K_X}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{|\mathcal{Y}|}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}$, consider (without loss of generality) arbitrary zero-mean, unit-variance features $f: \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g: \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, whose corresponding feature vectors are $\xi^X \in \mathcal{J}^X$ and $\xi^Y \in \mathcal{J}^Y$, respectively.

In addition, let $f_L(x) = (\xi_G^X)^T x$ and $g_L(y) = (\xi_G^Y)^T y$ denote the linear MMSE approximations to f and g , respectively, i.e.,

$$\xi_G^X = \arg \min_{\xi_G \in \mathbb{R}^{K_X}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T X - f(X))^2 \right] \quad (679a)$$

$$\xi_G^Y = \arg \min_{\xi_G \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T Y - g(Y))^2 \right] \quad (679b)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbf{\Lambda}_X = \mathbf{I}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y = \mathbf{I}$, since if not they can be converted to this form by linear transformation. Then, from standard linear (MMSE) estimation theory it follows that

$$\xi_G^X = \mathbb{E} \left[f(X) X^T \right] = \underbrace{\mathbf{X} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{\Pi}^X} \xi^X \quad (680a)$$

$$\xi_G^Y = \mathbb{E} \left[g(Y) Y^T \right] = \underbrace{\mathbf{Y} \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y}}_{\triangleq \mathbf{\Pi}^Y} \xi^Y, \quad (680b)$$

where \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are matrices whose columns are the vectors in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively, and where the matrices $\mathbf{\Pi}^X$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}^Y$ characterize the associated projections.

Next, note that if f is linear, i.e.,

$$f(x) = \zeta_G^T x \quad (681)$$

for some ζ_G , then

$$(\mathbf{\Pi}^X)^T \zeta_G = \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_X} \mathbf{X}^T \zeta_G = \xi^X$$

since $\mathbf{X}^T \zeta_G$ is a vector whose x th element is $f(x)$.

Now for any feature f with feature vector ξ^X , the feature vector $\xi^Y \triangleq \mathbf{B} \xi^X$ corresponds to the feature $g(y) =$

$\mathbb{E}[f(X) | Y = y]$. To see this, it suffices to note that ξ^Y has elements

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^Y(y) &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} B(x, y) \xi^X(x) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{P_Y(y)}} P_{Y|X}(y|x) \sqrt{P_X(x)} \sqrt{P_X(x)} f(x) \\ &= \sqrt{P_Y(y)} \underbrace{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} P_{X|Y}(x|y) f(x)}_{=g(y)} \end{aligned}$$

In turn, specializing f to the case (681) yields

$$\mathbf{B} (\mathbf{\Pi}^X)^T \zeta_G = \sqrt{\mathbf{P}_Y} \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y],$$

and specializing the resulting g in (680b) with (679b) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Pi}^Y \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{\Pi}^X)^T \zeta_G &= \arg \min_{\xi_G \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T Y - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y])^2 \right] \\ &= \arg \min_{\xi_G \in \mathbb{R}^{K_Y}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T Y - \zeta_G^T X)^2 \right] \quad (682) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{YX} \zeta_G \quad (683)$$

$$= \mathbf{B}_G \zeta_G \quad (684)$$

To obtain (682) we have used

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T Y - \zeta_G^T X)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(\xi_G^T Y - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y])^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[(\zeta_G^T X - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y])^2 \right] \\ &\quad - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[(\zeta_G^T X - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y]) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot (\xi_G^T Y - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_G^T X | Y]) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where we note that the second term does not depend on ξ_G , and that the last term is zero due to the orthogonality property of MMSE estimators. In turn, to obtain (683) we recognize (682) as a linear MMSE estimation problem, whose solution depends only on the first and second moments of (X, Y) , and to obtain (684) we use (248). Finally, since (684) holds for all ζ_G , we obtain (677) as desired. \blacksquare

M. Proof of Fact 79

It suffices to note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_3} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_3^T | \tilde{Z}_2] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_1 | \tilde{Z}_2] \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_3 | \tilde{Z}_2]^T \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_2} \tilde{Z}_2 \tilde{Z}_2^T \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_3 \tilde{Z}_2}^T \right] \\ &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_2 \tilde{Z}_3} \\ &= \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_1 \tilde{Z}_2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{Z}_2 \tilde{Z}_3}. \end{aligned}$$

\blacksquare

N. Proof of Proposition 81

Without loss of generality, we restrict $S_{(k)}$ and $T_{(k)}$ so that they are normalized with respect to P_X and P_Y , respectively, i.e., $(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}, \mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \in \mathcal{L}$ as defined in (264). Accordingly, we have the representations (266) in which Ξ^X and Ξ^Y satisfy (268).

For the MMSE estimation of V based on $S_{(k)}$, the MSE is

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathfrak{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{V}|S_{(k)}} \mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \epsilon_Y^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2} (\Phi^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (685)$$

where we have used (303b), so

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\lambda}_e^{V|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathfrak{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)})] \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \frac{\epsilon_Y^2}{K_V K_Y} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &\geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) \left[1 - \frac{\epsilon_Y^2}{K_V K_Y} \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (686)$$

where to obtain (686) we have used Lemma 25, and to obtain (687) we have used Lemma 3. It further follows from Lemma 3 that the inequality (687) holds with equality when we choose Ξ^X according to (269a).

For the MMSE estimation of U based on $S_{(k)}$, the MSE is

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathfrak{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{U}|S_{(k)}} \mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) - \epsilon_X^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2} (\Phi^{X|U})^T \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (688)$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\lambda}_e^{U|S}(\mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\text{RIE}}[\lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathfrak{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)})] \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) - \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{K_U K_X} \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \|\Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (689)$$

$$= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) \left[1 - \frac{\epsilon_X^2 k}{K_U K_X} \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \right], \quad (690)$$

for any (admissible) choice of $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}$, where to obtain (689) we have used Lemma 25, and to obtain (690) we have used that $\|\Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 = k$ due to (268). Hence, the unique Pareto optimal choice of $\mathbf{F}_{(k)}$ in (309) is as given by (269a).

Via a symmetry argument (corresponding to interchanging the roles of X and Y , and U and V , and noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T$ share the same singular values), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\lambda}_e^{V|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) \left[1 - \frac{\epsilon_Y^2 k}{K_V K_Y} \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \right] \\ & \bar{\lambda}_e^{U|T}(\mathbf{G}_{(k)}) \geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) \left[1 - \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{K_U K_X} \mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\text{F}}^2] \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

with equality in the latter when $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}$ is given by (269b). Hence, the unique Pareto optimal choice of $\mathbf{G}_{(k)}$ in (309) is as given by (269a).

Finally, we note that we obtain (310) by recognizing that

$$\bar{E}^{X|U} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_{\text{F}}^2]}{K_U K_X} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{E}^{Y|V} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{F}}^2]}{K_V K_Y}. \quad \blacksquare$$

O. Proof of Proposition 82

For the MMSE estimation of V based on S , the MSE is, starting from (685),

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_e^{V|S}(\mathfrak{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \epsilon_Y^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2} (\Phi^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \epsilon_Y^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}^{Y|V} \mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V} (\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Xi^X\|_{\text{F}}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (691)$$

$$\geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \epsilon_Y^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2}\|_{\text{s}}^2 \|\mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V}\|_{\text{s}}^2 \|(\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\|_{\text{F}}^2 \|\Xi^X\|_{\text{s}}^2 \quad (692)$$

$$\geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_V) - \epsilon_Y^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_V^{1/2}\|_{\text{s}}^2 \left(\frac{K_Y + k}{k} \right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 \quad (693)$$

$$\geq k - \epsilon_Y^2 \left(\frac{K_Y + k}{k} \right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2, \quad (694)$$

where to obtain (691) we have expressed $\Phi^{Y|V}$ in terms of its SVD

$$\Phi^{Y|V} = \tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V} \mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V} (\mathbf{Q}^{Y|V})^T, \quad (695)$$

where the $K_Y \times k$ matrix $\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V}$ has orthonormal columns, i.e.,

$$(\tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\Phi}^{Y|V} = \mathbf{I}, \quad (696)$$

$\mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V}$ is a $k \times k$ diagonal matrix, and $\mathbf{Q}^{Y|V}$ is $k \times k$ orthogonal matrix. To obtain (692) we have (repeatedly) used Fact 29 and the fact that $\mathbf{Q}^{Y|V}$ is orthogonal, and to obtain (693) we have used that Ξ^X satisfies (268), that

$$\|\mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V}\|_{\text{s}}^2 = \|\Phi^{Y|V}\|_{\text{s}}^2 \leq \frac{K_Y + k}{k} \quad (697)$$

since V is a Gaussian multi-attribute and so satisfies the property of Definition 77, and applied Lemma 3 with the constraint (696). And to obtain (694) we have used the last constraint in (312), which implies that none of the singular values of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_V$ are smaller than unity. Finally, it is straightforward to verify that the inequalities leading to the right-hand side of (694) hold with equality when

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_V = \mathbf{I} \quad (698a)$$

$$\Phi^{Y|V} = \sqrt{\frac{K_Y + k}{k}} \Psi_{(k)}^Y \quad (698b)$$

and

$$\Xi^X = \Psi_{(k)}^X. \quad (699)$$

For the MMSE estimation of U based on S , the MSE is, starting from (688),

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_e^{U|S}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_X), \mathbf{F}_{(k)}) &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) - \epsilon_X^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2} (\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U})^T \mathbf{\Xi}^X\|_F^2 \\ &\geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) - \epsilon_X^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2}\|_s^2 \|\mathbf{\Delta}^{X|U}\|_s^2 \|(\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U})^T \mathbf{\Xi}^X\|_F^2 \end{aligned} \quad (700)$$

$$\geq \text{tr}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_U) - \epsilon_X^2 \|\mathbf{\Lambda}_U^{1/2}\|_s^2 (K_X + k) \quad (701)$$

$$\geq k - \epsilon_X^2 (K_X + k), \quad (702)$$

where to obtain (700) we have used Fact 29, expressing $\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U}$ in terms of its SVD

$$\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U} = \tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U} \mathbf{\Delta}^{X|U} (\mathbf{Q}^{X|U})^T, \quad (703)$$

where the $K_Y \times k$ matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U}$ has orthonormal columns, i.e.,

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U})^T \tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U} = \mathbf{I}, \quad (704)$$

$\mathbf{\Delta}^{X|U}$ is a $k \times k$ diagonal matrix, and $\mathbf{Q}^{X|U}$ is $k \times k$ orthogonal matrix. To obtain (701) we have used that $\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U}$ satisfies (704) and $\mathbf{\Xi}^X$ satisfies (268), Lemma 3, and that

$$\|\mathbf{\Delta}^{X|U}\|_s^2 = \|\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U}\|_s^2 \leq \frac{K_X + k}{k} \quad (705)$$

since U is a Gaussian multi-attribute and so satisfies the property of Definition 77. To obtain (702) we have used the penultimate constraint in (312), which implies that none of the singular values of $\mathbf{\Lambda}_U$ are smaller than unity. Finally, the inequalities leading to the right-hand side of (702) hold with equality when, for example,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_U = \mathbf{I} \quad (706a)$$

$$\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U} = \sqrt{\frac{K_X + k}{k}} \mathbf{\Psi}_{(k)}^X \quad (706b)$$

and $\mathbf{\Xi}^X$ is chosen according to (699).

Via a symmetry argument (corresponding to interchanging the roles of X and Y , and U and V , and noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T$ share the same singular values), it follows that $\lambda_e^{U|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_X}^{K_X}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_X), \mathbf{G}_{(k)})$ is minimized by choosing (706) and

$$\mathbf{\Xi}^Y = \mathbf{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y, \quad (707)$$

and that $\lambda_e^{V|T}(\mathcal{C}_{\epsilon_Y}^{K_Y}(\mathbf{\Lambda}_Y), \mathbf{G}_{(k)})$ is minimized by choosing, for example, (698) and (707). The unique pareto optimality of the choices then follows. Finally, (313) is obtained by combining the characterizations

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{XU} = \epsilon_X \mathbf{\Lambda}_X^{1/2} \mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Lambda}_{YV} = \epsilon_Y \mathbf{\Lambda}_Y^{1/2} \mathbf{\Phi}^{Y|V} \quad (708)$$

with (706b), (698b), and (271). ■

P. Proof of Proposition 83

First, since mutual information is invariant to coordinate transformations, without loss of generality we may choose $\mathbf{\Lambda}_U = \mathbf{\Lambda}_V = \mathbf{I}$, in which case $\tilde{U} = U$ and $\tilde{V} = V$. Then, using

the conditional independencies associated with the Markov chain (301) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV} &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[U V^T | \tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[U | \tilde{X}] \mathbb{E}[V^T | \tilde{Y}]] \\ &= \epsilon_X \epsilon_Y \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U})^T \tilde{X} \tilde{Y}^T \mathbf{\Phi}^{Y|V}] \\ &= \epsilon_X \epsilon_Y (\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{\Phi}^{Y|V}. \end{aligned} \quad (709)$$

Hence, with

$$\tilde{C} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} U \\ V \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{so} \quad \mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{C}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV} \\ \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV}^T & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(U; V) &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\tilde{C}}| \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV}^T| \\ &= \frac{\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2}{2} \|(\mathbf{\Phi}^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2) \end{aligned} \quad (710)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{X|U}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}^{Y|V}\|_s^2 \|\mathbf{\Delta}^{X|U}\|_s^2 \|\mathbf{\Delta}^{Y|V}\|_s^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2) \quad (711)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2}{2} \left(\frac{K_X + k}{k}\right) \left(\frac{K_Y + k}{k}\right) \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2 \epsilon_Y^2), \quad (712)$$

where to obtain (710) we have used (709) with Fact 71, to obtain (711) we have used the SVDs (703) and (695) with (repeatedly) Fact 29, and to obtain (712) we have used both Lemma 3 with (704), and both (705) and (697). Finally, it is straightforward to verify that the inequality (712) is achieved with equality when $\mathbf{\Phi}^{Y|V}$ and $\mathbf{\Phi}^{X|U}$ are chosen according to (698b) and (706b), respectively, which correspond to (313b)–(313c). With these choices, (709) specializes to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{UV} &= \epsilon_X \epsilon_Y \sqrt{\frac{K_X + k}{k}} \sqrt{\frac{K_Y + k}{k}} (\mathbf{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \mathbf{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y \\ &= \epsilon_X \epsilon_Y \sqrt{\frac{K_X + k}{k}} \sqrt{\frac{K_Y + k}{k}} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (294b). ■

Q. Proof of Corollary 84

It suffices to note from Corollary 73 that U and V so constrained correspond to $\epsilon_X(1 + o(1))$ - and $\epsilon_Y(1 + o(1))$ -multi-attributes with

$$\epsilon_X \triangleq \epsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{K_X + k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_Y \triangleq \epsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{K_Y + k}}. \quad (713)$$

In particular, the multi-attribute property (299) specialized to U is obtained via

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Phi^{X|U}\|_s^2 &= \lambda_{\max}((\Phi^{X|U})^T \Phi^{X|U}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\epsilon_X^2} \lambda_{\max}(\Lambda_{XU}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{XU}) \\
&= \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} \|\phi^{X|U_i}\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{K_X + k}{k} (1 + o(1)),
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain the second equality we have used that $\Lambda_U = \mathbf{I}$, and to obtain third equality we have used that $\Lambda_{XU}^T \Lambda_X^{-1} \Lambda_{XU}$ is diagonal. To obtain the inequality, note that with ϵ_X as defined,

$$I(U_i; X) = \epsilon_X^2 \|\phi^{X|U_i}\|^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2) \leq \epsilon^2 = \epsilon_X^2 \left(\frac{K_X + k}{k} \right),$$

whence

$$\|\phi^{X|U_i}\|^2 \leq \frac{K_X + k}{k} (1 + o(1)).$$

The corresponding result for V follows from symmetry. Finally, substituting for ϵ_X and ϵ_Y in the right-hand side of (315) yields (317). ■

R. Proof of Corollary 85

First, (322) holds from the conditional independence in the definition of an attribute. Next, since the variables are jointly Gaussian, it suffices to obtain the associated second moment characterization. In particular, using that $\Phi^{X|U} = \Psi_{(k)}^X$ and (261a) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[U|X] &= \epsilon (\Phi^{X|U})^T \tilde{X} \\
&= \epsilon S_{(k)}^*
\end{aligned} \tag{714}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{U|X} &= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 (\Phi^{X|U})^T \Phi^{X|U} \\
&= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 (\mathbf{F}_{(k)}^*)^T \Lambda_X \mathbf{F}_{(k)}^* \\
&= (1 - \epsilon^2) \mathbf{I},
\end{aligned} \tag{715}$$

whence (323a). And via a symmetry argument (corresponding to interchanging the roles of X and Y , and U and V), we obtain (323b) from (323a).

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{U|S_{(k)}^*, T_{(k)}^*, V}(u|s_{(k)}^*, t_{(k)}^*, v) &= \frac{p_{U,V|S_{(k)}^*, T_{(k)}^*}(u, v|s_{(k)}^*, t_{(k)}^*)}{p_{V|S_{(k)}^*, T_{(k)}^*}(v|s_{(k)}^*, t_{(k)}^*)} \\
&= \frac{p_{U,V|X,Y}(u, v|x, y)}{p_{V|X,Y}(v|x, y)} \\
&= P_{U|X}(u|x) \\
&= p_{U|S_{(k)}^*}(u|s_{(k)}^*).
\end{aligned} \tag{716}$$

verifying (324a), and (324b) follows from symmetry considerations.

Finally, to obtain (325a) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[V|X] &= \epsilon (\Phi^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{X} \\
&= \epsilon (\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{X} \\
&= \epsilon \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T \tilde{X} \\
&= \epsilon \Sigma_{(k)} S_{(k)}^*,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{V|X} &= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 (\Phi^{Y|V})^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \Phi^{Y|V} \\
&= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 (\Psi^Y)^T \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T \Psi^Y \\
&= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi^X)^T \Psi^X \Sigma_{(k)} \\
&= \mathbf{I} - \epsilon^2 \Sigma_{(k)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Via a symmetry argument, we obtain (325b) from (325a). ■

S. Proof of Proposition 86

First, since the constraints on U and V coincide with those of Corollary 84, from the proof of the latter we obtain that U and V are $\epsilon_X(1 + o(1))$ - and $\epsilon_Y(1 + o(1))$ -multi-attributes with ϵ_X and ϵ_Y as given by (713).

As such, for the maximization of $I(U; Y)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(Y; U) &= I(\tilde{Y}; U) \\
&= \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \Phi^{X|U}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{717}$$

$$= \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U} \Delta^{X|U}\|_F^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2) \tag{718}$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U}\|_F^2 \|\Delta^{X|U}\|_s^2 + o(\epsilon_X^2) \tag{719}$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon_X^2}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} \tilde{\Phi}^{X|U}\|_F^2 \left(\frac{K_X + k}{k} \right) + o(\epsilon_X^2) \tag{720}$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \tag{721}$$

where to obtain (717) we have used Lemma 68 with Corollary 73, to obtain (718) we have used the SVD (703), to obtain (719) we have used Fact 29, to obtain (720) we have used the (705), and to obtain (721) we have used Lemma 3 with (704). Finally, it is straightforward to verify that the inequalities all hold with equality when $\Phi^{X|U}$ is chosen according to (706b), which corresponds to (318a).

Via a symmetry argument (corresponding to interchanging the roles of X and Y , and U and V , and noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^T$ share the same singular values), it follows that

$$I(V; X) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2),$$

where the inequality holds with equality when $\Phi^{Y|V}$ is chosen according to (698b), which corresponds (318b). ■

T. Proof of Proposition 87

To simplify the exposition, we first consider the case $K_X = K_Y = K$. First, as defined in (261), $S^* \triangleq S_{(K)}^*$ and $T^* \triangleq S_{(K)}^*$ are invertible transformations of X and Y , respectively, with [cf. (254)]

$$\Lambda_{S^*} = \Lambda_{T^*} = \mathbf{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{T^* S^*} = \Sigma$$

and $S^* \leftrightarrow X \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow Y \leftrightarrow T^*$, a special case of which is

$$S_i^* \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow T_i^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, K. \tag{722}$$

Then

$$I(W; X, Y) = I(W; S^*, T^*) \quad (723)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*, T_i^* | (S^*)^{i-1}, (T^*)^{i-1}) \quad (724)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(S_i^*, T_i^*; W, (S^*)^{i-1}, (T^*)^{i-1}) - \underbrace{I(S_i^*, T_i^*; (S^*)^{i-1}, (T^*)^{i-1})}_{=0} \quad (725)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*, T_i^*) + \underbrace{I((S^*)^{i-1}, (T^*)^{i-1}; S_i^*, T_i^* | W)}_{\geq 0} \quad (726)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*, T_i^*) \quad (727)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*) + I(W; T_i^* | S_i^*) \quad (728)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*) + (I(S_i^*, W; T_i^*) - I(S_i^*; T_i^*)) \quad (729)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W; S_i^*) + I(W; T_i^*) - I(S_i^*; T_i^*) \quad (730)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^K I(\mathbb{E}[S_i^* | W]; S_i^*) + I(\mathbb{E}[T_i^* | W]; T_i^*) - I(S_i^*; T_i^*) \quad (731)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^K R_{S_i^*}(D_{S_i^*}) + R_{T_i^*}(D_{T_i^*}) - I(S_i^*; T_i^*) \quad (732)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \frac{1 - \sigma_i^2}{D_{S_i^*} D_{T_i^*}}, \quad (733)$$

where to obtain (723) we have used the invariance of mutual information to coordinate transformation, to obtain (724) we have used chain rule of mutual information, to obtain (725) we have used the chain rule of mutual information and note that the second term is zero since the S_i^*, T_i^* are independent of $(S^*)^{i-1}, (T^*)^{i-1}$, to obtain (726) we have used the chain rule of mutual information on the first term in (725), to obtain (727) we neglect the second term in (726), to obtain (728) we use the chain rule of mutual information, to obtain (729) we use the chain rule of information on the second term in (728), to obtain (730) we have used (722), to obtain (731) we have used the data processing inequality, and to obtain (732) we have used the definition of the (Gaussian) rate-distortion function (see, e.g., [157, Chapter 13]).

Now

$$D_{S_i^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[(S_i^* - \mathbb{E}[S_i^* | W])^2 \right] = 1 - \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[S_i^* | W]^2 \right]}_{\triangleq \delta_{S_i^*}} \quad (734)$$

$$D_{T_i^*} = \mathbb{E} \left[(T_i^* - \mathbb{E}[T_i^* | W])^2 \right] = 1 - \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[T_i^* | W]^2 \right]}_{\triangleq \delta_{T_i^*}} \quad (735)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[S_i^* T_i^* | W] \right]^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[S_i^* | W] \mathbb{E}[T_i^* | W] \right]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[S_i^* | W]^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}[T_i^* | W]^2 \right] \\ &= \delta_{S_i^*} \delta_{T_i^*}, \end{aligned} \quad (736)$$

where we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Hence, the lower bound (733) is minimized by maximizing $(1 - \delta_{S_i^*})(1 - \delta_{T_i^*})$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, subject to the constraint (736), which is a straightforward exercise, yielding $\delta_{S_i^*} = \delta_{T_i^*} = \sigma_i$, whence

$$I(W; X, Y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \left(\frac{1 + \sigma_i}{1 - \sigma_i} \right).$$

To show that the lower bound is achieved, choose W such that W, X, Y are jointly Gaussian, and let $W \in \mathbb{R}^K$ be zero-mean with $\mathbf{\Lambda}_W = \mathbf{I}$. Finally, choose

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S^*W} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{T^*W} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}. \quad (737)$$

Then using Fact 79, we confirm that with W so defined, $S^* \leftrightarrow W \leftrightarrow T^*$ since

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_{S^*W} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{T^*W}^T = \mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Lambda}_{S^*T^*}.$$

Finally, exploiting the resulting conditional independence structure, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(W; S^*, T^*) &= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W_i; S_i^*, T_i^*) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K I(W_i; S_i^*) + I(W_i; T_i^*) - I(S_i^*; T_i^*) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \left[\log(1 - \lambda_{S_i^* W_i}) + \log(1 - \lambda_{T_i^* W_i}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \log(1 - \lambda_{S_i^* T_i^*}) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \frac{1 - \sigma_i^2}{(1 - \sigma_i)(1 - \sigma_i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \log \frac{1 + \sigma_i}{1 - \sigma_i}. \end{aligned}$$

The extension to the case $K_X \neq K_Y$ is straightforward. In particular, when $K_X \leq K_Y$, we write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{\Psi}_-^Y \mathbf{\Sigma}_- (\mathbf{\Psi}_-^X)^T,$$

where the $K_Y \times K_X$ matrix Ψ_-^Y is formed from the first K_X columns of Ψ^Y , and where the $K_X \times K_X$ matrix Σ_- is formed from the first K_X rows of Σ (the rest being all zeros). In the associated analysis, we then replace (737) with

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{S^*W} &= \Sigma_-^{1/2} \\ \Lambda_{T^*W} &= \Sigma_-^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, when $K_X > K_Y$ we write

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \Psi^Y \tilde{\Sigma}_- (\Psi_-^X)^T,$$

where the $K_X \times K_Y$ matrix Ψ_-^X is formed from the first K_Y columns of Ψ^X , and where the $K_Y \times K_Y$ matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_-$ is formed from the first K_Y columns of Σ (the rest being all zeros). In this case, the associated analysis replaces (737) with

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{S^*W} &= \Sigma_-^{1/2} \\ \Lambda_{T^*W} &= \tilde{\Sigma}_-^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

The result in both cases can be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{XW} &= \Lambda_X^{1/2} \Psi_{(K)}^X \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} \\ \Lambda_{YW} &= \Lambda_Y^{1/2} \Psi_{(K)}^Y \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

and, in turn, (328). ■

U. Proof of Corollary 88

With

$$A^* \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} S^* \\ T^* \end{bmatrix}$$

we have, as a straightforward exercise in linear algebra,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W|X, Y] &= \mathbb{E}[W|S^*, T^*] \\ &= \Lambda_{W, A^*} \Lambda_{A^*}^{-1} A^* \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} & \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \Sigma_{(K)} \\ \Sigma_{(K)} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} S_{(K)}^* \\ T_{(K)}^* \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_{(K)}^* \\ T_{(K)}^* \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{W|X, Y} &= \Lambda_{W|S^*, T^*} \\ &= \mathbf{I} - \Lambda_{W|A^*}^T \Lambda_{A^*}^{-1} \Lambda_{W|A^*} \\ &= \mathbf{I} - 2\Sigma_{(K)} (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{I} - \Sigma_{(K)}) (\mathbf{I} + \Sigma_{(K)})^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

V. Proof of Corollary 89

It suffices to verify that \tilde{W} so defined has $\Lambda_{\tilde{W}X}$ and $\Lambda_{\tilde{W}Y}$ matching (328), i.e., that

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{\tilde{W}X} & \Lambda_{\tilde{W}Y} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{\tilde{W}U} & \Lambda_{\tilde{W}V} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \Lambda_{UV} \\ \Lambda_{UV}^T & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{UX} & \Lambda_{UY} \\ \Lambda_{VX} & \Lambda_{VY} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{WX} & \Lambda_{WY} \end{bmatrix} \quad (738)\end{aligned}$$

holds. But from (318) and (319) with $\epsilon = 1$, and using Fact 79 with (255), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{UX} & \Lambda_{UY} \\ \Lambda_{VX} & \Lambda_{VY} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I} & \Sigma_{(K)} \\ \Sigma_{(K)} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{F}_{(K)}^*)^T \Lambda_X & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & (\mathbf{G}_{(K)}^*)^T \Lambda_Y \end{bmatrix}\end{aligned}$$

and $\Lambda_{UV} = \Sigma_{(K)}$, and from (328) we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{WX} & \Lambda_{WY} \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma_{(K)}^{1/2} \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{F}_{(K)}^*)^T \Lambda_X & (\mathbf{G}_{(K)}^*)^T \Lambda_Y \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, with the choices (334), it follows that (738) holds. ■

W. Proof of Lemma 91

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\|V(y) - V_o(x)\|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{tr} \left((V(y) - V_o(x))(V(y) - V_o(x))^T \right) \right] \\ &= \text{tr} \Lambda_{V(y) - V_o(x)} + \|\mathbb{E}[V(y) - V_o(x)]\|^2 \quad (739) \\ &= \text{tr}(\Lambda_{V|Y}) + \text{tr}(\Lambda_{V|X}) \\ &\quad + \|\mathbb{E}[V|Y = y] - \mathbb{E}[V|X = x]\|^2, \quad (740)\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (739) we have used the trivial identity $\mathbb{E}[ZZ^T] = \Lambda_Z + \mathbb{E}[Z]\mathbb{E}[Z]^T$, and to obtain (740) we have used that $V(y)$ and $V_o(x)$ are independent and distributed according to $P_{V|Y}(\cdot|y)$ and $P_{V|X}(\cdot|x)$, respectively.

Finally, substituting (323b) and (325a) from Corollary 85 into (740), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\|V(y) - V_o(x)\|^2 \right] &= 2k - k\epsilon^2 - \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i^2 + \epsilon^2 \sum_{i=1}^k (g_i(y) - \sigma_i f_i(x))^2\end{aligned}$$

and the lemma follows. ■

X. Proof of Proposition 92

First, we rewrite (349) in the equivalent form

$$(\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^T \tilde{y} = \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T \tilde{x}. \quad (741)$$

■ Next, we note that the objective function $p_Y(y)$ in (350) is a monotonically decreasing function of $\|\tilde{y}\|$, and thus we seek to find the minimum norm solution $\tilde{y}^*(x)$ to (741). Via familiar linear algebra results—see, e.g., [24, Problem 7.3.P9]—the solution follows as

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{y}^*(x) &= (\Psi_{(k)}^Y)^{\dagger T} \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T x \\ &= \Psi_{(k)}^Y \Sigma_{(k)} (\Psi_{(k)}^X)^T \tilde{x}.\end{aligned} \quad (742)$$

Rewriting (742) in terms of y and x and using standard pseudoinverse properties then yields (351). ■

Y. Proof of Proposition 95

We have

$$D(P_{X,Y} \parallel P_{X,Y}^{(k)}) = \|\tilde{\mathbf{B}} - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (743)$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=k+1}^K \sigma_i^2 + o(\epsilon^2), \quad (744)$$

where to obtain (743) we have used Lemma 74 with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ as defined in (248) and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)} \triangleq \Lambda_Y^{-1/2} \Lambda_{YX}^{(k)} \Lambda_X^{-1/2}, \quad (745)$$

and to obtain (744) we have used Lemma 55 together with the fact that $\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)}) \leq k$ since $\text{rank}(\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)}) \leq k$ and Λ_X and Λ_Y are positive definite. Finally, it is straightforward to verify that the inequality (744) holds with equality when $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_*^{(k)}$, with $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_*$ as given in (294). ■

Z. Proof of Proposition 96

First, with the gain matrix [cf. (242)] $\Gamma_{Y|X} = \Lambda_{YX} \Lambda_X^{-1}$ we rewrite the optimization in (359a) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k} \mathbb{E}_{P_{X,Y}} \left[\|Y - \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} X\|^2 \right] \\ &= \arg \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k} \left(\mathbb{E}_{P_{X,Y}} \left[\|Y - \Gamma_{Y|X} X\|^2 \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\|(\Gamma_{Y|X} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) X\|^2 \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (746)$$

$$= \arg \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k} \mathbb{E}_{P_X} \left[\|(\Gamma_{Y|X} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) X\|^2 \right] \quad (747)$$

$$= \arg \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k} \|(\Gamma_{Y|X} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \Lambda_X^{1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (748)$$

where to obtain (746) we have used the orthogonal properties of the error in the MMSE estimate, and to obtain (747) we have used that the first term does not depend on $\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}$.

In turn, with

$$\mathbf{A} \triangleq \Gamma_{Y|X} \Lambda_X^{1/2} = \Lambda_{YX} \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \triangleq \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} \Lambda_X^{1/2}, \quad (749)$$

we can rewrite (748) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k} \|(\Gamma_{Y|X} - \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \Lambda_X^{1/2}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &= \min_{\tilde{\mathbf{A}} : \text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \leq k} \|\mathbf{A} - \tilde{\mathbf{A}}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (750)$$

since $\text{rank}(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \leq k$ if and only if $\text{rank}(\tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}) \leq k$ since Λ_X is nonsingular. Hence, with the SVD for \mathbf{A} expressed in the form (359c), it follows from Lemma 55 that the minimum on the right-hand side of (750) is achieved by the choice

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^Y \tilde{\Sigma}_{(k)} (\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\text{T}} = \mathbf{A} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X (\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\text{T}},$$

i.e., using (749),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X} &= \Lambda_{YX} \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X (\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\text{T}} \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \\ &= \Lambda_{YX} \left((\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\text{T}} \Lambda_X^{1/2} \right)^{\dagger} (\tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\text{T}} \Lambda_X^{-1/2} \\ &= \left(\Lambda_X^{-1/2} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X (\Lambda_X^{1/2} \tilde{\Psi}_{(k)}^X)^{\dagger} \Lambda_{XY} \right)^{\text{T}} \end{aligned}$$

where we obtain the second and third equalities using standard pseudoinverse properties. Finally, since

$$\Lambda_{XY}^{(k)\circ} = \Lambda_X \tilde{\Gamma}_{Y|X}^{\text{T}},$$

we obtain (359). ■

REFERENCES

- [1] S.-L. Huang, A. Makur, L. Zheng, and G. W. Wornell, "An information-theoretic approach to universal feature selection in high-dimensional inference," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Aachen, Germany, Jun. 2017.
- [2] S.-L. Huang, A. Makur, G. W. Wornell, and L. Zheng, "An information-theoretic view of learning in high dimensions: Universal features, maximal correlations, bottlenecks, and common information," in *Inform. Theory Appl. Workshop (ITA)*, San Diego, CA, Feb. 2018.
- [3] S.-L. Huang, G. W. Wornell, and L. Zheng, "Gaussian universal features, canonical correlations, and common information," in *Proc. Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Guangzhou, China, Nov. 2018.
- [4] H. O. Hirschfeld, "A connection between correlation and contingency," *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, vol. 31, pp. 520–524, 1935.
- [5] S.-L. Huang and L. Zheng, "Linear information coupling problems," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Cambridge, MA, Jul. 2012.
- [6] S. Borade and L. Zheng, "Euclidean information theory," in *Proc. Int. Zurich Seminar Commun. (IZS)*, Zurich, Switzerland, Mar. 2008.
- [7] A. Makur, F. Kozynski, S.-L. Huang, and L. Zheng, "An efficient algorithm for information decomposition and extraction," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2015.
- [8] K. Pearson, "On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space," *Phil. Mag.*, vol. 2, no. 11, pp. 559–572, 1901.
- [9] —, *On the Theory of Contingency and Its Relation to Association and Normal Correlation*, ser. Drapers' Company Research Memoirs, Biometric Series, I. Mathematical Contributions to the Theory of Evolution. London, England: Dulau and Co., 1904.
- [10] H. O. Lancaster, "A reconciliation of χ^2 , considered from metrical and enumerative aspects," *Sankhyā*, vol. 13, no. 1–2, pp. 1–10, Dec. 1953.
- [11] —, "The structure of bivariate distributions," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 29, pp. 719–736, 1958.
- [12] H. Gebelein, "Das statistische problem der korrelation als variations- und eigenwertproblem und sein zusammenhang mit der ausgleichsrechnung," *Z. Angewandte Math., Mech.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 364–379, 1941.
- [13] A. Rényi, "On measures of dependence," *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, vol. 10, no. 3–4, pp. 441–451, Sep. 1959.
- [14] J. P. Benzécri, *L'Analyse des Données, Tôme 2: L'Analyse des Correspondances*. Paris, France: Dunod, 1973.
- [15] —, *Correspondence Analysis Handbook*. New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, 1992.
- [16] M. Greenacre, *Theory and Applications of Correspondence Analysis*. London, UK: Academic Press, 1984.
- [17] L. Lebart, A. Morineau, and K. Warwick, *Multivariate Descriptive Statistical Analysis*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 1984.
- [18] F. du Pin Calmon, A. Makhdoumi, M. Médard, M. Varia, M. Christiansen, and K. R. Duffy, "Principal inertia components and applications," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 5011–5038, Aug. 2017.
- [19] A. Gifi, *Nonlinear Multivariate Analysis*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 1990.
- [20] G. Michailidis and J. de Leeuw, "The Gifi system of descriptive multivariate analysis," *Stat. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 307–336, 1998.
- [21] B. Le Roux and H. Rouanet, *Geometric Data Analysis: From Correspondence Analysis to Structured Data*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer, 2004.
- [22] S. Nishisato, *Multivariate Nonlinear Descriptive Analysis*. London, UK: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
- [23] M. Greenacre, *Correspondence Analysis in Practice*, 3rd ed. New York, NY: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2016.

- [24] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [25] A. S. Lewis, “The convex analysis of unitarily invariant matrix functions,” *J. Convex Anal.*, vol. 2, no. 1/2, pp. 173–183, 1995.
- [26] J. Neyman, “Contribution to the theory of the χ^2 test,” in *Proc. Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. Prob.*, Berkeley, CA, 1949, pp. 239–273.
- [27] C. Spearman, “‘General intelligence,’ objectively determined and measured,” *Amer. J. Psychol.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 201–292, Apr. 1904.
- [28] C. M. Bishop, “Latent variable models,” in *Learning in Graphical Models*, M. I. Jordan, Ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999, pp. 371–403.
- [29] A. P. Dawid, “Spherical matrix distributions and a multivariate model,” *J. Roy. Stat. Soc., Ser. B*, vol. 39, pp. 254–261, 1977.
- [30] M. A. Chmielewski, “Elliptically symmetric distributions: A review and bibliography,” *Int. Stat. Review*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 67–74, Apr. 1981.
- [31] N. Tishby, F. C. Pereira, and W. Bialek, “The information bottleneck method,” *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, pp. 368–377, Oct. 1999.
- [32] N. Slonim and N. Tishby, “Document clustering using word clusters via the information bottleneck method,” in *Proc. Int. Conf. Res., Dev. Inform. Retrieval (ACM SIGIR)*. Athens, Greece: ACM, Jul. 2000, pp. 208–215.
- [33] N. Tishby and N. Slonim, “Data clustering by Markovian relaxation and the information bottleneck method,” in *Advances Neural Inform. Process. Syst. (NIPS)*, Denver, CO, Dec. 2000, pp. 619–625.
- [34] R. Ahlswede and P. Gacs, “Spreading of sets in product spaces and hypercontraction of the Markov operator,” *Ann. Prob.*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 925–939, Dec. 1976.
- [35] P. Biswal, “Hypercontractivity and its applications,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1101.2913, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.2913>
- [36] S. Kamath and V. Anantharam, “Non-interactive simulation of joint distributions: The Hirschfeld-Gebelein-Rényi maximal correlation and the hypercontractivity ribbon,” in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2012.
- [37] G. R. Kumar and T. A. Courtade, “Which Boolean functions are most informative?” in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Istanbul, Turkey, Jul. 2013.
- [38] V. Anantharam, A. A. Gohari, S. Kamath, and C. Nair, “On hypercontractivity and the mutual information between Boolean functions,” in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2013.
- [39] —, “On maximal correlation, hypercontractivity, and the data processing inequality studied by Erkip and Cover,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1304.6133, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.6133>
- [40] V. Anantharam, A. Gohari, S. Kamath, and C. Nair, “On hypercontractivity and a data processing inequality,” in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Honolulu, HI, Jun. 2014.
- [41] A. Makur and L. Zheng, “Bounds between contraction coefficients,” in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2015.
- [42] —, “Linear bounds between contraction coefficients for f -divergences,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1510.01844, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.01844>
- [43] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu, “Strong data-processing inequalities for channels and Bayesian networks,” in *Convexity and Concentration*, ser. The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, E. Carlen, M. Madiman, and E. M. Werner, Eds., vol. 161. New York, NY: Springer, 2017, pp. 211–249.
- [44] P. Gács and J. Körner, “Common information is far less than mutual information,” *Probl. Contr. Inform. Theory*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 149–162, 1973.
- [45] H. S. Witsenhausen, “On sequences of pairs of dependent random variables,” *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 100–113, Jan. 1975.
- [46] A. D. Wyner, “The common information of two dependent random variables,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 163–179, Mar. 1975.
- [47] G. H. Golub and C. F. V. Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.
- [48] B. Recht, M. Fazel, and P. A. Parillo, “Guaranteed minimum-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via nuclear norm minimization,” *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 471–501, 2010.
- [49] F. Bach, J. Mairal, and J. Ponce, “Convex sparse matrix factorizations,” CNRS, Paris, France, Tech. Rep. HAL-00345747, 2008.
- [50] Y. Saad, *Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems*, 2nd ed. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 2011.
- [51] L. N. Trefethen and I. D. Bau, *Numerical Linear Algebra*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM, 1997.
- [52] L. Breiman and J. H. Friedman, “Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression and correlation,” *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, vol. 80, no. 391, pp. 580–598, Sep. 1985.
- [53] D. Wang and M. Murphy, “Estimating optimal transformations for multiple regression using the ACE algorithm,” *J. Data Science*, vol. 2, pp. 329–346, 2004.
- [54] D. V. Gokhale, “Iterative maximum likelihood estimation for discrete distributions,” *Sankhyā B*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 293–298, Sep. 1973.
- [55] R. W. M. Wedderburn, “Generalized linear models specified in terms of constraints,” *J. Roy. Stat. Soc., Ser. B*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 449–454, 1974.
- [56] M. Haber, “Maximum likelihood methods for linear and log-linear models in categorical data,” *Comp. Stat., Data Anal.*, vol. 3, pp. 1–10, May 1985.
- [57] S.-L. Huang and X. Xu, “On the sample complexity of HGR maximal correlation functions,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1907.00393, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.00393>
- [58] P. Melville and V. Sindhvani, “Recommender systems,” in *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning and Data Mining*, C. Sammut and G. I. Webb, Eds. Boston, MA: Springer, 2017, pp. 1056–1066.
- [59] D. Goldberg, D. Nichols, B. M. Oki, and D. Terry, “Using collaborative filtering to weave an information tapestry,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 12, pp. 61–70, Dec. 1992.
- [60] N. Srebro, “Learning with matrix factorizations,” Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA, Aug. 2004.
- [61] Y. Koren, R. Bell, and C. Volinsky, “Matrix factorization techniques for recommender systems,” *Computer*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 30–37, Aug. 2009.
- [62] A. Rohde and A. B. Tsybakov, “Estimation of high-dimensional low-rank matrices,” *Ann. Stat.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 887–930, Apr. 2011.
- [63] E. J. Candès and B. Recht, “Exact matrix completion via convex optimization,” *Foundations Comput. Math.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 717–772, 2009.
- [64] R. H. Keshavan, A. Montanari, and S. Oh, “Matrix completion from a few entries,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2980–2998, Jun. 2010.
- [65] E. J. Candès and T. Tao, “The power of convex relaxation: Near-optimal matrix completion,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2054–2080, May 2010.
- [66] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, “Matrix completion with noise,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 98, no. 6, pp. 925–936, Jun. 2010.
- [67] A. Ganesh, J. Wright, X. Li, E. Candès, and Y. Ma, “Dense error correction for low-rank matrices via principal component pursuit,” in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Austin, TX, Jun. 2010.
- [68] N. Vaswani, T. Bouwmans, S. Javed, and P. Narayanamurthy, “Robust subspace learning: Robust PCA, robust subspace tracking, and robust subspace recovery,” *IEEE Signal Processing Mag.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 32–55, Jul. 2018.
- [69] J. Bennett and S. Lanning, “The Netflix Prize,” in *Proc. KDD Cup and Workshop*, San Jose, CA, Aug. 2007.
- [70] C. Eckart and G. Young, “The approximation of one matrix by another of lower rank,” *Psychometrika*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 211–218, Sep. 1936.
- [71] G. W. Stewart, “On the early history of the singular value decomposition,” *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 551–566, Dec. 1993.
- [72] E. Schmidt, “Zur theorie der linearen und nichtlinearen integralgleichungen. I. Teil: Entwicklung willkürlicher funktionen nach systemen vorgeschriebener,” *Math. Ann.*, vol. 63, pp. 433–476, 1907.
- [73] K. W. Church and P. Hanks, “Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography,” *J. Comput. Linguist.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 22–29, Mar. 1990.
- [74] T. S. Han and S. Verdú, “Approximation theory of output statistics,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 752–772, May 1993.
- [75] T. Mikolov, K. Chen, G. Corrado, and J. Dean, “Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1301.3781, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781>
- [76] O. Levy and Y. Goldberg, “Neural word embedding as implicit matrix factorization,” in *Advances Neural Inform. Process. Syst. (NIPS)*, Montréal, Canada, Dec. 2014, pp. 2177–2185.
- [77] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. New York, NY: Springer, 2006.

- [78] D. R. Cox, "The regression analysis of binary sequences (with discussion)," *J. Roy. Stat. Soc., Ser. B*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 215–242, 1958.
- [79] G. Cybenko, "Approximation by superpositions of a sigmoidal function," *Math. Control, Signals, Systems*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 303–314, 1989.
- [80] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White, "Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 359–366, 1989.
- [81] A. R. Barron, "Universal approximation bounds for superpositions of a sigmoidal function," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 930–945, May 1993.
- [82] M. Minsky and S. Papert, *Perceptrons*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969.
- [83] I. Goodfellow, J. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep Learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2017.
- [84] N. Tishby and N. Zaslavsky, "Deep learning and the information bottleneck principle," in *Proc. Inform. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Jerusalem, Israel, Apr. 2015.
- [85] —, "Deep learning and the information bottleneck principle," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1503.02406, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02406>
- [86] A. A. Alemi, I. Fischer, J. V. Dillon, and K. Murphy, "Deep variational information bottleneck," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1612.00410, 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.00410>
- [87] R. Shwartz-Ziv and N. Tishby, "Opening the black box of deep neural networks via information," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1703.00810, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.00810>
- [88] A. Achille and S. Soatto, "On the emergence of invariance and disentangling in deep representations," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1706.01350, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.01350>
- [89] D. J. Miller, A. Rao, K. Rose, and A. Gersho, "An information-theoretic learning algorithm for neural network classification," in *Advances Neural Inform. Process. Syst. (NIPS)*, Denver, CO, Dec. 1996, pp. 591–597.
- [90] J. M. Vegas and P. J. Zufiria, "Generalized neural networks for spectral analysis: Dynamics and Liapunov functions," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 233–245, Mar. 2004.
- [91] G. K. Dziugaite and D. M. Roy, "Neural network matrix factorization," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1511.06443, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06443>
- [92] H. Hotelling, "Relations between two sets of variates," *Biometrika*, vol. 28, pp. 321–377, 1936.
- [93] D. R. Hardoon, S. Szedmak, and J. Shawe-Taylor, "Canonical correlation analysis: An overview with application to learning methods," *Neural Comput.*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 2639–2664, Dec. 2004.
- [94] W. K. Härdle and L. Simar, *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2012, ch. Canonical Correlation Analysis, pp. 385–395.
- [95] H. Hotelling, "Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components," *J. Ed. Psych.*, vol. 24, pp. 417–441, 498–520, 1933.
- [96] I. T. Jolliffe, *Principal Component Analysis*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer, 2002.
- [97] E. Abbe and L. Zheng, "A coordinate system for Gaussian networks," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 721–733, Feb. 2012.
- [98] A. Makur and L. Zheng, "Polynomial spectral decomposition of conditional expectation operators," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Sep. 2016.
- [99] —, "Polynomial singular value decompositions of a family of source-channel models," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 7716–7728, Dec. 2017.
- [100] H. O. Lancaster, *The Chi-Squared Distribution*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1969.
- [101] T. W. Anderson, *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*, 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2003.
- [102] A. Bastlevisky, *Statistical Factor Analysis and Related Methods*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 1994.
- [103] G. Chechik, A. Globerson, N. Tishby, and Y. Weiss, "Information bottleneck for Gaussian variables," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 6, pp. 165–188, May 2005.
- [104] S. Satpathy and P. Cuff, "Gaussian secure source coding and Wyner's common information," in *Proc. Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, Hong Kong, China, Jun. 2015.
- [105] O. Ledoit and M. Wolf, "A well-conditioned estimator for large-dimensional covariance matrices," *J. Multivariate Anal.*, vol. 88, pp. 365–411, 2004.
- [106] W. James and C. Stein, "Estimation with quadratic loss," in *Proc. Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.*, Berkeley, CA, 1961, pp. 361–379.
- [107] S. Negahban and M. J. Wainwright, "Estimation of (near) low-rank matrices with noise and high-dimensional scaling," *Ann. Stat.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 1069–1097, Apr. 2011.
- [108] G. Young, "Maximum likelihood estimation and factor analysis," *Psychometrika*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 49–53, Feb. 1940.
- [109] C. R. Rao, *Linear Statistical Inference and its Applications*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1965.
- [110] D. R. Brillinger, *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory*. New York, NY: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- [111] A. J. Izenman, "Reduced-rank regression for the multivariate linear model," *J. Multivariate Anal.*, vol. 5, pp. 248–264, 1975.
- [112] E. Oja, "A simplified neuron model as a principal component analyzer," *J. Math. Biology*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 267–273, Nov. 1982.
- [113] P. Baldi and K. Hornik, "Neural networks and principal component analysis: Learning from examples without local minima," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 53–58, 1989.
- [114] E. Oja, "Principal components, minor components, and linear neural networks," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 927–935, Nov-Dec. 1992.
- [115] J. Kay, "Canonical correlation analysis using a neural network," in *Proc. Symp. Comp. Stat. (COMPSTAT)*, Neuchâtel, Switzerland, Aug. 1992, pp. 305–308.
- [116] S. Akaho, "A kernel method for canonical correlation analysis," in *Proc. Int. Meeting Psychometric Soc. (IMPS2001)*, Osaka, Japan, 2001.
- [117] G. Andrew, R. Arora, J. Bilmes, and K. Livescu, "Deep canonical correlation analysis," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Machine Learning (ICML)*, vol. 28, no. 3, Atlanta, GA, Jun. 2013, pp. 1247–1255.
- [118] T. Michaeli, W. Wang, and K. Livescu, "Nonparametric canonical correlation analysis," in *Proc. Int. Conf. Machine Learning (ICML)*, New York, NY, Jun. 2016.
- [119] A. Benton, H. Khayrallah, B. Gujral, D. Reisinger, S. Zhang, and R. Arora, "Deep generalized canonical correlation analysis," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1702.02519, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.02519>
- [120] M. A. Kramer, "Nonlinear principal component analysis using autoassociative neural networks," *AIChe J.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 233–243, Feb. 1991.
- [121] G. Licciardi, P. R. Marpu, J. Chanussot, and J. A. Benediktsson, "Linear versus nonlinear PCA for the classification of hyperspectral data based on the extended morphological profiles," *IEEE Geosci., Remote Sensing Lett.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 447–451, May 2012.
- [122] A. Painsky, M. Feder, and N. Tishby, "An information-theoretic framework for non-linear canonical correlation analysis," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1810.13259, 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.13259>
- [123] J. Karhunen, E. Oja, L. Wang, R. Vigário, and J. Joutsensalo, "A class of neural networks for independent component analysis," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 486–504, May 1997.
- [124] E. Oja, "The nonlinear PCA learning rule in independent component analysis," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 25–45, Sep. 1997.
- [125] T.-W. Lee, M. Girolami, A. J. Bell, and T. J. Sejnowski, "A unifying information-theoretic framework for independent component analysis," *Comput., Math., Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 11, pp. 1–21, Jun. 2000.
- [126] A. Painsky, S. Rosset, and M. Feder, "Generalized independent component analysis over finite alphabets," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1508.04934, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.04934>
- [127] —, "Binary independent component analysis: Theory, bounds and algorithms," in *Int. Workshop, Machine Learning, Signal Processing (MLSP)*, Vietri sul Mare, Italy, Sep. 2016.
- [128] A. Painsky, "Generalized independent components analysis over finite alphabets," Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel, Sep. 2016.
- [129] O. Chapelle, B. Schölkopf, and A. Zien, Eds., *Semi-Supervised Learning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.
- [130] H. Scudder, "Probability of error of some adaptive pattern-recognition machines," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 363–371, Jul. 1965.
- [131] K. Pearson, "Contributions to the mathematical theory of evolution," *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London, A*, vol. 185, pp. 71–110, 1894.
- [132] R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork, *Pattern Classification*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Wiley, 2000.
- [133] S. Basu, M. Bilenko, A. Banerjee, and R. Mooney, "Probabilistic semi-supervised clustering with constraints," in *Semi-Supervised Learning*, O. Chapelle, B. Schölkopf, and A. Zien, Eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006, ch. 5, pp. 73–102.
- [134] A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin, "Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm," *J. Roy. Stat. Soc., B*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 1–38, 1977.

- [135] A. Gersho and R. Gray, *Vector Quantization and Signal Compression*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Press, 1991.
- [136] D. Qiu, A. Makur, and L. Zheng, "Probabilistic clustering using maximal matrix norm couplings," in *Proc. Allerton Conf. Commun., Contr., Computing*, Monticello, IL, Oct. 2018.
- [137] L. K. Saul, K. Q. Weinberger, F. Sha, J. Ham, and D. D. Lee, "Spectral methods for dimensionality reduction," in *Semi-Supervised Learning*, O. Chapelle, B. Schölkopf, and A. Zien, Eds. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006, ch. 16, pp. 293–308.
- [138] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. J. C. Burges, "MNIST handwritten digit database," <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>, retrieved 2017.
- [139] T. Zhang, R. Ramakrishnan, and M. Livny, "BIRCH: An efficient data clustering method for very large databases," in *Proc. ACM Conf. Management Data (SIGMOD)*, Montréal, Canada, Jun. 1996, pp. 103–114.
- [140] M. Kumar, A. Gramfort, and J. Nothman, "Machine Learning in Python code for BIRCH scikit-learn.sklearn.cluster.birch," <https://github.com/scikit-learn/scikit-learn/blob/a24c8b46/sklearn/cluster/birch.py>, version 0.18.1 (2017-09-02).
- [141] C. Cortes and V. Vapnik, "Support-vector networks," *Machine Learning*, vol. 20, pp. 273–297, Sep. 1995.
- [142] Y. LeCun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner, "Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2278–2324, Nov. 1998.
- [143] A. Berman and R. J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*, ser. Classics in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), 1994.
- [144] A. L. Gibbs and F. E. Su, "On choosing and bounding probability metrics," *Int. Stat. Rev.*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 419–435, 2002.
- [145] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [146] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, 2nd ed., ser. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability. New York, NY: Springer, 1998, vol. 38.
- [147] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, "A probabilistic and RIPless theory of compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 7235–7254, Nov. 2011.
- [148] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [149] J. A. Tropp, "User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices," *Found. Comp. Math.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 389–434, Aug. 2012.
- [150] G. W. Stewart, "Perturbation theory for the singular value decomposition," in *SVD and Signal Processing, II: Algorithms, Analysis and Applications*, R. J. Vaccaro, Ed. Elsevier, 1991, pp. 99–109.
- [151] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- [152] I. Csiszár and P. C. Shields, "Information theory and statistics: A tutorial," *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 417–528, 2004.
- [153] I. Csiszár, "A class of measures of informativity of observation channels," *Periodica Math. Hungarica*, vol. 2, no. 1–4, pp. 191–213, 1972.
- [154] F. G. Mehler, "Ueber die entwicklung einer function von beliebig vielen variablen nach Laplaceschen functionen höherer ordnung," *J. Reine, Angewandte Math.*, vol. 66, pp. 161–176, 1866.
- [155] W. F. Kibble, "An extension of a theorem of Mehler's on Hermite polynomials," *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 12–15, Jun. 1945.
- [156] D. Slepian, "On the symmetrized Kronecker power of a matrix and extensions of Mehler's formula for Hermite polynomials," *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 606–616, 1972.
- [157] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1991.