



**VICTORIA UNIVERSITY**  
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

*Some New Inequalities for Hermite-Hadamard  
Divergence in Information Theory*

This is the Published version of the following publication

Barnett, Neil S, Cerone, Pietro and Dragomir, Sever S (2000) Some New Inequalities for Hermite-Hadamard Divergence in Information Theory. RGMIA research report collection, 5 (4).

The publisher's official version can be found at

Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/17786/>

# SOME NEW INEQUALITIES FOR HERMITE-HADAMARD DIVERGENCE IN INFORMATION THEORY

N.S. BARNETT, P. CERONE, AND S.S DRAGOMIR

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove some new inequalities for Hermite-Hadamard divergence in Information Theory.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the important issues in many applications of Probability Theory is finding an appropriate measure of *distance* (or *difference* or *discrimination*) between two probability distributions. A number of divergence measures for this purpose have been proposed and extensively studied by Jeffreys [1], Kullback and Leibler [2], Rényi [3], Havrda and Charvat [4], Kapur [5], Sharma and Mittal [6], Burbea and Rao [7], Rao [8], Lin [9], Csiszár [10], Ali and Silvey [12], Vajda [13], Shioya and Da-te [40] and others (see for example [5] and the references therein).

These measures have been applied in a variety of fields such as: anthropology [8], genetics [14], finance, economics, and political science [15], [16], [17], biology [18], the analysis of contingency tables [19], approximation of probability distributions [20], [21], signal processing [22], [23] and pattern recognition [24], [25]. A number of these measures of distance are specific cases of  $f$ -divergence and so further exploration of this concept will have a flow on effect to other measures of distance and to areas in which they are applied.

Let the set  $\chi$  and the  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$  be given and consider the set of all probability densities on  $\mu$  to be defined on  $\Omega := \{p|p : \chi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p(x) \geq 0, \int p(x) d\mu(x) = 1\}$ . The Kullback-Leibler divergence [2] is well known among the  $\chi$  information divergences. It is defined as:

$$(1.1) \quad D_{KL}(p, q) := \int_{\chi} p(x) \log \left[ \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega,$$

where  $\log$  is to base 2.

In Information Theory and Statistics, various divergences are applied in addition to the Kullback-Leibler divergence. These are the: *variation distance*  $D_v$ , *Hellinger distance*  $D_H$  [1],  $\chi^2$ -*divergence*  $D_{\chi^2}$ ,  $\alpha$ -*divergence*  $D_{\alpha}$ , *Bhattacharyya distance*  $D_B$  [2], *Harmonic distance*  $D_{Ha}$ , *Jeffreys distance*  $D_J$  [1], *triangular discrimination*  $D_{\Delta}$  [35], etc... They are defined as follows:

$$(1.2) \quad D_v(p, q) := \int_{\chi} |p(x) - q(x)| d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

---

*Date:* March 20, 2000.

*1991 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 94Xxx; Secondary 26D15.

*Key words and phrases.* Divergence measures in Information Theory.

$$(1.3) \quad D_H(p, q) := \int_{\chi} \left| \sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)} \right| d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.4) \quad D_{\chi^2}(p, q) := \int_{\chi} p(x) \left[ \left( \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right)^2 - 1 \right] d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.5) \quad D_{\alpha}(p, q) := \frac{4}{1 - \alpha^2} \left[ 1 - \int_{\chi} [p(x)]^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} [q(x)]^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} d\mu(x) \right], \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.6) \quad D_B(p, q) := \int_{\chi} \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.7) \quad D_{Ha}(p, q) := \int_{\chi} \frac{2p(x)q(x)}{p(x)+q(x)} d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.8) \quad D_J(p, q) := \int_{\chi} [p(x) - q(x)] \ln \left[ \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega;$$

$$(1.9) \quad D_{\Delta}(p, q) := \int_{\chi} \frac{[p(x) - q(x)]^2}{p(x) + q(x)} d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega.$$

For other divergence measures, see the paper [5] by Kapur or the book on line [6] by Taneja. For a comprehensive collection of preprints available on line, see the RGMIA web site <http://rgmia.vu.edu.au/papersinfth.html>

Csiszár  $f$ -divergence is defined as follows [10]

$$(1.10) \quad D_f(p, q) := \int_{\chi} p(x) f \left[ \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right] d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega,$$

where  $f$  is convex on  $(0, \infty)$ . It is assumed that  $f(u)$  is zero and strictly convex at  $u = 1$ . By appropriately defining this convex function, various divergences are derived. All the above distances (1.1)–(1.9), are particular instances of  $f$ -divergence. There are also many others that are not in this class (see for example [5] or [6]). For the basic properties of  $f$ -divergence see [7]–[10].

In [11], Lin and Wong (see also [9]) introduced the following divergence

$$(1.11) \quad D_{LW}(p, q) := \int_{\chi} p(x) \log \left[ \frac{p(x)}{\frac{1}{2}p(x) + \frac{1}{2}q(x)} \right] d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega.$$

This can be represented as follows, using the Kullback-Leibler divergence:

$$D_{LW}(p, q) = D_{KL} \left( p, \frac{1}{2}p + \frac{1}{2}q \right).$$

Lin and Wong have established the following inequalities

$$(1.12) \quad D_{LW}(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(p, q);$$

$$(1.13) \quad D_{LW}(p, q) + D_{LW}(q, p) \leq D_v(p, q) \leq 2;$$

$$(1.14) \quad D_{LW}(p, q) \leq 1.$$

In [45], Shioya and Da-te improved (1.12) – (1.14) by showing that

$$D_{LW}(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} D_v(p, q) \leq 1.$$

In the same paper [45], the authors introduced the generalised Lin-Wong  $f$ -divergence  $D_f(p, \frac{1}{2}p + \frac{1}{2}q)$  and the Hermite-Hadamard ( $HH$ ) divergence

$$(1.15) \quad D_{HH}^f(p, q) := \int_{\chi} p(x) \frac{\int_1^{\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}} f(t) dt}{\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} - 1} d\mu(x), \quad p, q \in \Omega$$

and, by use of the Hermite-Hadamard inequality for convex functions, proved the following basic inequality

$$(1.16) \quad D_f\left(p, \frac{1}{2}p + \frac{1}{2}q\right) \leq D_{HH}^f(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2}D_f(p, q),$$

provided that  $f$  is convex and normalised, i.e.,  $f(1) = 0$ .

In this paper we point out new inequalities for the  $HH$ -divergence, which also improve the above result (1.16).

For classical and new results in comparing different kinds of divergence measures, see the papers [1]-[45] where further references are given.

## 2. THE RESULTS

In the following, we assume everywhere that the mapping  $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is convex and normalised.

The following result holds.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $p, q \in \mathcal{I}$ , then we have the inequality,*

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_f\left(p, \frac{1}{2}p + \frac{1}{2}q\right) \\ & \leq \lambda D_f\left(p, p + \frac{\lambda}{2}(q-p)\right) + (1-\lambda) D_f\left(p, \frac{p+q}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}(q-p)\right) \\ & \leq D_{HH}^f(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} [D_f(p, (1-\lambda)p + \lambda q) + (1-\lambda) D_f(p, q)] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} D_f(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* First, the following refinement of the Hermite-Hadamard inequality is proved.

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) \\ & \leq \lambda f\left(a + \lambda \cdot \frac{b-a}{2}\right) + (1-\lambda) f\left(\frac{a+b}{2} + \lambda \cdot \frac{b-a}{2}\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(u) du \leq \frac{1}{2} [f((1-\lambda)a + \lambda b) + \lambda f(a) + (1-\lambda) f(b)] \\ & \leq \frac{f(a) + f(b)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

Applying the Hermite-Hadamard inequality on each subinterval  $[a, (1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b]$ ,  $[(1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b, b]$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & f\left(\frac{a + (1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b}{2}\right) \times [(1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b - a] \\ \leq & \int_a^{(1-\lambda)a+\lambda b} f(u) du \\ \leq & \frac{f((1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b) + f(a)}{2} \times [(1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b - a] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & f\left(\frac{(1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b + b}{2}\right) \times [b - (1 - \lambda)a - \lambda b] \\ \leq & \int_{(1-\lambda)a+\lambda b}^b f(u) du \\ \leq & \frac{f(b) + f((1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b)}{2} \times [b - (1 - \lambda)a - \lambda b], \end{aligned}$$

which are clearly equivalent to

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda f\left(a + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right) & \leq \frac{1}{b - a} \int_a^{(1-\lambda)a+\lambda b} f(u) du \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda f((1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b) + \lambda f(a)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 - \lambda) f\left(\frac{a + b}{2} + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right) \\ \leq & \frac{1}{b - a} \int_{(1-\lambda)a+\lambda b}^b f(u) du \\ \leq & \frac{(1 - \lambda) f(b) + (1 - \lambda) f((1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

Summing (2.3) and (2.4), we obtain the second and first inequality in (2.2).

By the convexity property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda f\left(a + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right) + (1 - \lambda) f\left(\frac{a + b}{2} + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right) \\ \geq & f\left[\lambda\left(a + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right) + (1 - \lambda)\left(\frac{a + b}{2} + \lambda \cdot \frac{b - a}{2}\right)\right] \\ = & f\left(\frac{a + b}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and the first inequality in (2.1) is proved.

The latter inequality is obvious by the convexity property of  $f$ .

Now, if we choose  $a = 1$  and  $b = \frac{q(x)}{p(x)}$ ,  $x \in \chi$ , in (2.2) and multiply by  $p(x) \geq 0$ ,  $x \in \chi$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& p(x) f\left(\frac{p(x) + q(x)}{2p(x)}\right) \\
\leq & \lambda p(x) f\left(\frac{p(x) + \lambda(q(x) - p(x))}{2p(x)}\right) \\
& + (1 - \lambda) p(x) f\left(\frac{p(x) + q(x)}{2p(x)} + \frac{\lambda(q(x) - p(x))}{2p(x)}\right) \\
\leq & \frac{p^2(x)}{q(x) - p(x)} \int_1^{\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}} f(u) du \\
\leq & \frac{1}{2} \left[ f\left(\frac{(1 - \lambda)p(x) + \lambda q(x)}{p(x)}\right) p(x) + \lambda p(x) f(1) + (1 - \lambda) p(x) f\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right) \right] \\
\leq & \frac{p(x) f(1) + p(x) f\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Integrating on  $\chi$  and taking into account the definition of  $f$ -divergence (1.10) and the Hermite-Hadamard divergence (1.15), we obtain (2.1). ■

**Remark 1.** If  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda = 1$ , then by (2.1), we obtain the inequality (1.16).

**Corollary 1.** Let  $p, q \in \Omega$ , then we have the inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.5) \quad D_f\left(p, \frac{p+q}{2}\right) & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[ D_f\left(p, \frac{3p+q}{4}\right) + D_f\left(p, \frac{p+3q}{4}\right) \right] \\
& \leq D_{HH}^f(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[ D_f\left(p, \frac{p+q}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2} D_f(p, q) \right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} D_f(p, q),
\end{aligned}$$

which is obtained by taking  $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$  in (2.1).

**Remark 2.** If we replace  $\lambda$  by  $(1 - \lambda)$  in (2.1), we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.6) \quad D_f\left(p, \frac{p+q}{2}\right) & \leq (1 - \lambda) D_f\left(p, \frac{p+q}{2} + \lambda(p - q)\right) + \lambda D_f\left(p, q + \lambda \frac{p - q}{2}\right) \\
& \leq D_{HH}^f(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} [D_f(p, \lambda p + (1 - \lambda)q) + \lambda D_f(p, q)] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} D_f(p, q).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if we add (2.1) and (2.6) and divide by 2, we can state the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $p, q \in \Omega$ , then we have the inequality,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad & D_f \left( p, \frac{p+q}{2} \right) \\
& \leq \lambda \left[ D_f \left( p, p + \frac{\lambda}{2} (q-p) \right) + D_f \left( p, q + \frac{\lambda}{2} (p-q) \right) \right] \\
& \quad + (1-\lambda) \left[ D_f \left( p, \frac{p+q}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{2} (q-p) \right) + D_f \left( p, \frac{p+q}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (p-q) \right) \right] \\
& \leq D_{HH}^f(p, q) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{4} [D_f(p, (1-\lambda)p + \lambda q) + D_f(p, \lambda p + (1-\lambda)q) + D_f(p, q)] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} D_f(p, q),
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ .

We also define the divergence.

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.8) \quad H_f(p, q; t) & : = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) f \left[ \frac{tq(x) + (1-t)p(x)}{p(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& = D_f(p, tq + (1-t)p).
\end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $p, q \in \Omega$ , then,*

- (i)  $H_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is convex on  $[0, 1]$ ;
- (ii) We have the bounds

$$(2.9) \quad \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} H_f(p, q; t) = H_f(p, q; 0) = 0,$$

$$(2.10) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} H_f(p, q; t) = H_f(p, q; 1) = D_f(p, q),$$

and the inequality

$$(2.11) \quad H_f(p, q; t) \leq tD_f(p, q) \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

- (iii) The mapping  $H_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is monotonic nondecreasing on  $[0, 1]$ .

*Proof.* (i) Let  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$  with  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ , then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_f(p, q; \alpha t_1 + \beta t_2) \\
& = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) f \left[ \frac{(\alpha t_1 + \beta t_2)q(x) + (1 - \alpha t_1 - \beta t_2)p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& = \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) f \left[ \alpha \cdot \frac{[t_1 q(x) + (1-t_1)p(x)]}{q(x)} + \beta \cdot \frac{[t_2 q(x) + (1-t_2)p(x)]}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& \leq \alpha \cdot \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) f \left[ \frac{t_1 q(x) + (1-t_1)p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& \quad + \beta \cdot \int_{\mathcal{X}} p(x) f \left[ \frac{t_2 q(x) + (1-t_2)p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \\
& = \alpha H_f(p, q, t_1) + \beta H_f(p, q, t_2)
\end{aligned}$$

and convexity is proved.

(ii) Using Jensen's inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H_f(p, q, t) &\geq f \left[ \int_{\chi} p(x) \left[ \frac{tq(x) + (1-t)p(x)}{q(x)} \right] d\mu(x) \right] \\ &= f \left[ t \int_{\chi} q(x) d\mu(x) + (1-t) \int_{\chi} p(x) d\mu(x) \right] \\ &= f(1) = 0 = H_f(p, q, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Also, by convexity of  $f$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} H_f(p, q, t) &\leq \int_{\chi} p(x) \left[ tf \left( \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right) + (1-t) f(1) \right] d\mu(x) \\ &\leq t \int_{\chi} p(x) f \left( \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right) d\mu(x) + (1-t) f(1) \int_{\chi} p(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= tD_f(p, q), \end{aligned}$$

and the statement (ii) is proved.

(iii) Let  $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$  with  $t_2 > t_1$ . As  $H_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is convex, then

$$\frac{H_f(p, q, t_2) - H_f(p, q, t_1)}{t_2 - t_1} \geq \frac{H_f(p, q, t_1) - H_f(p, q, 0)}{t_1 - 0}$$

and as

$$H_f(p, q, t_1) \geq H_f(p, q, 0) = 0,$$

we deduce that  $H_f(p, q, t_1) \leq H_f(p, q, t_2)$ , which proves the monotonicity of  $H_f(p, q, \cdot)$ .

■

**Remark 3.** If we write (2.11) in terms of  $1-t$  rather than  $t$ , we obtain

$$(2.12) \quad H_f(p, q, 1-t) \leq (1-t) D_f(p, q), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Adding (2.11) and (2.12), we get,

$$(2.13) \quad H_f(p, q, t) + H_f(p, q, 1-t) \leq D_f(p, q)$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

**Remark 4.** For  $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ , we have the inequality,

$$(2.14) \quad D_f \left( p, \frac{1}{2}p + \frac{1}{2}q \right) \leq D_f(p, tq + (1-t)p) \leq tD_f(p, q),$$

which is similar to (1.13).

We can also define the divergence,

$$(2.15) \quad F_f(p, q; t) := \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} p(x) p(y) f \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)} \right] d\mu(x) d\mu(y),$$

where  $p, q \in \Omega$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

The properties of this mapping are embodied in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.** Let  $p, q \in \Omega$ , then,

(i)  $F_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is symmetrical about  $\frac{1}{2}$ , that is,

$$(2.16) \quad F_f(p, q; t) = F_f(p, q; 1-t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

(ii)  $F$  is convex on  $[0, 1]$ ;



(iii) We have the bounds:

$$(2.17) \quad \sup_{t \in [0,1]} F_f(p, q; t) = F_f(p, q; 0) = F_f(p, q; 1) = D_f(p, q),$$

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} & \inf_{t \in [0,1]} F_f(p, q; t) = F_f\left(p, q; \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &= \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} p(x) p(y) f\left[\frac{q(x)p(y) + p(x)q(y)}{2p(x)q(y)}\right] d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &\geq 0; \end{aligned}$$

(iv)  $F_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is nondecreasing on  $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$  and nonincreasing on  $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ ;

(v) We have the inequality:

$$(2.19) \quad F_f(p, q; t) \geq \max\{H_f(p, q; t); H_f(p, q; 1-t)\} \text{ for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

*Proof.* (i) Is obvious.

(ii) Follows by the convexity of  $f$  in a similar way to that in the proof of Theorem 2.

(iii) For all  $x, y \in \chi$  we have:

$$f\left[t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right] \leq t \cdot f\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right) + (1-t) \cdot f\left(\frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right)$$

for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Multiplying by  $p(x)p(y) \geq 0$  and integrating over  $\chi^2$ , we write,

$$\begin{aligned} F_f(p, q; t) &\leq \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} p(x) p(y) \left[ t \cdot f\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right) + (1-t) \cdot f\left(\frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right) \right] d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= t \int_{\chi} p(y) d\mu(y) \int_{\chi} p(x) f\left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)}\right) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + (1-t) \int_{\chi} d\mu(x) \int_{\chi} p(y) f\left(\frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right) d\mu(y) \\ &= t \cdot D_f(p, q) + (1-t) \cdot D_f(p, q) = D_f(p, q) \\ &= F_f(p, q; 0) = F_f(p, q; 1) \end{aligned}$$

and the bound (2.17) is proved.

Since  $f$  is convex, then for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $x, y \in \chi$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \left\{ f\left[t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right] + f\left[(1-t) \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + t \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right] \right\} \\ &\geq f\left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + \frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by  $p(x)p(y) \geq 0$  and integrating over  $\chi^2$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} [F_f(p, q; t) + F_f(p, q; 1-t)] \\ &\geq \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} p(x) p(y) f\left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + \frac{q(y)}{p(y)}\right)\right] d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \end{aligned}$$

and the first part of (2.18) is proved.

Using Jensen's integral inequality, we may write:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} f \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{q(x)p(y) + p(x)q(y)}{p(x)q(y)} \right) \right] p(x)p(y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\
\geq & f \left[ \int_{\chi} \int_{\chi} \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{q(x)p(y) + p(x)q(y)}{p(x)q(y)} \right) p(x)p(y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \right] \\
= & f \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left[ \int_{\chi} p(x) d\mu(x) \int_{\chi} p(y) d\mu(y) + \int_{\chi} q(x) d\mu(x) \int_{\chi} q(y) d\mu(y) \right] \right] \\
= & f(1) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and the second part of (2.18) is proved.

- (iv) The mapping  $F_f(p, q; \cdot)$  being convex on  $[0, 1]$ , we may write, for  $1 \geq t_2 > t_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$ , that,

$$\frac{F_f(p, q; t_2) - F_f(p, q; t_1)}{t_2 - t_1} \geq \frac{F_f(p, q; t_1) - F_f(p, q; \frac{1}{2})}{t_1 - \frac{1}{2}}$$

and as

$$F_f(p, q; t_1) \geq F_f\left(p, q; \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad t_1 \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

we deduce that  $F_f(p, q; t_2) \geq F_f(p, q; t_1)$ , i.e., the mapping  $F_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is monotonically nondecreasing on  $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ .

Similarly, we can prove that  $F_f(p, q; \cdot)$  is monotonically nonincreasing on  $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , and the statement (iv) is proved.

- (v) Using Jensen's integral inequality, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\chi} p(y) f \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)} \right] d\mu(y) \\
\geq & f \left[ \int_{\chi} p(y) \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \cdot \frac{q(y)}{p(y)} \right] d\mu(y) \right] \\
= & f \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \int_{\chi} p(y) d\mu(y) + (1-t) \cdot \int_{\chi} q(y) d\mu(y) \right] \\
= & f \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by  $p(x) \geq 0$  and integrating over  $\chi$ , we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_f(p, q; t) & \geq \int_{\chi} p(x) f \left[ t \cdot \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} + (1-t) \right] d\mu(x) \\
& = H_f(p, q; t),
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

Now, as

$$F_f(p, q; 1-t) \geq H_f(p, q; 1-t)$$

and  $F_f(p, q; t) = F_f(p, q; 1-t)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the inequality (2.19) is completely proved.

■

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. JEFFREYS, An invariant form for the prior probability in estimating problems, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London*, **186** A (1946), 453-461.
- [2] S. KULLBACK and R.A. LEIBLER, On information and sufficiency, *Ann. Math. Stat.*, **22** (1951), 79-86.
- [3] A. RÉNYI, On measures of entropy and information, *Proc. Fourth Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. and Prob.*, University of California Press, **1** (1961), 547-561.
- [4] J.H. HAVRDA and F. CHARVAT, Quantification method classification process: concept of structural  $\alpha$ -entropy, *Kybernetika*, **3** (1967), 30-35.
- [5] J.N. KAPUR, A comparative assessment of various measures of directed divergence, *Advances in Management Studies*, **3** (1984), 1-16.
- [6] B.D. SHARMA and D.P. MITTAL, New non-additive measures of relative information, *Journ. Comb. Inf. Sys. Sci.*, **2** (4)(1977), 122-132.
- [7] I. BURBEA and C.R. RAO, On the convexity of some divergence measures based on entropy function, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **28** (3) (1982), 489-495.
- [8] C.R. RAO, Diversity and dissimilarity coefficients: a unified approach, *Theoretic Population Biology*, **21** (1982), 24-43.
- [9] J. LIN, Divergence measures based on the Shannon entropy, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **37** (1) (1991), 145-151.
- [10] I. CSISZÁR, Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations, *Studia Math. Hungarica*, **2** (1967), 299-318.
- [11] I. CSISZÁR, On topological properties of  $f$ -divergences, *Studia Math. Hungarica*, **2** (1967), 329-339.
- [12] S.M. ALI and S.D. SILVEY, A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Sec B*, **28** (1966), 131-142.
- [13] I. VAJDA, *Theory of Statistical Inference and Information*, Dordrecht-Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.
- [14] M. MEL, The theory of genetic distance and evaluation of human races, *Japan J. Human Genetics*, **23** (1978), 341-369.
- [15] A. SEN, *On Economic Inequality*, Oxford University Press, London 1973.
- [16] H. THEIL, *Economics and Information Theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1967.
- [17] H. THEIL, *Statistical Decomposition Analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1972.
- [18] E.C. PIELOU, *Ecological Diversity*, Wiley, New York, 1975.
- [19] D.V. GOKHALE and S. KULLBACK, *Information in Contingency Tables*, New York, Marcel Dekker, 1978.
- [20] C.K. CHOW and C.N. LIN, Approximating discrete probability distributions with dependence trees, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **14** (3) (1968), 462-467.
- [21] D. KAZAKOS and T. COTSIDAS, A decision theory approach to the approximation of discrete probability densities, *IEEE Trans. Perform. Anal. Machine Intell.*, **1** (1980), 61-67.
- [22] T.T. KADOTA and L.A. SHEPP, On the best finite set of linear observables for discriminating two Gaussian signals, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **13** (1967), 288-294.
- [23] T. KAILATH, The divergence and Bhattacharyya distance measures in signal selection, *IEEE Trans. Comm. Technology.*, Vol COM-15 (1967), 52-60.
- [24] M. BETH BASSAT,  $f$ -entropies, probability of error and feature selection, *Inform. Control*, **39** (1978), 227-242.
- [25] C.H. CHEN, *Statistical Pattern Recognition*, Rocelle Park, New York, Hoyderc Book Co., 1973.
- [26] V.A. VOLKONSKI and J. A. ROZANOV, Some limit theorems for random function  $-I$ , (English Trans.), *Theory Prob. Appl.*, (USSR), **4** (1959), 178-197.
- [27] M.S. PINSKER, Information and Information Stability of Random variables and processes, (in Russian), Moscow: Izv. Akad. Nouk, 1960.
- [28] I. CSISZÁR, A note on Jensen's inequality, *Studia Sci. Math. Hung.*, **1** (1966), 185-188.
- [29] H.P. MCKEAN, JR., Speed of approach to equilibrium for Koc's caricature of a Maximilian gas, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **21** (1966), 343-367.
- [30] J.H.B. KEMPERMAN, On the optimum note of transmitting information, *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **40** (1969), 2158-2177.

- [31] S. KULLBACK, A lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **13** (1967), 126-127.
- [32] S. KULLBACK, Correction to a lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **16** (1970), 771-773.
- [33] I. VAJDA, Note on discrimination information and variation, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **16** (1970), 771-773.
- [34] G.T. TOUSSAINT, Sharper lower bounds for discrimination in terms of variation, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.*, **21** (1975), 99-100.
- [35] F. TOPSOE, Some inequalities for information divergence and related measures of discrimination, *Res. Rep. Coll., RGMIA*, **2** (1) (1999), 85-98.
- [36] L. LECAM, *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*, New York: Springer, 1986.
- [37] D. DACUNHA-CASTELLE, Ecole d'ete de Probability de Saint-Flour, III-1977, Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer 1978.
- [38] C. KRAFT, Some conditions for consistency and uniform consistency of statistical procedures, *Univ. of California Pub. in Statistics*, **1** (1955), 125-142.
- [39] S. KULLBACK and R.A. LEIBLER, On information and sufficiency, *Annals Math. Statist.*, **22** (1951), 79-86.
- [40] E. HELLINGER, Neue Begründung der Theorie quadratischer Formen von unendlichvielen Veränderlichen, *J. für reine und Angew. Math.*, **36** (1909), 210-271.
- [41] A. BHATTACHARYYA, On a measure of divergence between two statistical populations defined by their probability distributions, *Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc.*, **35** (1943), 99-109.
- [42] I. J. TANEJA, *Generalised Information Measures and their Applications* (<http://www.mtm.ufsc.br/~taneja/bhtml/bhtml.html>).
- [43] I. CSISZÁR and J. KÖRNER, *Information Theory: Coding Theorem for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [44] J. LIN and S.K.M. WONG, A new directed divergence measure and its characterization, *Int. J. General Systems*, **17** (1990), 73-81.
- [45] H. SHIOYA and T. DA-TE, A generalisation of Lin divergence and the derivative of a new information divergence, *Elec. and Comm. in Japan*, **78** (7) (1995), 37-40.

SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATICS, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, PO BOX 14428, MELBOURNE CITY MC, VICTORIA 8001, AUSTRALIA.

*E-mail address:* [neil@matilda.vu.edu.au](mailto:neil@matilda.vu.edu.au)

*URL:* <http://sci.vu.edu.au/staff/neilb.html>

*E-mail address:* [pc@matilda.vu.edu.au](mailto:pc@matilda.vu.edu.au)

*URL:* <http://rgmia.vu.edu.au/cerone>

*E-mail address:* [sever.dragomir@vu.edu.au](mailto:sever.dragomir@vu.edu.au)

*URL:* <http://rgmia.vu.edu.au/SSDragomirWeb.html>