

A Third Information-Theoretic Approach to Finite de Finetti Theorems

Mario Berta ^{*}

Lampros Gavalakis [†]

Ioannis Kontoyiannis [‡]


April 29, 2024

Abstract

A new finite form of de Finetti’s representation theorem is established using elementary information-theoretic tools. The distribution of the first k random variables in an exchangeable vector of $n \geq k$ random variables is close to a mixture of product distributions. Closeness is measured in terms of the relative entropy and an explicit bound is provided. This bound is tighter than those obtained via earlier information-theoretic proofs, and its utility extends to random variables taking values in general spaces. The core argument employed has its origins in the quantum information-theoretic literature.

Keywords — Exchangeability, de Finetti theorem, entropy, mixture, relative entropy, mutual information

^{*}Department of Computing, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, U.K., and Institute for Quantum Information, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany. Email: berta@physik.rwth-aachen.de. M.B. acknowledges funding by the European Research Council (ERC Grant Agreement No. 948139).

[†]Univ Gustave Eiffel, Univ Paris Est Creteil, CNRS, LAMA UMR8050 F-77447 Marne-la-Vallée, France. Email: lampros.gavalakis@univ-eiffel.fr. L.G. was supported in part by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101034255  and by the Bézout Labex, funded by ANR, reference ANR-10-LABX-58.

[‡]Statistical Laboratory, DPMMS, University of Cambridge, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WB, U.K. Email: yiannis@maths.cam.ac.uk. I.K. was supported in part by the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (H.F.R.I.) under the “First Call for H.F.R.I. Research Projects to support Faculty members and Researchers and the procurement of high-cost research equipment grant,” project number 1034.

1 Introduction: de Finetti's theorem

A vector of n random variables (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) is *exchangeable* if it has the same distribution as $(X_{\pi(1)}, X_{\pi(2)}, \dots, X_{\pi(n)})$ for every permutation π on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Similarly, we say that a process $\{X_k ; k \geq 1\}$ is exchangeable if (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) is exchangeable for all n .

De Finetti's celebrated representation theorem [12, 13] characterises all binary exchangeable processes.

Theorem 1.1 (de Finetti's representation theorem) *A binary process $\{X_k ; k \geq 1\}$ is exchangeable if and only if its distribution can be uniquely expressed as a mixture of independent and identically distributed binary processes.*

The importance of de Finetti's theorem (and its numerous extensions) for the foundations of Bayesian statistics is illustrated, e.g., by the observation that it justifies the subjective approach of treating any infinite binary exchangeable sequence as a sequence of *independent* coin tosses conditional on the value of the probability of Heads, which is itself distributed according to some prior distribution – namely, the mixing measure in Theorem 1.1; see [16, 3] and the references therein for extensive discussions.

In terms of its practical applicability in statistics and elsewhere, it is natural to ask whether the same representation applies to finite-length exchangeable random vectors. As it turns out, the condition that the entire process be exchangeable is necessary. For example, considering a pair of binary random variables (X_1, X_2) with $\Pr(X_1 = 1, X_2 = 0) = \Pr(X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1) = 1/2$, shows that (X_1, X_2) are exchangeable but their joint distribution cannot be expressed as a mixture of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) binary pairs [16].

Nevertheless, the distribution of the first k random variables in an exchangeable vector of length n admits an *approximate* de Finetti-style representation if k is small compared to n . Quantitative versions of this statement have been established by Diaconis [16] for binary random variables and Diaconis and Freedman [18] for random variables with values in abstract spaces, with sharp error bounds for the total variation distance. We refer to such results as ‘finite de Finetti’ theorems. Diaconis' proof in [16] is based on a geometric interpretation of the set of exchangeable measures as a convex subset of the probability simplex. The Diaconis and Freedman proof in [18] is based on the approximation of the hypergeometric by the binomial distribution. The general version of Theorem 1.1 due to Hewitt and Savage [22] for random variables with values in compact Hausdorff spaces was also recovered in [18]. Interestingly, one needs additional assumptions in order to deduce the infinite version from the – seemingly stronger – finite one.

1.1 Information-theoretic approaches

Since the early 1950s, there has been a long line of works establishing core probabilistic results via information-theoretic ideas and techniques; parts of this rich history are outlined in [11, 2, 23, 21]. In this spirit, two different *information-theoretic* proofs of finite de Finetti theorems were developed recently, one for binary alphabets [19] and one for finite alphabets [21]. These results are expressed in terms of the relative entropy, which is a stronger notion of ‘distance’ than total variation, but the resulting total variation bounds are generally suboptimal. We briefly recall these results to highlight their differences with the present development; a short review of these two approaches may be found in [20].

For any k , write X_1^k for a vector of random variables (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k) and similarly write x_1^k for a specific realisation (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) of X_1^k . When the X_i all take values in a finite alphabet,

we denote their joint probability mass function by $P_{X_1^k}$. If μ is a probability measure on the simplex \mathcal{P} of probability mass functions Q on A , we define the mixture:

$$M_{k,\mu}(x_1^k) := \int_{\mathcal{P}} Q^k(x_1^k) d\mu(Q), \quad x_1^k \in A^k.$$

The main result of the first information-theoretic proof [19] is that, if X_1^n is a binary exchangeable random vector, then there is a probability measure μ on the space of Bernoulli distributions such that, for every $k \leq n$,

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \frac{5k^2 \log n}{n-k}, \quad (1)$$

where $D(P \| Q) = \sum_{x \in B} P(x) \log[P(x)/Q(x)]$ denotes the relative entropy between two probability mass functions on the same finite alphabet B , and \log denotes the natural logarithm throughout. Writing $\|P - Q\| := \sup_B |P(B) - Q(B)|$ for the total variation distance between P and Q , Pinsker's inequality [10, 25] states that $\|P - Q\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} D(P \| Q)$. Thus, (1) yields,

$$\|P_{X_1^k} - M_{k,\mu}\| \leq k \left(\frac{5 \log n}{2(n-k)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2)$$

This bound is suboptimal in that, as shown in [18], the correct rate with respect to the total variation distance in (2) is $O(k/n)$. The proof in [19] is based on an estimate of the dependence between the random variables X_1^k conditional on the proportion of 1s it contains.

In the second information-theoretic approach to finite de Finetti theorems [21], a different finite- n bound was obtained for the relative entropy in (1), leading to an estimate of the form:

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) = O \left(\left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/2} \log \frac{n}{k} \right). \quad (3)$$

Although (3) is generally weaker than (1), it holds for random vectors X_1^n with values in arbitrary finite alphabets. The proof of the finite- n bound leading to (3) in [21] was based on a connection between the Gibbs conditioning principle from statistical mechanics, the information-theoretic ‘method of types’, and de Finetti’s theorem.

Finally, we note that a simple argument was recently used [24] to show that, for finite-valued exchangeable random vectors, it is possible to obtain a bound of the form:

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) = O \left(\left(\frac{k}{n} \right)^2 \right), \quad (4)$$

where the coefficient is proportional to the alphabet size, $|A|$. In view of the $O(k/n)$ lower bound [18] for the total variation distance mentioned above, Pinsker’s inequality implies that the rate, in terms of k and n , achieved in (4) is in fact optimal for the relative entropy. Unfortunately, the proof of (4) in [24] is *not* information-theoretic, as it is based on an earlier bound by Stam [29] for the relative entropy between the distributions of sampling with and without replacement, which was established by direct probabilistic and combinatorial arguments. For the sake of completeness, we state and prove (4) in Section 2.4.

1.2 A different information-theoretic approach

The main goal of this note is to present and explore yet another information-theoretic approach to developing finite de Finetti theorems, based only on elementary properties of the mutual information. To put it in context, we first remark that de Finetti-style theorems have attracted

increasing attention in the literature on quantum information theory in recent years. For example, starting from related ideas in [6], the third part of [8, Theorem 1] may be viewed as a classical de Finetti theorem with additional constraints, and a classical de Finetti result may also be obtained from the subsequent work [4, Theorem 2.4]. Additional relevant results can be found in [7, 5, 26] and the references therein.

One of our results, given as Corollary 2.4 in the following section, states that, if X_1^n is an exchangeable vector of random variables taking values in finite alphabet A , then:

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \frac{k(k-1)}{2(n-k-1)} \log |A|.$$

This bound, which is stronger than those obtained in [19] and in [21], will be derived as a consequence of our main result, Theorem 2.1.

The main idea of the proof of the general bound in Theorem 2.1 has its origins in quantum information theory. It is based on an argument that was implicitly used in the proof of the quantum information-theoretic result in [8, Theorem 1]. The fact that this argument leads to interesting classical de Finetti-style results appears to have been noted by several authors, and it is even mentioned as an exercise in the recent text [28].

Our main purpose here is to explore and adapt this argument in order to show that it can be employed to obtain finite- n bounds for de Finetti's theorem in terms of relative entropy, which are both stronger and more general than those obtained via the earlier information-theoretic proofs [19, 21].

Compared to the Diaconis and Freedman [18] variational distance bound $k(k-1)/(2n)$, our information-theoretic corollary is weaker in terms of the dependence on n and k , and additionally features the logarithm of the alphabet size. However, our bound holds in the stronger relative entropy distance and it is then an interesting question if the logarithm of the alphabet size is needed for that distance measure. Moreover, following [4, 8], we note that our bound also holds for de Finetti theorems with linear constraints. In the same way that Diaconis and Freedman's result [17] gives a polynomial time approximation scheme for the minimization of polynomials of fixed degree over the simplex [14, 15], the versions with linear constraints from [4] – that feature the logarithm of the alphabet size – give rise to quasi-polynomial time approximation schemes for the minimization of polynomials of fixed degree over the simplex intersected with affine constraints [4]. Additionally, for this quasi-polynomial time approximation scheme there also exists a matching hardness-of-approximation result [1]. As such, we conclude that at least under certain complexity-theoretic assumptions, any finite de Finetti proof strategy that can incorporate linear constraints will likely need to feature the logarithm of the alphabet size in the approximation error.

2 Finite de Finetti theorems

2.1 A general bound under exchangeability

We begin with some preliminary definitions and assumptions.

Let (A, \mathcal{A}) be a measurable space. Write $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$ for the space of probability measures on (A, \mathcal{A}) . For $P, Q \in \mathcal{M}_1(A)$, the *relative entropy* between P and Q is,

$$D(P \| Q) = \begin{cases} \int \log \frac{dP}{dQ} dP, & \text{if } P \ll Q, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where dP/dQ denotes the Radon-Nikodým derivative of P with respect to Q . For a pair of random variables (X, Y) with values in the measurable spaces (A_1, \mathcal{A}_1) and (A_2, \mathcal{A}_2) , respectively, and with joint law $P_{X,Y} \in \mathcal{M}_1(A_1 \times A_2)$, the *mutual information between X and Y* is,

$$I(X; Y) = D(P_{X,Y} \| P_X \times P_Y),$$

where $P_X \in \mathcal{M}_1(A_1)$ and $P_Y \in \mathcal{M}_1(A_2)$ denote the first and second marginal of $P_{X,Y}$, respectively. In order to consider mixture measures on given measurable space (A, \mathcal{A}) , we first need to equip $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$ with its own σ -algebra. For every $F \in \mathcal{A}$, define the map $\pi_F : \mathcal{M}_1(A) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by,

$$\pi_F(P) = P(F), \quad P \in \mathcal{M}_1(A),$$

and let \mathcal{F} denote the smallest σ -algebra of subsets of $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$ that makes the maps $\{\pi_F ; F \in \mathcal{A}\}$ measurable. Now consider a specific measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(A))$ and a given $k \geq 1$. For any $F \in \mathcal{A}^k$ the map $Q \mapsto Q^k(F)$ is \mathcal{F} -measurable, so we can define the mixture $M_{k,\mu} \in \mathcal{M}_1(A)$ as,

$$M_{k,\mu}(F) := \int_{\mathcal{M}_1(A)} Q^k(F) d\mu(Q), \quad F \in \mathcal{A}^k.$$

Throughout, we assume that (A, \mathcal{A}) is standard a Borel space, namely, that there exists a complete separable metric space whose Borel σ -algebra is isomorphic to \mathcal{A} . This ensures that regular conditional probabilities exist [27]. Although in many cases, especially in potential applications of our results, this assumption may be unnecessary, it ensures that, in the general case, we will not be committing any measure-theoretic *faux pas*.

We can now state our main result.

Theorem 2.1 (Exchangeability and information) *Suppose X_1^n is an exchangeable vector of random variables X_i with values in a standard Borel space (A, \mathcal{A}) , and with joint law $P_{X_1^n}$. For every $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ there exists a probability measure $\mu = \mu_{k,n}$ on $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$, such that:*

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n). \quad (5)$$

For the proof we will need the following two lemmas. The first one is a simple identity for the relative entropy, stated without proof. The second one provides a lower bound on the mutual informations between X_1^i and X_k^n , for $k > i$, which will be a key step in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.2 *For any random vector Z_1^k of length k , the relative entropy between the joint law $P_{Z_1^k}$ of Z_1^k and the product $\prod_{i=1}^k P_{Z_i}$ of its marginals can be expressed as:*

$$D\left(P_{Z_1^k} \left\| \prod_{i=1}^k P_{Z_i}\right.\right) = \sum_{i=1}^k I(Z_1^{i-1}; Z_i).$$

Recall that conditional mutual information between X and Y given Z is defined as,

$$I(X; Y|Z) = \int D\left(P_{X,Y|Z}(\cdot|z) \left\| P_{X|Z}(\cdot|z) \times P_{Y|Z}(\cdot|z)\right.\right) dP_Z(z),$$

where $P_{X,Y|Z}(\cdot|z)$, $P_{X|Z}(\cdot|z)$, $P_{Y|Z}(\cdot|z)$, denote the conditional laws of (X, Y) , X , Y , given Z , respectively, whenever these exist.

Lemma 2.3 Suppose X_1^n are as in Theorem 2.1. Then, for each $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n-1$:

$$\sum_{m=k}^n I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^m) \leq I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n).$$

PROOF. Let $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n-1$ be fixed. For any $k \leq m \leq n$, by exchangeability we have,

$$I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^m) = I(X_1^{i-1}; X_m | X_k^{m-1}),$$

with the obvious convention that X_{k+1}^k is just a constant. Summing over all $k \leq m \leq n$ and using the chain rule for mutual information yields,

$$\sum_{m=k}^n I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^m) = \sum_{m=k}^n I(X_1^{i-1}; X_m | X_k^{m-1}) = I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n),$$

as claimed. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. Adding the identities of Lemma 2.3 over all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and dividing by $(n-k+1)$,

$$\frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{m=k}^n \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^m) \leq \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n).$$

Since the average over m satisfies this upper bound, there is an $m^* \in \{k, k+1, \dots, n\}$ such that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^{m^*}) \leq \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n). \quad (6)$$

Let $Q^* = Q_{k,n}^* \in \mathcal{M}_1(A^{m^*-k})$ denote the joint law of $X_{k+1}^{m^*}$. Taking $\mu = \mu_{k,n}$ to be the law of the regular conditional probability $P_{X_1 | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | X_{k+1}^{m^*})$, the mixture $M_{k,\mu}$ can be expressed:

$$M_{k,\mu}(F) = \int_{A^{m^*-k}} P_{X_1 | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}^k(F | x_{k+1}^{m^*}) dQ^*(x_{k+1}^{m^*}), \quad F \in \mathcal{A}^k.$$

Using the joint convexity of relative entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) &= D\left(\int_{A^{m^*-k}} P_{X_1^k | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*}) dQ^*(x_{k+1}^{m^*}) \middle\| \int_{A^{m^*-k}} P_{X_1^k | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*}) dQ^*(x_{k+1}^{m^*})\right) \\ &\leq \int D\left(P_{X_1^k | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*}) \middle\| P_{X_1^k | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}^k(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*})\right) dQ^*(x_{k+1}^{m^*}) \\ &= \int D\left(P_{X_1^k | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*}) \middle\| \prod_{i=1}^k P_{X_i | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}(\cdot | x_{k+1}^{m^*})\right) dQ^*(x_{k+1}^{m^*}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the fact that, by exchangeability, $P_{X_i | X_{k+1}^{m^*}}$ is the same for all $i \leq k$. Finally, applying Lemma 2.2 to the integrand, yields,

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_i | X_{k+1}^{m^*}),$$

and the claimed bound follows from this combined with (6). \square

2.2 Explicit de Finetti-style theorems

For random variables X_1^k on a discrete (finite or countably infinite) alphabet A , the mutual information always satisfies [9],

$$I(X_1^k; Y) = H(X_1^k) - H(X_1^k | Y) \leq H(X_1^k) \leq k \log |A|,$$

where $H(X) = -\sum_{x \in B} P(x) \log P(x)$ denotes the entropy of a random variable with probability mass function P on a discrete alphabet B . Therefore, Theorem 2.1 immediately yields:

Corollary 2.4 (Finite de Finetti theorem for discrete random variables) *Suppose X_1^n is an exchangeable vector of random variables X_i taking values in a discrete alphabet A . For every $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ there exists a probability measure $\mu = \mu_{k,n}$ on $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$, such that:*

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \frac{k(k-1)}{2(n-k+1)} H(X_1) \leq \frac{k(k-1)}{2(n-k+1)} \log |A|.$$

Compared with the earlier information-theoretic results (1) and (3), the bound in Corollary 2.4 is both more general and stronger. Moreover, it can be used to recover the classical infinite version of de Finetti's theorem for compact spaces, under some conditions.

Corollary 2.5 (Classical de Finetti theorem for compact spaces) *Let G be a compact metrisable space equipped with its Baire σ -algebra \mathcal{G} . Suppose the process $\{X_k ; k \geq 1\}$ is exchangeable and the X_k take values in G and are \mathcal{G} -measurable. If for every k we have $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then there is a probability measure μ on $\mathcal{M}_1(G)$ such that:*

$$P_{X_1^k} = M_{k,\mu}, \quad \text{for every } k \geq 1.$$

Note that Corollary 2.5 applies to all finite-alphabet exchangeable processes: Any finite set $G = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}\}$ is compact with respect to the metric $d(a_i, a_j) = |i - j| \pmod{m}$. And since $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) \leq H(X_1^{k-1}) \leq (k-1) \log m$, the condition $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$ is always satisfied.

PROOF. Choose and fix $k \geq 1$. Since G is compact and metrisable, it is also complete and separable and thus standard Borel. And since $\{X_k\}$ is exchangeable, we can apply Theorem 2.1 in combination with Pinsker's inequality to obtain that, for any $n \geq k$,

$$\|P_{X_1^k} - M_{k,\mu_{k,n}}\| \leq \left[\frac{1}{2(n-k+1)} \sum_{i=1}^k I(X_1^{i-1}; X_k^n) \right]^{1/2}. \quad (7)$$

The condition $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$ implies that the right-hand side vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and we are almost done, except that the mixing measure $\mu_{k,n}$ depends on both n and k .

Since G is compact and metrisable, it is also Hausdorff. Following [18], we note that $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(A))$ is compact in the weak* topology, so that there is a $\mu_k \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(A))$ and a subsequence $\{n_j\}$ increasing to infinity such that $\mu_{k,\mu_{k,n_j}} \rightarrow \mu_k$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Then, since the map $\mu \mapsto M_{k,\mu}$ is weak*-continuous, we have that $M_{k,\mu_{k,n_j}} \rightarrow M_{k,\mu_k}$ in the weak* topology as $j \rightarrow \infty$, and, in view of (7), we also have that $M_{k,\mu_{k,n_j}} \rightarrow P_{X_1^k}$ in total variation. Therefore, we must have that,

$$P_{X_1^k} = M_{k,\mu_k}.$$

Since k was arbitrary, by the fact that the marginals of the process $\{X_k\}$ are necessarily consistent we must also have that $P_{X_1^k} = M_{k,\mu_n}$, for each k and all $n \geq k$. Using weak*-compactness again,

we can find a subsequence $\{\mu_{k_\ell}\}$ that converges to some $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{M}_1(A))$ in the weak* topology as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. By the consistency of the marginals and using again the weak*-continuity of $M_{k,\mu}$ in μ , we then have that for each k , as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, $P_{X_1^k} = M_{k,\mu_{k_\ell}} \rightarrow M_{k,\mu}$ in the weak* topology, completing the proof. \square

2.3 Examples

Except for finite-valued processes (noted after Corollary 2.5) the condition $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$ appears rather technical and is generally not easy to verify. The following example describes a class of real-valued exchangeable processes that satisfy the condition $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$. Although these are not covered by Corollary 2.5 or the classical infinite de Finetti theorems (since \mathbb{R} is not compact), our Theorem 2.1 does provide useful bounds.

Example 1. Consider a finite collection of densities $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m\}$ on \mathbb{R} , such that the differential entropy $h(f_i) = -\int f_i \log f_i$ exists and is finite for each i . Let θ be an arbitrary random variable with values in $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Define an exchangeable real-valued process $\{X_k; k \geq 1\}$ as follows. Conditional on $\theta = i$, let $\{X_k\}$ be i.i.d. with each $X_k \sim f_i$. Then, since conditioning reduces the differential entropy [9],

$$I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = h(X_1^{k-1}) - h(X_1^{k-1} | X_k^n) \leq h(X_1^{k-1}) - h(X_1^{k-1} | X_k^n, \theta),$$

and since X_1^{k-1} is conditionally independent of X_k^n given θ ,

$$I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = h(X_1^{k-1}) - h(X_1^{k-1} | \theta) \leq (k-1) [h(X_1) - \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} h(f_i)].$$

Therefore, in this case Theorem 2.1 provides a useful bound of $O(k/n)$ for the relative entropy.

On the other hand, the following is an example of an exchangeable process $\{X_n\}$ on a compact space, for which the condition $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$ fails.

Example 2. Define a process $\{X_k; k \geq 1\}$ as follows. Let $\theta \sim U[0, 1]$ and, conditional on $\theta = x$, let the X_k be i.i.d. with each X_k taking the values $x/2$ and x with probability $1/2$ each. Then $\{X_k\}$ is a mixture of i.i.d. processes and hence exchangeable. But it is easy to see that the joint law $P_{X_1^n}$ is never absolutely continuous with respect to $P_{X_1^{k-1}} \times P_{X_k^n}$. Therefore, not only do we not have $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n) = o(n)$, but $I(X_1^{k-1}; X_k^n)$ is equal to $+\infty$ and the result of Theorem 2.1 is trivial. One possible explanation for this is that, in some cases, the mixing measure μ obtained in the proof of Theorem 2.1 is not the “right” one.

2.4 A non-information-theoretic bound

Finally, we prove the upper bound (4) in the Introduction.

Proposition 2.6 (Optimal de Finetti upper bound [24]) *If X_1^n is an exchangeable vector of random variables X_i with values in a finite alphabet A , then, for every $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, there exists a probability measure $\mu = \mu_{k,n}$ on $\mathcal{M}_1(A)$, s.t.:*

$$D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(|A| - 1) \frac{k(k-1)}{(n-1)(n-k+1)}.$$

Proof. Write $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m\}$ with $|A| = m$, let \hat{P}_n denote the (random) empirical probability mass function (p.m.f.) induced by X_1^n on A , and let μ denote the distribution of \hat{P}_n on \mathcal{P} . Write $\mathcal{P}_n \subset \mathcal{P}$ for the collection of all possible p.m.f.s that can arise as empirical distributions of strings $x_1^n \in A^n$. A key observation here is that, for an exchangeable X_1^n , conditional on $\hat{P}_n = Q$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the distribution of X_1^n is uniform over all x_1^n with the same empirical frequencies as Q , namely, containing $nQ(a_j)$ appearances of a_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Therefore, conditional on $\hat{P}_n = Q$, the distribution of X_1^k is the distribution of k draws without replacement from an urn with $nQ(a_j)$ balls labelled $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Let $P_Q^{(\text{nr})}$ denote this distribution, for each $Q \in \mathcal{P}_n$, so that,

$$P_{X_1^k} = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) P_Q^{(\text{nr})}.$$

We will compare this with the mixture of i.i.d.s,

$$M_{k,\mu} = \int Q^k d\mu(Q) = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) Q^k = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) P_Q^{(\text{r})},$$

where $P_Q^{(\text{r})} = Q^k$ is the distribution of k draws *with* replacement from an urn with $nQ(a_j)$ balls labelled j for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Now we recall the following bound due to Stam [29],

$$D(P_Q^{(\text{nr})} \| P_Q^{(\text{r})}) \leq \frac{(m-1)k(k-1)}{2(n-1)(n-k+1)}. \quad (8)$$

By the joint convexity of the relative entropy in its two arguments we have,

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{X_1^k} \| M_{k,\mu}) &= D\left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) P_Q^{(\text{nr})} \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) P_Q^{(\text{r})}\right.\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mu(Q) D(P_Q^{(\text{nr})} \| P_Q^{(\text{r})}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and the result follows upon combining (8) with (9). \square

References

- [1] S. Aaronson, R. Impagliazzo, and D. Moshkovitz. AM with multiple Merlins. In *2014 IEEE 29th Conference on Computational Complexity (CCC)*, pages 44–55, Vancouver, BC, June 2014.
- [2] A.R. Barron. Information theory in probability, statistics, learning, and neural nets. In Y. Freund and R.E. Schapire, editors, *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory (COLT)*, Nashville, Tennessee, July 1997. Available at www.stat.yale.edu/~arb4/publications_files/COLT97.pdf.
- [3] M. Bayarri and J.O. Berger. The interplay of Bayesian and frequentist analysis. *Statist. Sci.*, 19(1):58–80, February 2004.
- [4] M. Berta, F. Borderi, O. Fawzi, and V.B. Scholz. Semidefinite programming hierarchies for constrained bilinear optimization. *Math. Program.*, 194(1-2):781–829, July 2022.

- [5] F. Borderi. *De Finetti methods in quantum information*. PhD thesis, Department of Computing, Imperial College, University of London, London, U.K., April 2022.
- [6] F.G.S.L. Brandão, M. Christandl, and J. Yard. Faithful squashed entanglement. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 306:805–830, September 2011.
- [7] F.G.S.L. Brandão and A.W. Harrow. Product-state approximations to quantum states. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 342(1):47–80, 2016.
- [8] F.G.S.L. Brandão and A.W. Harrow. Quantum de Finetti theorems under local measurements with applications. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 353(2):469–506, 4 2017.
- [9] T.M. Cover and J.A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, second edition, 2012.
- [10] I. Csiszár. Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 2:299–318, 1967.
- [11] I Csiszár. Information theoretic methods in probability and statistics. In *1997 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, Ulm, Germany, June 1997.
- [12] B. De Finetti. Sul significato soggettivo della probabilità. *Fundam. Math.*, 17(1):298–329, 1931.
- [13] B. De Finetti. La prévision: Ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré*, 7(1):1–68, 1937.
- [14] E. de Klerk, M. Laurent, and P.A. Parrilo. A PTAS for the minimization of polynomials of fixed degree over the simplex. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 361(2):210–225, 2006.
- [15] E. de Klerk, M. Laurent, and Z. Sun. An alternative proof of a PTAS for fixed-degree polynomial optimization over the simplex. *Math. Program.*, 151:433–457, 2015.
- [16] P. Diaconis. Finite forms of de Finetti’s theorem on exchangeability. *Synthese*, 36(2):271–281, 1977.
- [17] P. Diaconis and D.A. Freedman. De Finetti’s theorem for Markov chains. *Ann. Probab.*, 8(1):115–130, 1980.
- [18] P. Diaconis and D.A. Freedman. Finite exchangeable sequences. *Ann. Probab.*, 8(4):745–764, 1980.
- [19] L. Gavalakis and I. Kontoyiannis. An information-theoretic proof of a finite de Finetti theorem. *Electron. Comm. Probab.*, 26:1–5, 2021.
- [20] L. Gavalakis and I. Kontoyiannis. Information-theoretic de Finetti-style theorems. In *2022 IEEE Workshop on Information Theory (ITW)*, pages 71–76, Mumbai, India, 2022.
- [21] L. Gavalakis and I. Kontoyiannis. Information in probability: Another information-theoretic proof of a finite de Finetti theorem. In J.-M. Morel and B. Teissier, editors, *Mathematics Going Forward: Collected Mathematical Brushstrokes*, volume LNM 2313 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, May 2023.
- [22] E. Hewitt and L.J. Savage. Symmetric measures on Cartesian products. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 80(2):470–501, 1955.

- [23] O. Johnson. *Information theory and the central limit theorem*. Imperial College Press, London, U.K., 2004.
- [24] O. Johnson, L. Gavalakis and I. Kontoyiannis. Relative entropy bounds for sampling with and without replacement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06632*, 2024.
- [25] S. Kullback. A lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 13(1):126–127, January 1967.
- [26] K. Li and G. Smith. Quantum de Finetti theorem under fully-one-way adaptive measurements. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114:160503, April 2015.
- [27] K.R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*. Academic Press, New York, NY, 1967.
- [28] Y. Polyanskiy and Y. Wu. *Information theory: From coding to learning*. Book preprint, 2023. Available at people.lids.mit.edu/yp/homepage.
- [29] A.J. Stam. Distance between sampling with and without replacement. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 32(2):81–91, 1978.