## Interactive compression to entropy

Shay Moran (Technion)

based on work with

Balthazar Bauer (ENS) and Amir Yehudayoff (Technion)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

# Compression

Compression is about identifying the essential parts of objects of interest (and discarding the rest).

Compressing is often an evidence of understanding

Occam's razor - "Simpler is better". Einstein's razor - "Make things as simple as possible, but not simpler".

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Here we focus on compression of conversations.

#### A conversation that is easy to compress

Alice: hi. Bob: hi. Alice: how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: great. how are you? Bob: great. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. how are you? Alice: good. how are you? Bob: good. bye. Alice: bye.

# Model

Communication complexity [Yao '79].

There are 2 players: Alice and Bob. Alice gets input x and Bob gets input y.

They communicate according to a protocol  $\pi$ : Alice says  $m_1$ , Bob says  $m_2$ , Alice says  $m_3$ , ...

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The transcript is denoted by  $M_{\pi}$ .

Roughly, we want shorten the conversation as much as possible while keeping its content.

There are several ways to measure information [Shannon, ..., (Bar-Yossef)-Jayram-Kumar-Sivakumar, Chakrabarti-Shi-Wirth-Yao, Barak-Braverman-Chen-Rao, ..., Bauer-M-Yehudayoff, ...].

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Information complexities: external and internal information

The input (X, Y) is drawn from a known distribution  $\mu$ .

The external information of  $\pi$  is

$$I_{\mu}^{ext} = I(M_{\pi} : XY)$$

Number of bits an external observer learns on the input from the transcript

The internal information of  $\pi$  is

$$I_{\mu}^{int} = I(M_{\pi} : Y|X) + I(M_{\pi} : X|Y)$$

Number of bits that Alice learns on input from the transcript +Number of bits that Bob learns on input from the transcript

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Information complexities: external and internal entropies

The input (X, Y) is drawn from a known distribution  $\mu$ .

The external entropy of  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is

$$H^{ext}_{\mu} = H(M_{\pi})$$

Number of bits required to describe the transcript to an external observer

The internal entropy of  $\pi$  is

$$H^{int}_{\mu}=H(M_{\pi}|X)+H(M_{\pi}|Y)$$

Number of bits required to describe the transcript to Alice +Number of bits required to describe the transcript to Bob

# Information versus entropy

$$H^{ext}_{\mu} \geq I^{ext}_{\mu}$$
 and  $H^{int}_{\mu} \geq I^{int}_{\mu}$ .

Both are lower bounds on communication.

Information satisfies direct sum.

[Braverman-Rao] Internal information = Amortized communication.

 $H_{\mu}^{ext} = I_{\mu}^{ext}$  and  $H_{\mu}^{int} = I_{\mu}^{int}$  for protocols without private randomness.

#### In this talk all protocols are deterministic

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

A protocol  $\sigma$  is an external  $\epsilon$ -error simulation of  $\pi$  if there exists a dictionary D such that the distribution of  $(x, y, M_{\pi})$  is  $\epsilon$ -close in statistical distance to that of  $(x, y, D(M_{\sigma}))$ .

An external observer can infer  $M_{\pi}$  from  $M_{\sigma}$ .

A protocol  $\sigma$  is an internal  $\epsilon$ -error simulation of  $\pi$  if there exists private dictionaries  $D_{Alice}$ ,  $D_{Bob}$ , such that the distribution of  $(x, y, M_{\pi})$  is  $\epsilon$ -close in statistical distance to that of  $(x, y, D_{Alice}(M_{\sigma}, x))$  and  $(x, y, D_{Bob}(M_{\sigma}, y))$ .

Alice and Bob can infer  $M_{\pi}$  from  $M_{\sigma}$ . This is not necessarily true for an external observer!

### Lower bounds

If  $\sigma$  is an external 0-error simulation of  $\pi$  then

$$CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \geq H^{\text{ext}}_{\mu}(\pi).$$

If  $\sigma$  is an internal 0-error simulation of  $\pi$  then

 $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \geq H^{int}_{\mu}(\pi).$ 

Are these lower bounds tight?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

External compression: Upper bounds

Huffman code: If in  $\pi$  just Alice speaks

 $\forall \mu \exists$  external 0-error simulation  $\sigma$ :  $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq H_{\mu}^{ext}(\pi) + 1.$ 

[Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich]

 $\forall \pi, \mu \exists$  external 0-error simulation  $\sigma$ :  $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq 2.18H_{\mu}^{ext}(\pi) + 2.$ 

The 2.18 factor can be improved [Kushilevitz - private communication]

## Internal compression: Upper bounds

[Barak-Braverman-Chen-Rao\*,

Brody-Buhrman-Koucky-Loff-Speelman-Vereshchagin, Pankratov]

 $\forall \pi, \mu, \epsilon > 0 \exists \text{ interrnal } \epsilon \text{-error simulation } \sigma: \\ CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq O_{\epsilon} \big( H^{int}_{\mu}(\pi) \log CC_{\mu}(\pi) \big).$ 

#### [Bauer-M-Yehudayoff]

 $\begin{aligned} \forall \pi, \mu, \epsilon > 0 \ \exists \text{ interrnal } \epsilon \text{-error simulation } \sigma: \\ \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq \mathcal{O}_{\epsilon}\big((\mathcal{H}_{\mu}^{int}(\pi))^{2} \log \log \mathcal{C}\mathcal{C}_{\mu}(\pi)\big). \end{aligned}$ 

A corollary: There is a private coin protocol with information O(k) and communication  $2^{2^k}$  such that every public coin simulation of it with information O(k) has an exponential loss in communication [Ganor-Kol-Raz].

# External simulation [Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich]

[Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich]

 $\forall \pi, \mu \exists$  external 0-error simulation  $\sigma$ :  $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq 2.18 H_{\mu}^{ext}(\pi) + 2.$ 

Proof:

Let  $\pi$  be a deterministic protocol.

We want to construct a protocol  $\sigma$  which simulates  $\pi$  with 0-error and  $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) = O(H_{\mu}^{ext}(\pi)).$ 

Idea: Communicate 2 bits and convey 0.5 bits of information.

# Meaningful vertices

Let  $\pi$  be a protocol and  $\mu$  a distribution on inputs.

For every vertex v in  $\pi$  the set

 $R_v = \{(x, y) : v \text{ is an ancestor of } M_\pi(x, y)\}$ 

is a rectangle.

v is meaningful if either

- $1/3 \leq \mu({\it R_v}) \leq 2/3$  , or
- v is a leaf and  $\mu(R_v) \ge 2/3$ .

#### Lemma: For all $\mu, \pi$ there exists a meaningful vertex!

# External simulation [Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich]

#### Description of $\sigma$ on input (x, y):

- Let v be a meaningful vertex. Alice and Bob communicate 2 bits to determine if (x, y) ∈ R<sub>v</sub> and update µ accordingly.
- Either v was a leaf and the simulation is over or they learned 0.5 bits of information (since v is "meaningful").

An external compression: Summary

[Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich]

 $\forall \pi, \mu \exists$  external 0-error simulation  $\sigma$ :  $CC_{\mu}(\sigma) \leq 2.18 H_{\mu}^{ext}(\pi) + 2.$ 

Idea: Communicate 2 bits and convey 0.5 bits of information.

Can something similar work for internal entropy?

What is a meaningful vertex in this case?

## Internal compression - meaningful vertices

Let (x, y) be an input and let v be a vertex in  $T_{\pi}$ .

-  $\mu_x(R_v) = \mu(R_v \mid X = x)$  Alice's perspective -  $\mu_y(R_v) = \mu(R_v \mid Y = y)$  Bob's perspective

Alice has a meaningful vertex  $v_a$  with respect to  $\mu_x$ . Bob has a meaningful vertex  $v_b$  with respect to  $\mu_y$ .

# Internal compression

Alice has a meaningful vertex  $v_a$ . Bob has a meaningful vertex  $v_b$ .



If both knew  $v_a$  or  $v_b \implies$  communicate 2 bits to learn 0.5 bits.

Problem: Alice doesn't know  $v_b$ , Bob doesn't know  $v_a$ 

# Internal compression



Problem: Alice doesn't know  $v_b$ , Bob doesn't know  $v_a$ Observation: Enough that they agree on a vertex v such that - v is an ancestor of  $v_a$ , and - v is not an ancestor of  $v_b$ .

Can be done with  $O_{\epsilon}(H^{int}_{\mu}(\pi) \log \log CC_{\mu}(\pi))$  communication:

- [Feige,Peleg, Raghavan, Upfal] protocol for finding the first difference,

- A variant of sampling from [Braverman-Rao] - (Braverman-Rao)

# Summary

Defined a couple of meanings for "compressing a conversation."

- Optimal external compression [Dietzfelbinger-Wunderlich].
- Efficient internal compression [Bauer-M-Yehudayoff].

We still do not have a full understanding.