

Note on bounds for symmetric divergence measures

S.Furuichi^{1,a)}, K.Yanagi² and K.Kuriyama³

¹*Nihon University*

²*Josai University*

³*Yamaguchi University*

^{a)}Corresponding author: furuichi@chs.nihon-u.ac.jp

Abstract. In the paper [1], the tight bounds for symmetric divergence measures are derived by applying the results established in the paper [2]. In this article, we are going to report two kinds of extensions for the above results, namely classical q -extension and non-commutative(quantum) extension.

INTRODUCTION

In the paper [1], the tight bounds for symmetric divergence measures are derived by applying the results established in the paper [2]. In the paper [1], the minimization problem for Bhattacharyya coefficient, Chernoff information, Jensen-Shannon divergence and Jeffrey's divergence under the constraint on total variation distance. In this article, we are going to report two kinds of extensions for the above results, namely classical q -extension and non-commutative(quantum) extension. The parametric q -extension means that Tsallis entropy $H_q(X) \equiv \sum_x \frac{p(x)^q - p(x)}{1-q}$ [3] converges to Shannon entropy when $q \rightarrow 1$. Namely, all results with the parameter q recover the usual (standard) Shannon's results when $q \rightarrow 1$. We give here list of our extensions as follows.

- (i) The lower bound for Jensen-Shannon-Tsallis divergence is given by applying the results in [2].
- (ii) The lower bound for Jeffrey-Tsallis divergence is given by applying the results in [2] and deriving q -Pinsker's inequality for $q \geq 1$. This implies new upper bounds of $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,t}(u)|$.
- (iii) The lower bound for quantum Chernoff information is given by the known relation between the trace distance and fidelity.
- (iv) The lower bound for quantum Jeffrey divergence is given by applying the monotonicity (data processing inequality) of quantum f -divergence.

q -EXTENDED CASES

Here we review some quantities. The total variation distance between two probability distributions $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ is defined by

$$d_{TV}(P, Q) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |P(x) - Q(x)| = \frac{1}{2} \|P - Q\|_1,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ represents l_1 norm. The f -divergence introduced by Csiszár in [4] is defined by

$$D_f(P||Q) \equiv \sum_x Q(x) f\left(\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}\right)$$

where f is convex function and $f(1) = 0$. If we take $f(t) = -t \ln_q \frac{1}{t}$, where $\ln_q(x) \equiv \frac{x^{1-q} - 1}{1-q}$ is q -logarithmic function defined for $x \geq 0$ and $q \neq 1$, then f -divergence is equal to the Tsallis relative entropy (Tsallis divergence) defined by

(see e.g., [5])

$$D_q(P\|Q) \equiv - \sum_x P(x) \ln_q \frac{Q(x)}{P(x)} = \sum_x \frac{P(x) - P(x)^q Q(x)^{1-q}}{1-q}.$$

In this section, we use the result established by Gilardoni in [2] for the symmetric divergence.

Theorem (Gilardoni, 2006 [2]) We suppose D_f is symmetric divergence (which condition is known as $f(u) = uf(1/u) + c(u-1)$, $u \in (0, \infty)$ and c is constant number) and $f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(1) = 0$. Then we have

$$\inf_{P, Q: d_{TV}(P, Q) = \varepsilon} D_f(P\|Q) = (1 - \varepsilon) f\left(\frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon}\right) - 2f'(1) \varepsilon$$

As corollaries of the above theorem, we obtain the following two propositions. We define the Jensen-Shannon-Tsallis divergence as

$$\overline{C}_q(P, Q) \equiv D_q\left(P\left\|\frac{P+Q}{2}\right.\right) + D_q\left(Q\left\|\frac{P+Q}{2}\right.\right).$$

Then $D_{f_q}(P\|Q) = \overline{C}_q(P, Q)$ with $f_q(t) = -t \ln_q \frac{t+1}{2t} - \ln_q \frac{t+1}{2}$, f_q is convex, with $f_q(1) = 0$ and $\overline{C}_q(P, Q) = \overline{C}_q(Q, P)$. Thus we have the following proposition which is q -parametric extension of Proposition 3 in [1].

Proposition 1

$$\min_{P, Q: d_{TV}(P, Q) = \varepsilon} \overline{C}_q(P, Q) = -(1 - \varepsilon) \ln_q \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} - (1 + \varepsilon) \ln_q \frac{1}{1 + \varepsilon},$$

The equality is archived when $P = \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}\right)$, $Q = \left(\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\right)$.

We also define Jeffrey-Tsallis divergence as

$$J_q(P, Q) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left\{ D_q(P\|Q) + D_q(Q\|P) \right\}.$$

Then $D_{f_q}(P\|Q) = J_q(P, Q)$ with $f_q(t) = \frac{(t^q - 1) \ln_q t}{2}$, f_q is convex with $f_q(1) = 0$ and $J_q(P, Q) = J_q(Q, P)$. Thus we have the following proposition which is q -parametric extension of Proposition 4 in [1].

Proposition 2

$$\min_{P, Q: d_{TV}(P, Q) = \varepsilon} J_q(P, Q) = -\frac{1}{2} \left\{ (1 + \varepsilon) \ln_q \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \varepsilon} + (1 - \varepsilon) \ln_q \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \right\}.$$

The equality is archived when $P = \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}\right)$, $Q = \left(\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}, \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}\right)$.

Here we are able to prove the following lemma, which may be named q -Pinsker's inequality.

Lemma 1

$$D_q(P\|Q) \geq \frac{1}{2} d_{TV}(P, Q)^2 \quad \text{for } q \geq 1.$$

Proof: The proof is easily done by the fact that $\log t \leq \frac{t^r - 1}{r}$, ($t > 0, r > 0$) implies $-\log \frac{1}{t} \leq -\ln_q \frac{1}{t}$, ($t > 0, q > 1$), putting $r = q - 1$. Thus we have

$$-x \ln_q \frac{y}{x} - (1-x) \ln_q \frac{1-y}{1-x} \geq -x \log \frac{y}{x} - (1-x) \log \frac{1-y}{1-x} \geq 2(x-y)^2$$

for $0 < x, y < 1, q \geq 1$. Thus we have this lemma by data processing inequality. ■

As remark, the above q -Pinsker inequality does not hold for the case $0 < q < 1$, since we have counter-examples. Applying this lemma, we can prove the following proposition, which condition is same to the paper [1] except for the

extended parameter q .

Theorem 1 Consider a memoryless stationary source with alphabet \mathcal{U} with probability distribution P and assume that a uniquely decodable code with an alphabet size d . For $q \geq 1$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l}(u)| \leq \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}} \right\}.$$

Where $\Delta_{d,q} \equiv \bar{n}_q - H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U})$, $\bar{n}_q \equiv -\frac{(c_{d,l})^{q-1}}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q d^{-l(u)}$, $H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) \equiv -\frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q p(u)$, $Q_{d,l}(u) \equiv \frac{d^{-l(u)}}{c_{d,l}}$ and $c_{d,l} \equiv \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} d^{-l(u)}$.

Proof: We give the sketch of the proof of this proposition. Firstly $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l}(u)| \leq 2$ is trivial. By Lemma 1, we have

$$D_q(P \| Q_{d,l}) \geq D_q(\widehat{P} \| \widehat{Q}_{d,l}) \geq 2(P(A) - Q_{d,l}(A))^2 = 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} d_{TV}(P, Q_{d,l}) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l}(u)| \right)^2,$$

where $A \equiv \{x : P(x) > Q_{d,l}(x)\}$, $Y \equiv \phi(X)$ and \widehat{P} and $\widehat{Q}_{d,l}$ are distributions of new random variable Y . By simple computations with formula $\ln_q \frac{y}{x} = x^{q-1}(\ln_q y - \ln_q x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_q(P \| Q_{d,l}) &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q (\ln_q p(u) - \ln_q Q_{d,l}(u)) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \left(\ln_q p(u) - \ln_q \frac{d^{-l(u)}}{c_{d,l}} \right) \\ &= -\log_e d \cdot H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) - (c_{d,l})^{q-1} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q (\ln_q d^{-l(u)} - \ln_q c_{d,l}) \\ &= -\log_e d \cdot H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) + \log_e d \cdot \bar{n}_q - \ln_q \frac{1}{c_{d,l}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \leq \log_e d \cdot \Delta_{d,q} \end{aligned}$$

since the Kraft-McMillian inequality $c_{d,l} \leq 1$ was used. Thus we have $\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l}(u)| \right)^2 \leq \log_e d \cdot \Delta_{d,q}$. ■

Remark 1 This theorem is a parametric extension of the inequality (32) in the paper [1] in the sense that the left hand side of our inequality contains the parameter $q \geq 1$. We also note that the condition $q \geq 1$ is corresponding to the result in our previous paper [6], so the condition $q \geq 1$ may not be so unnatural within our framework of this topic.

In addition, we compare our upper bound with parameter $q \geq 1$ obtained in Theorem 1 and that obtained in the paper [1]. Actually we give an example such that $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,1} \log_e d}{2}}$, where $\Delta_{d,1}$ was used in the paper [1] as Δ_d . Consider the following information source

$$\mathcal{U} = \begin{pmatrix} u_1, & u_2, & u_3 \\ 0.5, & 0.3, & 0.2 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $d = 2$. Then we have the code $u_1 \rightarrow "0"$, $u_2 \rightarrow "10"$, $u_3 \rightarrow "110"$ by Shannon-Fano coding, so that $c_{d,l} = \frac{7}{8} < 1$ since $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 2, l_3 = 3$. By numerical computations, we have $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{2,1.5} \log_e 2}{2}} \approx 0.225793$ and $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{2,1} \log_e 2}{2}} \approx 0.272669$.

This means there exists a code such that $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,1} \log_e d}{2}}$, which shows our upper bound with the parameter $q \geq 1$ is tighter than the upper bound in the paper [1], in this example. We performed some numerical computations with a few information sources, then we could find the parameter $q \geq 1$ such that $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,1} \log_e d}{2}}$ for the case $c_{d,l} < 1$.

However, for the case $c_{d,l} = 1$ (e.g., Huffman code), the following proposition can be proven.

Proposition 3 Let $q \geq 1$ and $c_{d,l} = 1$. Then we have the relation $\Delta_{d,1} \leq \Delta_{d,q}$.

Proof: We firstly prove the inequality $f_q(x, y) \geq 0$ for $q \geq 1, 0 < x, y \leq 1$, where $f_q(x, y) \equiv x(\log_e y - \log_e x) + x^q(\ln_q x - \ln_q y)$. Since $\frac{df_q(x,y)}{dy} = \frac{x^q}{y^q} \left(\frac{x^{1-q}}{y^{1-q}} - 1 \right)$, if $x \leq y$, then $\frac{df_q(x,y)}{dy} \geq 0$ and if $x \geq y$, then $\frac{df_q(x,y)}{dy} \leq 0$, thus we have $f_q(x, y) \geq f_q(x, x) = 0$. Putting $x = p(u)$ and $y = d^{-l(u)}$, taking summation on both sides by $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and dividing the both sides by $\log_e d$, we have

$$-\frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q d^{-l(u)} + \frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) \log_e d^{-l(u)} - \frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) \log_e p(u) + \frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q p(u) \geq 0.$$

When $c_{d,l} = 1$, we thus obtain the inequality $\Delta_{d,q} - \Delta_{d,1} = \bar{n}_q - \bar{n}_1 + H_{d,1}(\mathcal{U}) - H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) \geq 0$, taking account that the usual average code length can be rewritten as $\bar{n}_1 = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)l(u) = -\frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u) \log_e d^{-l(u)}$. ■

This proposition shows that for the special (but nontrivial) case $c_{d,l} = 1$, the upper bound $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,1} \log_e d}{2}}$ given in (32) of the paper [1] is always tighter than ours $\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}}$ (for $q \geq 1$) obtained in Theorem 1.

NON-COMMUTATIVE CASES

Let ρ and σ be density matrices (quantum states), which are positive semi-definite matrices and unit trace. Then the following quantities are well known in the field of quantum information or physics as trace distance and fidelity, respectively:

$$d(\rho, \sigma) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} |\rho - \sigma|, \quad F(\rho, \sigma) \equiv \text{Tr} |\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2}|,$$

Where $|A| = (A^* A)^{1/2}$. Then we have the following propositions.

Proposition 4 For the trace distance and fidelity, we have the following relation:

$$1 - d(\rho, \sigma) \leq F(\rho, \sigma) \leq \sqrt{1 - d(\rho, \sigma)^2}.$$

This relation is well known in the field of quantum information or quantum statistical physics, and this proposition is non-commutative extension of Proposition 1 in the paper [1].

By the easy calculations such as $C_Q(\rho, \sigma) \equiv -\log \left(\min_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \text{Tr} [\rho^s \sigma^{1-s}] \right) = -\min_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \left(\log \text{Tr} [\rho^s \sigma^{1-s}] \right) \geq -\log \text{Tr} [\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2}] \geq -\log \text{Tr} [\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2}] = -\log F(\rho, \sigma) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \log (1 - d(\rho, \sigma)^2)$, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5 For the quantum Chernoff information, we have

$$\min_{\rho, \sigma: d(\rho, \sigma) = \varepsilon} C_Q(\rho, \sigma) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} \log (1 - \varepsilon^2), & \varepsilon \in [0, 1) \\ +\infty, & \varepsilon = 1 \end{cases}$$

The above proposition is also non-commutative extension of Proposition 2 in the paper [1].

The quantum Pinsker inequality on quantum relative entropy (divergence) and similar one are known (see e.g., [7] and [8], respectively)

$$D(\rho|\sigma) \equiv \text{Tr}[\rho(\log \rho - \log \sigma)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}[\rho - \sigma]^2$$

and

$$D(\rho|\sigma) \geq -2 \log \text{Tr} [\rho^{1/2} \sigma^{1/2}] \geq \text{Tr} [\rho^{1/2} - \sigma^{1/2}]^2$$

To show our final result, we use the following well-known fact. See [7] for example.

Lemma 2 Let $\mathcal{E} : B(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K})$ be a state transformation. For an operator monotone decreasing function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the monotonicity holds:

$$D_f(\rho|\sigma) \geq D_f(\mathcal{E}(\rho)|\mathcal{E}(\sigma))$$

where $D_f(\rho|\sigma) \equiv \text{Tr} [\rho f(\Delta)(I)]$ is the quantum f -divergence, with $\Delta_{\sigma,\rho} \equiv \Delta = LR$ is the relative modular operator such as $L(A) = \sigma A$ and $R(A) = A\rho^{-1}$.

Theorem 2 The quantum Jeffrey divergence defined by $J(\rho|\sigma) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \{D(\rho|\sigma) + D(\sigma|\rho)\}$ has the following lower bound:

$$J(\rho|\sigma) \geq d(\rho, \sigma) \log \left(\frac{1 + d(\rho, \sigma)}{1 - d(\rho, \sigma)} \right).$$

Proof: By Lemma 2, Proposition 4 in the paper [1] and $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = \|P - Q\|_1$ (which will be shown in the end of proof), we have

$$J(\rho|\sigma) \geq J(P|Q) \geq d_{TV}(P, Q) \log \left(\frac{1 + d_{TV}(P, Q)}{1 - d_{TV}(P, Q)} \right) = d(\rho, \sigma) \log \left(\frac{1 + d(\rho, \sigma)}{1 - d(\rho, \sigma)} \right).$$

Here we note that $f(t) = \frac{1}{2}(t-1)\log t$ is operator convex which is equivalent to operator monotone decreasing and we have $D_{\frac{1}{2}(t-1)\log t}(\rho|\sigma) = J(\rho|\sigma)$, since $(\Delta_{\sigma,\rho} \log \Delta_{\sigma,\rho})(Y) = \sigma \log \sigma(Y) \rho^{-1} - \sigma \rho^{-1} \log \rho(Y)$.

Finally, we show $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = \|P - Q\|_1$. Let $\mathcal{A} = C^*(\rho_1 - \rho_2)$ be commutative C^* -algebra generated by $\rho_1 - \rho_2$, M_n be the set of all $n \times n$ matrices and set the map $\mathcal{E} : M_n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ as trace preserving, conditional expectation. If we take $p_1 = \mathcal{E}(\rho_1)$ and $p_2 = \mathcal{E}(\rho_2)$, then two elements $(\rho_1 - \rho_2)_+$ and $(\rho_1 - \rho_2)_-$ of Jordan decomposition of $\rho_1 - \rho_2$, are commutative functional calculus of $\rho_1 - \rho_2$, and we have $p_1 - p_2 = \mathcal{E}(\rho_1 - \rho_2) = \mathcal{E}((\rho_1 - \rho_2)_+ - (\rho_1 - \rho_2)_-) = \mathcal{E}((\rho_1 - \rho_2)_+) - \mathcal{E}((\rho_1 - \rho_2)_-) = (\rho_1 - \rho_2)_+ - (\rho_1 - \rho_2)_- = \rho_1 - \rho_2$ which implies $\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 = \|P - Q\|_1$. ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author (S. F.) was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K05257.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Sason, Tight Bounds for Symmetric Divergence Measures and a Refined Bound for Lossless Source Coding, IEEE, TIT, Vol. 61(2015), pp.701–707.
- [2] G. L. Gilardoni, On the minimum f -divergence for given total variation, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, Vol.343 (2006), pp.763–766.
- [3] C. Tsallis, Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics, J.Stat. Phys., Vol.52(1988), pp. 479–487.
- [4] I. Csizsár, Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations, Stud. Sci. Math. Hungarica, Vol. 2(1967), pp. 299–318.
- [5] S.Furuichi, K.Yanagi and K.Kuriyama, Fundamental properties of Tsallis relative entropy, J.Math.Phys., Vol.45(2004), pp.4868–4877.
- [6] S.Furuichi, Information theoretical properties of Tsallis entropies, J.Math.Phys., Vol.47(2006), 023302.
- [7] D.Petz, Quantum information theory and quantum statistics, Springer, 2004.
- [8] E.A.Carlen and E.H. Lieb, Remainder terms for some quantum entropy inequalities, J. Math. Phys., Vol.55 (2014), 042201.

Appendix: Added notes related to Theorem 1

Actually we have $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \bar{n}_q = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)l(u)$ which is the usual average code length, but the definition of \bar{n}_q in Theorem 1 seems to be complicated and somewhat unnatural to understand its meaning. In order to overcome this problem, we may adopt the simple alternative definition for \bar{n}_q instead of that in Theorem 1. Then we have the following proposition.

Proposition A Let $q \geq 1$ and $c_{d,l,q} \leq 1$. Then we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l,q}(u)| \leq \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_{d,q} \log_e d}{2}} \right\}$$

Where $\Delta_{d,q} \equiv \bar{n}_q - H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U})$, $\bar{n}_q \equiv \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q l(u)$, $H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) \equiv -\frac{1}{\log_e d} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q p(u)$, $Q_{d,l,q}(u) \equiv \frac{1}{c_{d,l,q}} \exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)})$ and $c_{d,l,q} \equiv \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)})$, where q -exponential function $\exp_q(\cdot)$ is the inverse function of q -logarithmic function $\ln_q(\cdot)$ and its form is given in the proof of this proposition.

Proof: By the same way to the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$D_q(P \| Q_{d,l,q}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l,q}(u)| \right)^2,$$

By simple computations with formula $\ln_q \frac{y}{x} = y^{1-q} (\ln_q y + \ln_q \frac{1}{x})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_q(P \| Q_{d,l,q}) &= \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q (\ln_q p(u) - \ln_q Q_{d,l,q}(u)) = -\log_e d \cdot H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \ln_q \frac{\exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)})}{c_{d,l,q}} \\ &= -\log_e d \cdot H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \left(\exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)}) \right)^{1-q} \ln_q \frac{1}{c_{d,l,q}} - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \log_e d^{-l(u)} \\ &= \log_e d \cdot \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q l(u) - \log_e d \cdot H_{d,q}(\mathcal{U}) - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \left(\exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)}) \right)^{1-q} \ln_q \frac{1}{c_{d,l,q}} \\ &= \Delta_{d,q} \log_e d - \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} p(u)^q \left(\exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)}) \right)^{1-q} \ln_q \frac{1}{c_{d,l,q}} \\ &\leq \Delta_{d,q} \log_e d \end{aligned}$$

since $d \geq 2$, $l(u) \geq 1$ implies $\log_e d^{-l(u)} \leq 0$ thus we have $1 + (1-q) \log_e d^{-l(u)} \geq 0$, then the definition of q -exponential function

$$\exp_q(x) = \begin{cases} (1 + (1-q)x)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, & \text{if } 1 + (1-q)x > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

shows $\exp_q(\log_e d^{-l(u)}) \geq 0$ and $c_{d,l,q} \leq 1$ was used. Thus we have $\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} |p(u) - Q_{d,l,q}(u)| \right)^2 \leq \Delta_{d,q} \log_e d$. ■

We could not remove the needless and meaningless condition $c_{d,l,q} \leq 1$ in the above proposition, unfortunately. It is known that the inequality $c_{d,l,1} \leq 1$ holds for the uniquely decodable code and the equality $c_{d,l,1} = 1$ holds if the code archives the entropy, namely $\bar{n}_1 = H_{d,1}(\mathcal{U})$ [1]. In our proposition, we obtained q -parametric extension but it does not have any information theoretical meaning. We will have to consider about this problem in the future.