

A Lower Bound on the Average Error of Vector Quantizers

J. H. Conway
Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, CB2 1SB, England

N. J. A. Sloane
Mathematical Sciences Research Center
AT&T Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, NJ 07974, USA

Abstract

A lower bound is proposed for the mean squared error of an n -dimensional vector quantizer with a large number of output points. Although no formal proof has been found, a plausible geometrical argument is given for believing that the bound is correct. The new bound is analogous to the Rogers bound for packing spheres, the Coxeter-Few-Rogers bound for covering space with spheres, and the Coxeter-Böröczky bound for packing spherical caps. It is significantly stronger than Zador's sphere bound for quantizers.

1. Introduction

An n -dimensional vector quantizer ([3], [11]) with output points $y_1, \dots, y_M \in \mathbf{R}^n$ maps an input point $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ into a closest output point y_i . If x has probability density function $p(x)$, the mean squared error per symbol of this quantizer is

$$E = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \|x - y_i\|^2 p(x) dx ,$$

where $\|x\| = (x \cdot x)^{1/2}$. We wish to choose y_1, \dots, y_M to minimize E . Zador [25] showed under quite general assumptions about $p(x)$ that the mean squared error of an optimal quantizer satisfies

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} M^{2/n} E = G_n \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} p(x)^{n/(n+2)} dx \right]^{(n+2)/n} , \quad (1)$$

where G_n depends only on n . He also showed that

$$G_n \geq \frac{1}{(n+2)\pi} \Gamma \left[\frac{n}{2} + 1 \right]^{2/n} \quad (2)$$

(the "sphere bound"), and

$$G_n \leq \frac{1}{n\pi} \Gamma \left[\frac{n}{2} + 1 \right]^{2/n} \Gamma \left[1 + \frac{2}{n} \right] . \quad (3)$$

Since the probability density function $p(x)$ only appears in the last term of (1), we may choose any convenient $p(x)$ when attempting to find G_n . In particular, this implies that G_n is the mean squared error of an optimal quantizer in the case when the input x is uniformly distributed over a large sphere in \mathbf{R}^n , and $M \rightarrow \infty$, which is an important question in its own right.

In this correspondence we propose a stronger lower bound than (2). We give a plausible geometrical argument for believing that G_n cannot be less than the quantity

$$\frac{n+3-2H_{n+2}}{4n(n+1)} (n+1)^{\frac{1}{n}} (n!)^{\frac{4}{n}} f_n(n)^{\frac{2}{n}}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$H_m = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{i} \quad (m = 1, 2, \dots) \quad (5)$$

is a harmonic sum, and $f_n(x)$ is Schläfli's function (see Section II).

Some numerical values of (4) are given in Figure 1 and Table I, together with Zador's bounds (2) and (3). We also show some upper bounds on G_n that were obtained in [3], [5] by evaluating the mean squared error of certain lattices when used to quantize uniformly distributed inputs. The following lattices were used: the so-called Voronoi lattices of the first type, A_n^* (the subscript indicates the dimension, and the asterisk that these are the duals of the root lattices A_n - see [3]); the lattices D_n^* ; and, in the column of the Table headed "other", the lattices E_6^* , E_7^* , the Gosset lattice E_8 , the Coxeter-Todd lattice K_{12} , the Barnes-Wall lattice Λ_{16} , and the Leech lattice Λ_{24} (see [3]-[5]).

It is known that A_1^* (the integers) and A_2^* (the familiar two-dimensional hexagonal lattice) are optimal for quantizing uniformly distributed inputs in one and two dimensions ([8], [10], [18]), and that the body-centered cubic lattice A_3^* is similarly optimal among *lattice* quantizers in three dimensions [1]. It can be seen from the Table that (4) is stronger than Zador's sphere bound (2), and gives considerably better estimates of G_n for $n \geq 2$. In dimensions 8 and 24, in particular, the bounds are remarkably close together.

When Coxeter [6] published his conjectured bound for spherical caps (which as we shall see in Section II is analogous to (4)) he observed a similar phenomenon in eight dimensions, and remarked that this was "a manifestation of the extraordinary near-regularity" of the Gosset lattice E_8 . The Leech lattice Λ_{24} is just as extraordinary as Gosset's (see [4], [5], [15], [16], [19], [24]), and the existence of these two lattices explains the small gaps in the Table at 8 and 24 dimensions. Asymptotically, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, all three bounds (2), (3), (4) agree, and $G_n \rightarrow 1/(2\pi e)$. (The asymptotic form of $f_n(n)$ may be found on page 676 of [14]; see also [21].)

2. The Proposed New Bound

In this section we derive (4), and give our reasons for believing that is a lower bound for G_n . The following argument has been applied to a number of geometrical problems. In three dimensions it is possible to arrange four equal spheres so that they all touch one another, the centers then being at the vertices of a regular tetrahedron. Since the four spheres cannot move closer together, this is the tightest possible packing of four spheres. Suppose new spheres are added to this configuration one at a time, so as to form a new tetrahedron at each step. If this process could be continued indefinitely, it is plausible that the resulting configuration would have the highest packing density of any arrangement of spheres, since every tetrahedral configuration would be packed as densely as possible [24]. Unfortunately, however, regular tetrahedra do not fit together perfectly to fill space, and after a while this construction cannot be extended. Nevertheless, Rogers showed in [20] (see also [22]) that the density of this hypothetical arrangement is indeed an upper bound on the density of any three-dimensional packing, and that a similar result

holds in any dimension.

In order to give a precise statement of Rogers' bound, let T_n denote the n -dimensional regular simplex (T_2 is a triangle, T_3 is a tetrahedron) having the $n + 1$ vertices $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, where there are $n + 1$ coordinates. The edge length of this simplex is $\sqrt{2}$. If spheres of radius $1/\sqrt{2}$ are placed at the vertices, they form a set of $n + 1$ mutually touching (but non-overlapping) spheres. Let σ_n denote the ratio of the volume of the part of T_n covered by the spheres to the total volume of T_n . Then Rogers proved that the density Δ of any packing of spheres in \mathbf{R}^n cannot exceed σ_n .

A formula for σ_n can be given in terms of Schlafli's function $f_n(x)$. This function has been studied by several authors (see [6], [14] and the references given there), and we just mention that it is defined recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= 1, \\ f_2(x) &= \frac{\operatorname{arcsec} x}{\pi}, \\ f_n(x) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{n-1}^x \frac{f_{n-2}(x-2) dx}{x\sqrt{x^2-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Rogers' bound can then be written

$$\frac{\Delta}{V_n} \leq 2^{\frac{-3n}{2}} \sqrt{n+1} (n!)^2 f_n(n) = U(n) \quad (\text{say}) \quad (6)$$

where V_n is the volume of a unit sphere in \mathbf{R}^n (see Leech [14, p. 675]).

Similar reasoning led Coxeter, Few and Rogers ([7]; see also [22, Chapter 8]) to give a lower bound on the density of any *covering* of \mathbf{R}^n by overlapping spheres. For this

problem, however, instead of spheres of radius $1/\sqrt{2}$, they placed spheres of radius $\{n/(n+1)\}^{1/2}$ at the vertices of T_n , this radius being chosen so that the spheres just cover T_n . Let τ_n denote the ratio of the sum of the volumes of the "sectors" of these spheres lying in T_n to the total volume of T_n . Then Coxeter, Rogers and Few proved that the density Δ of any covering of \mathbf{R}^n by spheres cannot be less than τ_n . Since

$$\tau_n = \left(\frac{2n}{n+1} \right)^{n/2} \sigma_n, \quad (7)$$

this bound can also be expressed in terms of Schläfli's function.

Coxeter ([6]; see also [9]) used essentially the same argument (but replacing T_n by a regular spherical simplex) to propose an upper bound on the density of nonoverlapping spherical caps placed on an n -dimensional sphere. Coxeter was unable to prove this bound, and it was only established fifteen years later by Böröczky [2]. It should also be mentioned that both Rogers' and Coxeter's bounds have since been improved in many cases ([12], [17], [19], [23]).

Our justification of (4) uses the same reasoning, and its status is that of Coxeter's bound in 1963: it seems very plausible, but we cannot give a proof. (We do not expect that (4) will be easy to prove. Certainly the methods used by Rogers [22] do not seem to be applicable.) We consider quantizers in \mathbf{R}^n with a uniformly distributed input and a large number of output points. We argue as above that an optimal quantizer would be obtained if we could fill space with copies of T_n . This cannot be done, except in one and two dimensions, but nevertheless the mean squared error of this hypothetical quantizer should be a lower bound on the error of any quantizer, and therefore a lower bound on

G_n . We now evaluate the mean squared error of this hypothetical quantizer, and show that it is given by (4).

Each output point y_i of a quantizer belongs to a Voronoi region

$$V(y_i) = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \|x - y_i\| \leq \|x - y_j\| \text{ for all } j\}.$$

If the Voronoi regions are all congruent, to some polytope P , say, then the mean squared error per symbol of the quantizer is given by

$$\frac{1}{n} \frac{\int_P \|x - \hat{x}\|^2 dx}{\left[\int_P dx \right]^{(n+2)/n}}, \quad (8)$$

where \hat{x} is the centroid of P (see [3], [11], [25]). To find the Voronoi region of our quantizer, we first decompose T_n into $(n + 1)!$ congruent smaller simplices L by joining the centroid of T_n to the midpoints of all i -dimensional faces, for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Then $n!$ copies of L meet at each vertex of T_n . Figure 2 illustrates the case $n = 2$.

As shown in Figure 2, six copies of T_2 fit together around any vertex. In n dimensions, imagine a small sphere drawn around one vertex of T_n , and let κ be the ratio of the area (or $(n - 1)$ -dimensional content) of this sphere to the area of the intersection with T_n . If our hypothetical quantizer existed, κ would be an integer, and κ copies of T_n would fit together perfectly around a vertex. In two dimensions $\kappa = 6$. Figure 3 shows a sketch of the case $n = 3$, when $\kappa = 4\pi/(3 \operatorname{arcsec} 3 - \pi) = 22.79 \dots$.

The Voronoi region of the hypothetical quantizer is then the disjoint union of $\kappa \cdot n!$ copies of L arranged around a vertex of T_n (see Figure 2). The mean squared error can be evaluated using (8), and the fact that there is an explicit formula for the second moment of an arbitrary simplex L with vertices Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_n about any point [3, Eq. (15)]. The second moment about Q_0 (say) is given by

$$\frac{\int_L x \cdot x dx}{\int_L dx} = \frac{n+1}{n+2} \|\hat{Q} - Q_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{(n+1)(n+2)} \sum_{i=0}^n \|Q_i - Q_0\|^2, \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{Q} = (n+1)^{-1} \sum Q_i$ is the centroid of L . In our case

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0 &= P_0 = (1, 0, 0, 0, \dots) \\ Q_1 &= 2^{-1} (1, 1, 0, 0, \dots) \\ Q_2 &= 3^{-1} (1, 1, 1, 0, \dots) \\ &\dots \\ Q_n &= (n+1)^{-1} (1, 1, \dots, 1) \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\hat{Q} = (n+1)^{-1} (H_{n+1} - H_0, \quad H_{n+1} - H_1, \quad \dots, \quad H_{n+1} - H_n),$$

where H_m is defined in (5). From this it can be shown that

$$\|\hat{Q} - Q_0\|^2 = \frac{n+3}{n+1} - \frac{2n+3}{(n+1)^2} H_{n+1};$$

we omit the details of the algebra. The right-hand side of (9) then simplifies to

$$\frac{n+3 - 2H_{n+1}}{n+1}. \quad (10)$$

The volumes of S , L and P are respectively

$$\frac{\sqrt{n+1}}{n!}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1} (n!)^2}, \frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{n+1} n!}, \quad (11)$$

and with the aid of (10) and (11), (8) becomes

$$\frac{n+3-2H_{n+2}}{n(n+1)} (n+1)^{\frac{1}{n}} (n!)^{\frac{2}{n}} \kappa^{-\frac{2}{n}}. \quad (12)$$

It remains to find κ . But this is exactly what the Schläfli functions are designed for, and from [6, Eq. (4.1)] we find

$$\kappa = \frac{2^n}{n! f_n(n)}. \quad (13)$$

(4) now follows from (12) and (13).

Leech (see [6, §10]) has calculated $f_n(n)$ for $n \leq 8$, and a more extensive but unpublished table has been obtained by Lang [13]. Fortunately Rogers' bound $U(n)$ is given in [15] and [16] for $n \leq 24$, and our bound (4) can be written in terms of Rogers' as

$$\frac{2(n+3-2H_{n+2})}{n(n+1)} U(n)^{\frac{2}{n}} \quad (14)$$

using (6). The numerical values of our bound that are given in Table I were computed with the aid of (14).

Finally, we remark that it is clear that the proposed bound can be generalized to any k -th power distortion measure. We have restricted attention to the mean squared error criterion because it is the most popular, and because in this case the integrals can be

evaluated explicitly.

List of Table Captions

Table I. Bounds on G_n (multiplied by 100)

Table I. Bounds on G_n (multiplied by 100)

| Dimension n | Lower bounds | | Upper bounds | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|---------|-------|-----------|
| | Sphere bound (2) | New bound (4) | A_n^* | D_n^* | Other | Zador (3) |
| 1 | 8.333 | 8.333 | 8.333 | | | 50.000 |
| 2 | 7.958 | 8.019 | 8.019 | | | 15.915 |
| 3 | 7.697 | 7.787 | 7.854 | 7.854 | | 11.580 |
| 4 | 7.503 | 7.609 | 7.756 | 7.660 | | 9.974 |
| 5 | 7.352 | 7.465 | 7.692 | 7.563 | | 9.132 |
| 6 | 7.230 | 7.347 | 7.649 | 7.512 | 7.424 | 8.608 |
| 7 | 7.130 | 7.248 | 7.619 | 7.486 | 7.312 | 8.248 |
| 8 | 7.045 | 7.163 | 7.597 | 7.474 | 7.168 | 7.982 |
| 9 | 6.973 | 7.090 | 7.582 | 7.469 | | 7.778 |
| 10 | 6.910 | 7.026 | 7.570 | 7.470 | | 7.614 |
| 12 | 6.807 | 6.918 | 7.557 | 7.480 | 7.010 | 7.367 |
| 14 | 6.724 | 6.831 | 7.551 | 7.495 | | 7.189 |
| 16 | 6.657 | 6.759 | 7.549 | 7.513 | 6.830 | 7.053 |
| 18 | 6.600 | 6.698 | 7.550 | 7.530 | | 6.945 |
| 20 | 6.552 | 6.646 | 7.553 | 7.548 | | 6.857 |
| 22 | 6.511 | 6.600 | 7.558 | 7.565 | | 6.784 |
| 24 | 6.475 | 6.561 | 7.563 | 7.581 | 6.577 | 6.722 |

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Comparison of the new bound with the sphere bound and Zador's bound.

Figure 2. The two-dimensional case, when six copies of T_2 fit together at a vertex, and the Voronoi region P of that vertex is made up of 12 copies of the small simplex L .

Figure 3. A sketch of the 3-dimensional case, showing the intersection of a regular tetrahedron with a small sphere around one vertex. The shaded area occupies $1/\kappa$ -th of the surface of the sphere, where $\kappa = 22.79 \dots$

References

1. E. S. Barnes and N. J. A. Sloane, *The optimal lattice quantizer in three dimensions*, SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Methods, **4** (1983), 30-41.
2. K. Böröczky, *Packing of spheres in spaces of constant curvature*, Acta Math. Acad. Scient. Hungar., **32** (1978), 243-261.
3. J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Voronoi regions of lattices, second moments of polytopes, and quantization*, IEEE Trans. Information Theory, **IT-28** (1982), 211-226.
4. J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Laminated lattices*, Annals Math., **116** (1982), 593-620.
5. J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *On the Voronoi regions of certain lattices*, SIAM J. Alg. Discrete Methods, **5** (1984), 294-305.
6. H. S. M. Coxeter, *An upper bound for the number of equal nonoverlapping spheres that can touch another of the same size*, in Proc. Symp. Pure Math., Vol. **VII**, pp. 53-71, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence R.I., 1963. Reprinted (with corrections) as Chapter 9, pp. 179-198 of *Twelve Geometric Essays*, by H. S. M. Coxeter, Southern Illinois Univ. Press, Carbondale, Ill., 1968.
7. H. S. M. Coxeter, L. Few and C. A. Rogers, *Covering space with equal spheres*, Mathematika, **6** (1959), 147-157.
8. L. Fejes Tóth, *Lagerungen in der Ebene, auf der Kugel und in Raum*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1953. Second edition, Springer-Verlag, New York and Berlin,

1972.

9. L. Fejes Tóth, *Kreisausfüllungen der hyperbolischen Ebene*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., **4** (1953), 103-110.
10. L. Fejes Tóth, *Sur la représentation d'une population infinie par une nombre fini d'elements*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., **10** (1959), 299-304.
11. A. Gersho, *Asymptotically optimal block quantization*, IEEE Trans. Information Theory, **IT-25** (1979), 373-380.
12. G. A. Kabatiansky and V. I. Levenshtein, *Bounds for packings on a sphere and in space* (in Russian), Problemy Peredachi Informatsii, **14** (No. 1, 1978), 3-25. English translation in Problems of Information Transmission, **14** (No. 1, 1978), 1-17.
13. G. R. Lang, personal communication.
14. J. Leech, *Some sphere packings in higher space*, Canad. J. Math., **16** (1964), 657-682.
15. J. Leech, *Notes on sphere packings*, Canad. J. Math., **19** (1967), 251-267.
16. J. Leech and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere packing and error-correcting codes*, Canad. J. Math., **23** (1971), 718-745.
17. V. I. Levenshtein, *On bounds for packings in n -dimensional Euclidean space* (in Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **245** (No. 6, 1979), 1299-1303. English translation in Soviet Math. Doklady, **20** (No. 2, 1979), 417-421.

18. D. J. Newman, *The hexagon theorem*, IEEE Trans. Information Theory, **IT-28** (1982), 137-139.
19. A. M. Odlyzko and N. J. A. Sloane, *New bounds on the number of unit spheres that can touch a unit sphere in n dimensions*, J. Combinatorial Theory, **26A** (1979), 210-214.
20. C. A. Rogers, *The packing of equal spheres*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **8** (1958), 609-620.
21. C. A. Rogers, *An asymptotic expansion for certain Schläfli functions*, J. London Math. Soc., **36** (1961), 78-80.
22. C. A. Rogers, *Packing and Covering*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1964.
23. N. J. A. Sloane, *Recent bounds for codes, sphere packings and related problems obtained by linear programming and other methods*, in *Papers in Algebra, Analysis and Statistics*, edited by R. Lidl, Contemporary Mathematics, Volume 9. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I. 1982, pp. 153-185.
24. N. J. A. Sloane, *The packing of spheres*, Scientific American, **250** (No. 1, 1984), 116-125.
25. P. Zador, *Asymptotic quantization error of continuous signals and their quantization dimension*, IEEE Trans. Information Theory, **IT-28** (1982), 139-149.