

Asymptotic Approximation of Marginal Likelihood Integrals

Shaowei Lin

Abstract

The accurate asymptotic evaluation of marginal likelihood integrals is a fundamental problem in Bayesian statistics. Following the approach introduced by Watanabe, we translate this into a problem of computational algebraic geometry, namely, to determine the real log canonical threshold of a polynomial ideal, and we present effective methods for solving this problem. Our results are based on resolution of singularities, and they apply to all statistical models for discrete data that admit a parametrization by real analytic functions.

1 Introduction

The evaluation of marginal likelihood integrals is essential in model selection and has important applications in areas such as machine learning and computational biology. Exact evaluation of such integrals is a difficult problem [4, 16] and classical approximation formulas usually apply only for smooth models. Recent work by Watanabe and his collaborators [1, 22, 21, 23, 24] extended these formulas to a broad class of models with singularities. His work also uncovered interesting connections with resolution of singularities in algebraic geometry.

The aim of this paper is to systematically study the algebraic geometry behind Watanabe's formulas, and to develop symbolic algebra tools which allow the user to accurately evaluate the asymptotics of integrals in Bayesian statistics. The algebraic problem we address here is that of computing the real log canonical threshold of an ideal in a polynomial ring.

In this paper, we study a statistical model \mathcal{P} on a finite discrete space $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ parametrized by a real analytic map $p : \Omega \rightarrow \Delta_{k-1}$ where Ω is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^d and Δ_{k-1} is the probability simplex $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : x_i \geq 0, \sum x_i = 1\}$. We assume that Ω is *semianalytic*, i.e. $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : g_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, g_l(x) \geq 0\}$ is defined by real analytic inequalities. Let $q \in \Delta_{k-1}$ be a point in the model with non-zero entries. Consider a sample of size n drawn from the distribution q , and let $U = (U_i)$ denote the vector of relative frequencies for this sample. Let $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be *nearly analytic*, i.e. φ is a product $\varphi_a \varphi_s$ of functions where φ_a is real analytic and φ_s is positive and smooth. Consider a Bayesian

prior defined by $|\varphi|$. We want to estimate the marginal likelihood integral

$$Z(U; n) = \int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^k p_i(\omega)^{nU_i} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega. \quad (1)$$

The first few terms of the asymptotics of the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\log Z(U; n)]$ as n grows large has been derived by Watanabe. To state his result, we first recall that the Kullback-Leibler distance $K(\omega)$ between q and $p(\omega)$ is

$$K(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \log \frac{q_i}{p_i(\omega)}.$$

This function satisfies $K(\omega) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $p(\omega) = q$.

Theorem 1.1 ([22, §6]). *The expectation $\mathbb{E}[\log Z(U; n)]$ is asymptotically*

$$\mathbb{E}[\log Z(U; n)] \approx n \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \log q_i - \lambda \log n + (\theta - 1) \log \log n + O(1) \quad (2)$$

where the positive rational number λ is the smallest pole of the zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} K(\omega)^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

and θ is its multiplicity.

Here, λ is known as the *learning coefficient* of the statistical model. Because formula (2) generalizes the Bayesian information criterion [8, 22], the numbers λ and θ are important in model selection. Indeed, the BIC corresponds to the case $(\lambda, \theta) = (\frac{d}{2}, 1)$ for smooth models. In algebraic geometry, λ is also known as the *real log canonical threshold* [17] of K , a term that is motivated by the more familiar complex *log canonical threshold* (see Remark 4.1). These thresholds may be defined for ideals as well. Given an ideal $I = \langle f_1, \dots, f_r \rangle$ generated by functions f_i which are real analytic on a compact subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and given a smooth amplitude function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we consider the zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} \left(f_1(\omega)^2 + \dots + f_r(\omega)^2 \right)^{-z/2} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega. \quad (3)$$

If φ is nearly analytic, $\zeta(z)$ has an analytic continuation to the whole complex plane. Its poles are positive rational numbers with a smallest element λ which we call the *real log canonical threshold* of I with respect to φ over Ω . Let θ be the multiplicity of λ as a pole of $\zeta(z)$ and define $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(I; \varphi)$ to be the pair (λ, θ) . This pair does not depend on the choice of generators f_1, \dots, f_r for I .

The next result expresses the learning coefficient and its multiplicity directly in terms of the functions p_1, \dots, p_k parametrizing the model. Geometrically, it says that the learning coefficient is the real log canonical threshold of the fiber

$p^{-1}(q) \subset \Omega$. The theorem is computationally very useful especially when the p_i are polynomials or rational functions, and certain special cases have been applied by Sumio Watanabe and his collaborators [23, 24]. Our proof in Section 4 comes from a discussion with him. Now, recall that $\varphi = \varphi_a \varphi_s$ is nearly analytic.

Theorem 1.2. *Let λ be the learning coefficient of the statistical model \mathcal{P} and θ its multiplicity. Let I be the ideal $\langle p_1(\omega) - q_1, \dots, p_k(\omega) - q_k \rangle$. Then,*

$$(2\lambda, \theta) = \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(I; \varphi_a)$$

where each Ω_x is a sufficiently small neighborhood of x in Ω .

In order to prove fundamental properties of real log canonical thresholds, we recall Hironaka's theorem on the resolution of singularities [12] in Section 2. We also need to understand asymptotic expansions of Laplace integrals which is discussed in Section 3. As an application, we investigate what happens when we substitute the multinomial distribution of the relative frequencies U with its multivariate Gaussian approximation. Let the resulting random variable be \mathcal{U} and consider the normalized marginal likelihood integral

$$Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n) = \frac{Z(\mathcal{U}; n)}{\prod_{i=1}^k \mathcal{U}_i^{n\mathcal{U}_i}}.$$

Define the function $L : \Delta_{k-1} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$L(u, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \log \frac{u_i}{p_i(\omega)} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2q_i} (u_i - q_i)^2$$

and let du be the Lebesgue probability measure on Δ_{k-1} . If α is a pole of

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Delta_{k-1}} L(u, \omega)^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| du d\omega, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad (4)$$

let $d_{i,\alpha}$ be the coefficient of $(z - \alpha)^{-i}$ in the Laurent expansion of $\zeta(z)$, and let $\Gamma^{(i)}$ denote the i -th derivative of the gamma function Γ .

Theorem 1.3. *The expectation $\mathbb{E}[Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n)]$ is asymptotically*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n)] \approx \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_{i,\alpha} n^{\frac{k-1}{2} - \alpha} (\log n)^i \quad (5)$$

where the α range over positive rational numbers which are poles of $\zeta(z)$ and

$$c_{i,\alpha} = \frac{(-1)^{i+1} (k-1)!}{i! \sqrt{(2\pi)^{k-1} q_1 q_2 \cdots q_k}} \sum_{j=i}^{d-1} \frac{\Gamma^{(j-i)}(\alpha)}{(j-i)!} d_{j+1,\alpha}.$$

Moreover, the first term of the asymptotic expansion is $cn^{-\lambda} (\log n)^{\theta-1}$ where λ is the learning coefficient and θ its multiplicity.

Our next aim is to develop computer algebra tools for finding real log canonical thresholds of ideals. In general, there are global and local considerations in computing real log canonical thresholds. Firstly, it is known that one can reduce a global computation over a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to local ones. In particular, the real log canonical threshold of an ideal I over Ω is the minimum of thresholds of I over small neighborhoods of points in Ω . Identifying where these minimum thresholds occur is by itself a difficult problem which we discuss in Section 2.

In the local picture, these thresholds can be computed using local resolutions of singularities. This process is explained in Section 2. We will see in particular that the threshold at a point on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ depends on the analytic inequalities $g_i \geq 0$ defining Ω . Section 4 summarizes fundamental properties of real log canonical thresholds which are useful computationally. In Section 5, we derive local thresholds in nondegenerate cases using an important tool from toric geometry involving Newton polyhedra. This tool was invented by Varchenko [20] and applied to statistical models by Watanabe and Yamazaki [24]. Their methods were defined for functions, but we extend them so that they work for ideals. A formula for the real log canonical threshold of a monomial ideal with respect to a monomial amplitude function is given in Theorem 5.7.

Currently, there are no programs for computing real log canonical thresholds. There are applications which compute resolutions of singularities, but our statistical problems are too big for them. We hope our work is a step in bridging the gap. A SINGULAR library which implements our tools is available at

<http://math.berkeley.edu/~shaowei/r1ct.html>.

In Section 6, we demonstrate our methods with a discrete mixture model which comes from a study involving 132 schizophrenic patients.

While we usually restrict our computations to polynomials or rational functions, proofs of their properties carry over easily to real analytic functions. To introduce some notation, given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\mathcal{A}_x(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the ring of real-valued functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are analytic at x . We sometimes shorten the notation to \mathcal{A}_x when it is clear we are working with \mathbb{R}^d . When $x = 0$, it is convenient to think of \mathcal{A}_0 as a subring of the formal power series ring $\mathbb{R}[[\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d]] = \mathbb{R}[[\omega]]$. It consists of power series which are convergent in some neighborhood of the origin. For all x , $\mathcal{A}_x \simeq \mathcal{A}_0$ by translation. Given a subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let \mathcal{A}_Ω be the ring of real functions analytic at each point $x \in \Omega$. Locally, each function can be represented as a power series centered at x . Given $f \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega$, define the analytic variety $\mathcal{V}_\Omega(f) = \{\omega \in \Omega : f(\omega) = 0\}$ while for an ideal $I \subset \mathcal{A}_\Omega$, we set $\mathcal{V}_\Omega(I) = \bigcap_{f \in I} \mathcal{V}_\Omega(f)$. Lastly, given a finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $\#\min S$ denote the number of times the minimum is attained in S .

2 Resolution of Singularities

In this section, we introduce Hironaka's theorem on resolutions of singularities. We derive real log canonical thresholds of monomial functions, and demonstrate how such resolutions allow us to find the thresholds of non-monomial functions.

We show that the threshold of a function over a compact set is the minimum of local thresholds, and present an example where the threshold at a boundary point depend on the boundary inequalities. We end this section with a conjecture about the location of singularities with the smallest threshold.

Before we explore real log canonical thresholds of ideals, let us study those of functions. Given a compact subset Ω of \mathbb{R}^d , a real analytic function $f \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega$ and a smooth function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider the zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega. \quad (6)$$

If $\zeta(z)$ has a smallest pole, we denote the pole and its multiplicity by $\text{rlct}_\Omega(f; \varphi)$ and $\text{mult}_\Omega(f; \varphi)$. If $\zeta(z)$ has no poles, set $\text{rlct}_\Omega(f; \varphi) = \text{mult}_\Omega(f; \varphi) = \infty$. Let $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f; \varphi)$ be the pair $(\text{rlct}_\Omega(f; \varphi), \text{mult}_\Omega(f; \varphi))$, and order these pairs such that $(\lambda_1, \theta_1) > (\lambda_2, \theta_2)$ if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, or $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ and $\theta_1 < \theta_2$. Lastly, let $\text{RLCT}_\Omega f$ denote $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f; 1)$ where 1 is the constant unit function. We start with a simple class of functions, namely monomials $\omega_1^{\kappa_1} \cdots \omega_d^{\kappa_d} = \omega^\kappa$, for which it is easy to compute the real log canonical threshold.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d)$ and $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_d)$ be vectors of non-negative integers. If Ω is the positive orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ and $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a compactly supported smooth function with $\phi(0) > 0$, then*

$$\text{rlct}_\Omega(\omega^\kappa; \omega^\tau \phi) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left\{ \frac{\tau_j + 1}{\kappa_j} \right\}, \quad \text{mult}_\Omega(\omega^\kappa; \omega^\tau \phi) = \# \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left\{ \frac{\tau_j + 1}{\kappa_j} \right\}.$$

Proof. See [2, Lemma 7.3]. The idea is to express $\phi(\omega)$ as $T_s(\omega) + R_s(\omega)$ where T_s is the s -th degree Taylor polynomial and R_s the difference. We then integrate the main term $|f|^{-z} T_s$ explicitly and show that the integral of the remaining term $|f|^{-z} R_s$ does not have larger poles. This process gives the analytic continuation of $\zeta(z)$ to the whole complex plane, so we have the Laurent expansion

$$\zeta(z) = \sum_{\alpha > 0} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{d_{i,\alpha}}{(z - \alpha)^i} + P(z) \quad (7)$$

where the poles α are positive rational numbers and $P(z)$ is a polynomial. \square

For non-monomial $f(\omega)$, Hironaka's celebrated theorem [12] on the *resolution of singularities* tells us that we can always reduce to the monomial case.

Theorem 2.2 (Resolution of Singularities). *Let f be a non-constant real analytic function in some neighborhood $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of the origin with $f(0) = 0$. Then, there exists a triple (M, W, ρ) where*

- a. $W \subset \Omega$ is a neighborhood of the origin,
- b. M is a d -dimensional real analytic manifold,
- c. $\rho : M \rightarrow W$ is a real analytic map

satisfying the following properties.

- i. ρ is proper, i.e. the inverse image of any compact set is compact.
- ii. ρ is a real analytic isomorphism between $M \setminus \mathcal{V}_M(f \circ \rho)$ and $W \setminus \mathcal{V}_W(f)$.
- iii. For any $y \in \mathcal{V}_M(f \circ \rho)$, there exists a local chart M_y with coordinates $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_d)$ such that y is the origin and

$$f \circ \rho(\mu) = a(\mu)\mu_1^{\kappa_1}\mu_2^{\kappa_2}\cdots\mu_d^{\kappa_d} = a(\mu)\mu^\kappa$$

where $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_d$ are non-negative integers and a is a real analytic function with $a(\mu) \neq 0$ for all μ . Furthermore, the Jacobian determinant equals

$$|\rho'(\mu)| = h(\mu)\mu_1^{\tau_1}\mu_2^{\tau_2}\cdots\mu_d^{\tau_d} = h(\mu)\mu^\tau$$

where $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_d$ are non-negative integers and h is a real analytic function with $h(\mu) \neq 0$ for all μ .

We say that (M, W, ρ) is a *resolution of singularities* or a *desingularization* of f at the origin. In fact, we can desingularize a list of functions simultaneously.

Corollary 2.3 (Simultaneous Resolutions). *Let f_1, \dots, f_l be non-constant real analytic functions in some neighborhood $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ of the origin with all $f_i(0) = 0$. Then, there exists a triple (M, W, ρ) that desingularizes each f_i at the origin.*

Proof. The idea is to desingularize the product $f_1(\omega) \cdots f_l(\omega)$ and to show that such a resolution of singularities is also a resolution for each f_i . See [22, Thm 11] and [9, Lemma 2.3] for details. \square

For the rest of this section, let $\Omega = \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d, g_1(\omega) \geq 0, \dots, g_l(\omega) \geq 0\}$ be compact and semianalytic. We also assume that $f, \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega$.

Lemma 2.4. *For each $x \in \Omega$, there is a neighborhood Ω_x of x in Ω such that for all smooth functions ϕ on Ω_x with $\phi(x) > 0$,*

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi\phi) = \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \Omega$. If $f(x) \neq 0$, then by the continuity of f , there exists a small neighborhood Ω_x where $0 < c_1 < |f(\omega)| < c_2$ for some constants c_1, c_2 . Hence, for all smooth functions ϕ , the zeta functions

$$\int_{\Omega_x} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)\phi(\omega)| d\omega \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_x} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega$$

do not have any poles, so the lemma follows in this case.

Suppose $f(x) = 0$. By Corollary 2.3, we have a simultaneous local resolution of singularities (M, W, ρ) for the functions $f, \varphi, g_1, \dots, g_l$ vanishing at x . For each point y in the fiber $\rho^{-1}(x)$, we have a local chart satisfying property (iii) of Theorem 2.2. Since ρ is proper, the fiber $\rho^{-1}(x)$ is compact so there is a finite subcover $\{M_y\}$. We claim that the image $\rho(\bigcup M_y)$ contains a neighborhood W_x

of x in \mathbb{R}^d . Indeed, otherwise, there exists a bounded sequence $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of points in $W \setminus \rho(\bigcup M_y)$ whose limit is x . We pick a sequence $\{y_1, y_2, \dots\}$ such that $\rho(y_i) = x_i$. Since the x_i are bounded, the y_i lie in a compact set so there is a convergent subsequence with limit y_* . The y_i are not in the open set $\bigcup M_y$ so nor is y_* . But $\rho(y_*) = \lim \rho(y_i) = x$ so $y_* \in \rho^{-1}(x) \subset M_y$, a contradiction.

Now, define $\Omega_x = W_x \cap \Omega$ and let $\{\mathcal{M}_y\}$ be the collection of all sets $\mathcal{M}_y = M_y \cap \rho^{-1}(\Omega_x)$ which have positive measure. Picking a partition of unity $\{\sigma_y(\mu)\}$ subordinate to $\{\mathcal{M}_y\}$ such that σ_y is positive at y for each y , we write the zeta function $\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega_x} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)\phi(\omega)| d\omega$ as

$$\sum_y \int_{\mathcal{M}_y} |f \circ \rho(\mu)|^{-z} |\varphi \circ \rho(\mu)| |\phi \circ \rho(\mu)| |\rho'(\mu)| \sigma_y(\mu) d\mu.$$

For each y , the boundary conditions $g_i \circ \rho(\mu) \geq 0$ become monomial inequalities, so \mathcal{M}_y is the union of orthant neighborhoods of y . The integral over \mathcal{M}_y is then the sum of integrals of the form

$$\zeta_y(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d} \mu^{-\kappa z + \tau} \psi(\mu) d\mu$$

where κ and τ are non-negative integer vectors while ψ is a compactly supported smooth function with $\psi(0) > 0$. Note that κ and τ do not depend on ϕ nor on the choice of orthant at y . By Proposition 2.1, the smallest pole of $\zeta_y(z)$ is

$$\lambda_y = \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left\{ \frac{\tau_j + 1}{\kappa_j} \right\}, \quad \theta_y = \# \min_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left\{ \frac{\tau_j + 1}{\kappa_j} \right\}.$$

Now, $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi\phi) = \min_y \{(\lambda_y, \theta_y)\}$. Since this formula is independent of ϕ , we set $\phi = 1$ and the lemma follows. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be positive and smooth. Then, for sufficiently small neighborhoods Ω_x , the set $\{\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi) : x \in \Omega\}$ has a minimum and*

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(f; \varphi\phi) = \min_{x \in \Omega} \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi).$$

Proof. Lemma 2.4 associates a small neighborhood to each point in the compact set Ω , so there exists a subcover $\{\Omega_x : x \in S\}$ where S is finite. Let $\{\sigma_x(\omega)\}$ be a partition of unity subordinate to this subcover. Then,

$$\int_{\Omega} |f(\Omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)\phi(\omega)| d\omega = \sum_{x \in S} \int_{\Omega_x} |f(\Omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)\phi(\omega)| \sigma_x(\omega) d\omega.$$

From this finite sum, we have

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(f; \varphi\phi) = \min_{x \in S} \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi\phi\sigma_x) = \min_{x \in S} \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi).$$

Now, if $y \in \Omega \setminus S$, let Ω_y be a neighborhood of y prescribed by Lemma 2.4 and consider the cover $\{\Omega_x : x \in S\} \cup \{\Omega_y\}$ of Ω . After choosing a partition of unity subordinate to this cover and repeating the above argument, we get

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(f; \varphi\phi) \leq \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_y}(f; \varphi) \quad \text{for all } y \in \Omega.$$

Combining the two previously displayed equations proves the proposition. \square

Abusing notation, we now let $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi)$ represent the real log canonical threshold for a sufficiently small neighborhood Ω_x of x in Ω . If x is an interior point of Ω , we denote the threshold at x by $\text{RLCT}_x(f; \varphi)$. More generally, we say that Ω is *full* at x if x lies in the closure of the interior of Ω . Note that if Ω is not full at x , then the integral (6) over small Ω_x is zero so $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi) = (\infty, \infty)$.

Corollary 2.6 (See also [22, §4.5]). *Given a compact semianalytic set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, a nearly analytic function $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and $f \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega$ satisfying $f(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \Omega$, the zeta function (6) can be continued analytically to \mathbb{C} . It has a Laurent expansion (7) whose poles are positive rational numbers with a smallest element.*

Proof. The proofs of Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.5 outline a way to compute the Laurent expansion of the zeta function (6). \square

Example 2.7. We now show that the threshold at a boundary point depends on the boundary inequalities. Consider the following two small neighborhoods of the origin in some larger compact set.

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq y \leq \varepsilon\} \\ \Omega_2 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq y \leq x \leq \varepsilon\}\end{aligned}$$

To compute the real log canonical threshold of the function xy^2 over these sets, we have the corresponding zeta functions below.

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_1(z) &= \int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^y x^{-z} y^{-2z} dx dy = \frac{\varepsilon^{-3z+2}}{(-z+1)(-3z+2)} \\ \zeta_2(z) &= \int_0^\varepsilon \int_0^x x^{-z} y^{-2z} dy dx = \frac{\varepsilon^{-3z+2}}{(-2z+1)(-3z+2)}\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_1}(xy^2) = 2/3$ while $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_2}(xy^2) = 1/2$. \square

Because the real log canonical threshold over a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the minimum of thresholds at points $x \in \Omega$, we want to know where this minimum is achieved. Let us study this problem topologically. Consider a locally finite collection \mathcal{S} of pairwise disjoint submanifolds $S \subset \Omega$ such that $\Omega = \cup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S$ and each S is locally closed, i.e. the intersection of an open and a closed subset. Let \overline{S} be the closure of S . We say \mathcal{S} is a *stratification* of Ω if $S \cap \overline{T} \neq \emptyset$ implies $S \subset \overline{T}$ for all $S, T \in \mathcal{S}$. A stratification \mathcal{S} of Ω is a *refinement* of another stratification \mathcal{T} if $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$ implies $S \subset T$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

Let the amplitude $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nearly analytic. Define $S_{\lambda,1}, \dots, S_{\lambda,r}$ to be the connected components of the set $\{x \in \Omega : \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f; \varphi) = \lambda\}$ and let \mathcal{S} be the collection $\{S_{\lambda,i}\}$. Now, define the order $\text{ord}_x f$ of f at a point $x \in \Omega$ to be the smallest degree of a monomial appearing in a series expansion of f at x . This number is independent of the choice of local coordinates $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d$ because it is the largest k such that $f \in \mathfrak{m}_x^k$ where $\mathfrak{m}_x = \{g \in \mathcal{A}_x : g(x) = 0\}$ is the vanishing ideal of x . Define $T_{1,1}, \dots, T_{l,s}$ to be the connected components

of the set $\{x \in \Omega : \text{ord}_x f = l\}$ and let \mathcal{T} be the collection $\{T_{l,j}\}$. We conjecture the following relationship between \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . It implies that the minimum real log canonical threshold over a set must occur at a point of highest order.

Conjecture 2.8. *The collections \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are stratifications of Ω . Furthermore, if the amplitude φ is a positive smooth function, then \mathcal{S} refines \mathcal{T} .*

3 Asymptotic Expansion

The goal of this section is to derive the asymptotic expansion in Theorem 1.3. First, we show that under the Gaussian assumption, $\mathbb{E}[Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n)]$ is equal to the Laplace integral (8). We then employ standard techniques to relate the asymptotics of the integral to poles of the zeta function (4).

Proposition 3.1. *If \mathcal{U} is the multivariate Gaussian approximation of the multinomially distributed U , the expectation $\mathbb{E}[Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n)]$ is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_0(\mathcal{U}; n)] = \frac{(k-1)! n^{\frac{k-1}{2}}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{k-1} q_1 q_2 \cdots q_k}} \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Delta_{k-1}} e^{-nL(u, \omega)} |\varphi(\omega)| du d\omega. \quad (8)$$

Proof. The random variable nU of counts for a sample of size n drawn from the distribution q follows the multinomial distribution with mean nq and covariance $n\Sigma$ where $\Sigma = \text{diag}(q) - qq^t$, $\text{diag}(q)$ is the diagonal matrix with entries q and q^t is the transpose of q . The central limit theorem states that $\sqrt{n}(U - q)$ converges in law to the multivariate Gaussian distribution $V \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. The probability density function [19] of V is

$$\frac{(k-1)!}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{k-1} q_1 q_2 \cdots q_k}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k v_i^2 / q_i}.$$

Now, we rewrite $Z_0(u; n)$ as the Laplace integral

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega} \prod_{i=1}^k p_i(\omega)^{nu_i} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega}{\prod_{i=1}^k u_i^{nu_i}} = \int_{\Omega} e^{-n \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \log \frac{u_i}{p_i(\omega)}} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega.$$

Combine the above two formulas, set $v = \sqrt{n}(u - q)$ and the result follows. \square

Laplace integrals such as (8) occur frequently in physics, statistics and other applications. At first, the relationship between their asymptotic expansions and the zeta function (4) seems strange. The key is to write these integrals as

$$\begin{aligned} Z(n) &= \int_{\Omega} e^{-n|f(\omega)|} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-nt} v(t) dt \\ \zeta(z) &= \int_{\Omega} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega = \int_0^{\infty} t^{-z} v(t) dt \end{aligned}$$

where $v(t)$ is the state density function [22] or Gelfand-Leray function [2]

$$v(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{0 < |f(\omega)| < t} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega.$$

Formally, $Z(n)$ is the Laplace transform of $v(t)$ while $\zeta(z)$ is its Mellin transform. Note that contrary to its name, $v(t)$ is generally not a function but a Schwartz distribution. Next, we study the series expansions

$$Z(n) \approx \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_{i,\alpha} n^{-\alpha} (\log n)^i \quad (9)$$

$$v(t) \approx \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_{i,\alpha} t^{\alpha} (\log t)^i \quad (10)$$

$$\zeta(z) \sim \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d d_{i,\alpha} (z - \alpha)^{-i} \quad (11)$$

where (9) and (10) are asymptotic expansions while (11) is the principal part of the Laurent series expansion. Formulas relating their coefficients are then deduced from the Laplace and Mellin transforms of $t^{\alpha} (\log t)^i$. Detailed expositions on this subject have been written by Arnol'd–Gusein-Zade–Varchenko [2, §6-7], Watanabe [22, §4] and Greenblatt [10].

Theorem 1.3 follows immediately from Proposition 3.1 and the next theorem, except for its last statement which we prove in Proposition 4.8.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact semianalytic subset and $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nearly analytic. If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega}$ with $f(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \Omega$, the Laplace integral*

$$Z(n) = \int_{\Omega} e^{-n|f(\omega)|} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega$$

has the asymptotic expansion

$$\sum_{\alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_{i,\alpha} n^{-\alpha} (\log n)^i. \quad (12)$$

The α in this expansion range over positive rational numbers which are poles of

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega_{\delta}} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega \quad (13)$$

where $\Omega_{\delta} = \{\omega \in \Omega : |f(\omega)| < \delta\}$ for any $\delta > 0$. The coefficients $c_{i,\alpha}$ satisfy

$$c_{i,\alpha} = \frac{(-1)^{i+1}}{i!} \sum_{j=i}^{d-1} \frac{\Gamma^{(j-i)}(\alpha)}{(j-i)!} d_{j+1,\alpha} \quad (14)$$

where $d_{j+1,\alpha}$ is the coefficient of $(z - \alpha)^{-(j+1)}$ in the Laurent expansion of $\zeta(z)$.

Proof. First, set $\delta = 1$. We split the integral $Z(n)$ into two parts:

$$Z(n) = \int_{|f(\omega)| < 1} e^{-n|f(\omega)|} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega + \int_{|f(\omega)| \geq 1} e^{-n|f(\omega)|} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega.$$

The second integral is bounded above by Ce^{-n} for some positive constant C , so asymptotically it goes to zero more quickly than any $n^{-\alpha}$. For the first integral, we write $\zeta(z)$ as the Mellin transform of the state density function $v(t)$.

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{|f(\omega)| < 1} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega = \int_0^1 t^{-z} v(t) dt.$$

By Corollary 2.6, $\zeta(z)$ has a Laurent expansion (7). Moreover, since $|f(\omega)| < 1$, $\zeta(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow -\infty$ so the polynomial part $P(z)$ is identically zero. Applying the inverse Mellin transform to $\zeta(z)$, we get a series expansion (10) of the state density function $v(t)$. Applying the Laplace transform to $v(t)$ in turn gives the asymptotic expansion (9) of $Z(n)$. The formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-nt} t^{\alpha-1} (\log t)^i dt &\approx \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{i}{j} (-1)^j \Gamma^{(i-j)}(\alpha) n^{-\alpha} (\log n)^j \\ \int_0^1 t^{-z} t^{\alpha-1} (\log t)^i dt &= -i! (z - \alpha)^{-(i+1)} \end{aligned}$$

from [2, Thm 7.4] and [22, Ex 4.7] give us the relations

$$c_{i,\alpha} = (-1)^i \sum_{j=i}^{d-1} \binom{j}{i} \Gamma^{(j-i)}(\alpha) b_{j,\alpha-1}, \quad d_{j+1,\alpha} = -j! b_{j,\alpha-1}.$$

Equation (14) follows immediately. Finally, for all other values of δ , we write

$$\int_{\Omega} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega = \int_{\Omega_\delta} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega + \int_{|f(\omega)| \geq \delta} |f(\omega)|^{-z} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega.$$

The last integral does not have any poles, so the principal parts of the Laurent expansions of the first two integrals are the same for all δ . \square

4 Real Log Canonical Thresholds

In this section, we prove fundamental properties of real log canonical thresholds (RLCTs) which allow us to perform algebraic computations. The learning coefficient of a statistical model is shown to be the RLCT of the ideal generated by its defining equations. We also complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

In this section, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact semianalytic subset and let $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nearly analytic. Given functions $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{A}_\Omega$, let $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi)$ be the smallest pole and multiplicity of the zeta function (3). Recall that these pairs are ordered by the rule $(\lambda_1, \theta_1) > (\lambda_2, \theta_2)$ if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, or $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ and $\theta_1 < \theta_2$. For $x \in \Omega$, we define $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi)$ to be the threshold for a sufficiently small neighborhood Ω_x of x in Ω .

Remark 4.1. The (complex) log canonical threshold may be defined in a similar fashion. It is the smallest pole of the zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} \left(|f_1(\omega)|^2 + \cdots + |f_r(\omega)|^2 \right)^{-z} d\omega.$$

Note that the f_i^2 have been replaced by $|f_i|^2$ and the exponent $-z/2$ is changed to $-z$. Crudely, this factor of 2 comes from the fact that \mathbb{C}^d is a real vector space of dimension $2d$. The complex threshold is often different from the RLCT [17]. From the algebraic geometry point of view, more is known about complex log canonical thresholds than about real log canonical thresholds. Many results in this paper were motivated by their complex analogs [3, 13, 14, 15].

Now, we give several equivalent definitions of $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi)$ which are helpful in proofs of the fundamental properties.

Proposition 4.2. *Given real analytic functions $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega}$, the pairs (λ, θ) defined in the statements below are all equal.*

a. *The logarithmic Laplace integral*

$$\log Z(n) = \log \int_{\Omega} \exp \left(-n \sum_{i=1}^r f_i(\omega)^2 \right) |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega$$

is asymptotically $-\frac{\lambda}{2} \log n + (\theta - 1) \log \log n + O(1)$.

b. *The zeta function*

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{i=1}^r f_i(\omega)^2 \right)^{-z/2} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega$$

has a smallest pole λ of multiplicity θ .

c. *The pair (λ, θ) is the minimum*

$$\min_{x \in \Omega} \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x}(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi).$$

In fact, it is enough to vary x over $\mathcal{V}_{\Omega}(\langle f_1, \dots, f_r \rangle)$.

Proof. Item (b) is the original definition of the RLCT. The equivalence of (a) and (b) follows from Theorem 3.2, and that of (b) and (c) from Proposition 2.5. The last statement of (c) follows from the fact that the RLCT is ∞ for points $x \notin \mathcal{V}_{\Omega}(\langle f_1, \dots, f_r \rangle)$. See also [22, Thm 7.1]. \square

If the function whose RLCT we are finding is complicated, we may replace it with a simpler function that bounds it. Given $f, g \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega}$, we say that f and g are *comparable* in Ω if $c_1 f \leq g \leq c_2 f$ in Ω for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Proposition 4.3 ([22, §7]). *Given $f, g \in \mathcal{A}_{\Omega}$, suppose $0 \leq cf \leq g$ in Ω for some $c > 0$. Then, $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(f; \varphi) \leq \text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(g; \varphi)$.*

Corollary 4.4. *If f, g are comparable in Ω , then $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f; \varphi) = \text{RLCT}_\Omega(g; \varphi)$.*

$\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f_1^2 + \cdots + f_r^2; \varphi) = (\lambda, \theta)$ implies $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi) = (2\lambda, \theta)$. From this, it seems that we should restrict ourselves to RLCTs of single and not multiple functions. However, as the next proposition shows, multiple functions are important because they allow us to work with ideals for which different generating sets can be chosen. This gives us freedom to switch between single and multiple functions in powerful ways. For instance, special cases of this proposition such as Lemmas 3 and 4 of [1] have been used to simplify computations.

Proposition 4.5. *If two sets $\{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_s\}$ of functions generate the same ideal $I \subset \mathcal{A}_\Omega$, then*

$$\text{RLCT}_\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi) = \text{RLCT}_\Omega(g_1, \dots, g_s; \varphi).$$

Define this pair to be $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(I; \varphi)$.

Proof. Each g_j can be written as a combination $h_1 f_1 + \cdots + h_r f_r$ of the f_i where the h_i are real analytic over Ω . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$g_j^2 \leq (h_1^2 + \cdots + h_r^2)(f_1^2 + \cdots + f_r^2).$$

Because Ω is compact, the h_i are bounded. Thus, summing over all the g_j , there is some constant $c > 0$ such that,

$$\sum_{j=1}^s g_j^2 \leq c \sum_{i=1}^r f_i^2.$$

By Proposition 4.3, $\text{RLCT}_\Omega(g_1, \dots, g_s; \varphi) \leq \text{RLCT}_\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi)$ and by symmetry, the reverse is also true, so we are done. See also [17, §2.6]. \square

For the next result, let $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{A}_X$ and $g_1, \dots, g_s \in \mathcal{A}_Y$ where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are compact semianalytic subsets. This occurs, for instance, when the f_i and g_j are polynomials with disjoint sets of indeterminates $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$. Let $\varphi_x : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi_y : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nearly analytic. Define $(\lambda_x, \theta_x) = \text{RLCT}_X(f_1, \dots, f_r; \varphi_x)$ and $(\lambda_y, \theta_y) = \text{RLCT}_Y(g_1, \dots, g_s; \varphi_y)$.

By composing with projections $X \times Y \rightarrow X$ and $X \times Y \rightarrow Y$, we may regard the f_i and g_j as functions analytic over $X \times Y$. Let I_x and I_y be ideals in $\mathcal{A}_{X \times Y}$ generated by the f_i and g_j respectively. Recall that the sum $I_x + I_y$ is generated by all the f_i and g_j while the product $I_x I_y$ is generated by $f_i g_j$ for all i, j .

Proposition 4.6. *The RLCTs for the sum and product of ideals I_x and I_y are*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RLCT}_{X \times Y}(I_x + I_y; \varphi_x \varphi_y) &= (\lambda_x + \lambda_y, \theta_x + \theta_y - 1), \\ \text{RLCT}_{X \times Y}(I_x I_y; \varphi_x \varphi_y) &= \begin{cases} (\lambda_x, \theta_x) & \text{if } \lambda_x < \lambda_y, \\ (\lambda_y, \theta_y) & \text{if } \lambda_x > \lambda_y, \\ (\lambda_x, \theta_x + \theta_y) & \text{if } \lambda_x = \lambda_y. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Define $f(x) = f_1^2 + \cdots + f_r^2$ and $g(y) = g_1^2 + \cdots + g_s^2$, and let $Z_x(n)$ and $Z_y(n)$ be the corresponding Laplace integrals. By Proposition 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\log Z_x(n) &= -\frac{1}{2}\lambda_x \log n + (\theta_x - 1) \log \log n + O(1) \\ \log Z_y(n) &= -\frac{1}{2}\lambda_y \log n + (\theta_y - 1) \log \log n + O(1)\end{aligned}$$

asymptotically. If $(\lambda, \theta) = \text{RLCT}_{X \times Y}(I_x + I_y; \varphi_x \varphi_y)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{2}\lambda \log n + (\theta - 1) \log \log n + O(1) &= \log \int_{X \times Y} e^{-nf(x) - ng(y)} |\varphi_x| |\varphi_y| dx dy \\ &= \log \left(\int_X e^{-nf(x)} |\varphi_x| dx \right) \left(\int_Y e^{-ng(y)} |\varphi_y| dy \right) \\ &= \log Z_x(n) + \log Z_y(n) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}(\lambda_x + \lambda_y) \log n + (\theta_x + \theta_y - 2) \log \log n + O(1)\end{aligned}$$

and the first result follows. For the second result, note that

$$f(x)g(y) = f_1^2 g_1^2 + f_1^2 g_2^2 + \cdots + f_r^2 g_s^2.$$

Let $\zeta_x(z)$ and $\zeta_y(z)$ be the zeta functions corresponding to $f(x)$ and $g(y)$. By Proposition 4.2, (λ_x, θ_x) and (λ_y, θ_y) are the smallest poles of $\zeta_x(z)$ and $\zeta_y(z)$ while $\text{RLCT}_{X \times Y}(I_x I_y; \varphi_x \varphi_y)$ is the smallest pole of

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(z) &= \int_{X \times Y} (f(x)g(y))^{-z/2} |\varphi_x| |\varphi_y| dx dy \\ &= \left(\int_X f(x)^{-z/2} |\varphi_x| dx \right) \left(\int_Y g(y)^{-z/2} |\varphi_y| dy \right) = \zeta_x(z) \zeta_y(z).\end{aligned}$$

The second result then follows from the relationship between the poles. \square

Our last property tells us the behavior of RLCTs under a change of variables. Consider an ideal $I \subset \mathcal{A}_W$ where W is a neighborhood of the origin. Let M be a real analytic manifold and $\rho : M \rightarrow W$ a proper real analytic map. Then, the pullback $\rho^*I = \{f \circ \rho : f \in I\}$ is an ideal of real analytic functions on M . If ρ is an isomorphism between $M \setminus \mathcal{V}(\rho^*I)$ and $W \setminus \mathcal{V}(I)$, we say that ρ is a *change of variables away from $\mathcal{V}(I)$* . Let $|\rho'|$ denote the Jacobian determinant of ρ . We call $(\rho^*I; (\varphi \circ \rho)|\rho'|)$ the *pullback pair*.

Proposition 4.7. *Let W be a neighborhood of the origin and $I \subset \mathcal{A}_W$ a finitely generated ideal. If M is a real analytic manifold, $\rho : M \rightarrow W$ is a change of variables away from $\mathcal{V}(I)$ and $\mathcal{M} = \rho^{-1}(\Omega \cap W)$, then*

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_0}(I; \varphi) = \min_{x \in \rho^{-1}(0)} \text{RLCT}_{\mathcal{M}_x}(\rho^*I; (\varphi \circ \rho)|\rho'|).$$

Proof. Let f_1, \dots, f_r generate I and define $f = f_1^2 + \cdots + f_r^2$. Then, $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_0}(I; \varphi)$ is the smallest pole and multiplicity of the zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\Omega_0} f(\omega)^{-z/2} |\varphi(\omega)| d\omega$$

where $\Omega_0 \subset W$ is a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin in Ω . Applying the change of variables ρ , we have

$$\zeta(z) = \int_{\rho^{-1}(\Omega_0)} f \circ \rho(\mu)^{-z/2} |\varphi \circ \rho(\mu)| |\rho'(\mu)| d\mu.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.4 shows that if Ω_0 is sufficiently small, there are finitely many points $y \in \rho^{-1}(0)$ and a cover $\{\mathcal{M}_y\}$ of $\mathcal{M} = \rho^{-1}(\Omega_0)$ such that

$$\zeta(z) = \sum_y \int_{\mathcal{M}_y} f \circ \rho(\mu)^{-z/2} |\varphi \circ \rho(\mu)| |\rho'(\mu)| \sigma_y(\mu) d\mu$$

where $\{\sigma_y\}$ is a partition of unity subordinate to $\{\mathcal{M}_y\}$. Furthermore, the $f_i \circ \rho$ generate the pullback ρ^*I and $f \circ \rho = (f_1 \circ \rho)^2 + \dots + (f_r \circ \rho)^2$. Therefore,

$$\text{RLCT}_{\mathcal{M}_y}(f \circ \rho; (\varphi \circ \rho)|\rho'| \sigma_y) = \text{RLCT}_{\mathcal{M}_y}(\rho^*I; (\varphi \circ \rho)|\rho')$$

and the result follows from the two previously displayed equations. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2 which is due mainly to Watanabe.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $Q(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k (p_i(\omega) - q_i)^2$. The learning coefficient is the RLCT of the Kullback-Leibler distance $K(\omega)$, so it is enough to show that $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x} K = \text{RLCT}_{\Omega_x} Q$ for each $x \in \mathcal{V}(K) = \mathcal{V}(Q)$. By Corollary 4.4, we only need to show that K and Q are comparable in a sufficiently small neighborhood of x . Now, the Taylor expansion $-\log t = (1-t) + \frac{1}{2}(1-t)^2 + \dots$ implies there are constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all t near 1,

$$c_1(t-1)^2 \leq -\log t + t - 1 \leq c_2(t-1)^2. \quad (15)$$

Choosing a sufficiently small W_x such that $p_i(\omega)/q_i$ is near 1, we have

$$c_1 \left(\frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} - 1 \right)^2 \leq -\log \frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} + \frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} - 1 \leq c_2 \left(\frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} - 1 \right)^2$$

for all $\omega \in W_x$. Multiplying by q_i , summing from $i = 1$ to k and observing that the p_i and the q_i add up to 1, we get

$$c_1 \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \left(\frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} - 1 \right)^2 \leq K(\omega) \leq c_2 \sum_{i=1}^k q_i \left(\frac{p_i(\omega)}{q_i} - 1 \right)^2.$$

Again, using the fact that the q_i are non-zero, we have

$$\frac{c_1}{\max_i q_i} \sum_{i=1}^k (p_i(\omega) - q_i)^2 \leq K(\omega) \leq \frac{c_2}{\min_i q_i} \sum_{i=1}^k (p_i(\omega) - q_i)^2$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proposition 4.8. *The first term of the asymptotics (5) is $cn^{-\lambda}(\log n)^{\theta-1}$ where λ is the learning coefficient and θ its multiplicity.*

Proof. From the proof of the first half of Theorem 1.3 in Section 3, we see that

$$(\alpha, i) = \text{RLCT}_{\Delta_{k-1} \times \Omega}(L(u, \omega); \varphi(\omega))$$

We want to show that $(\alpha, i) = (\lambda + \frac{k-1}{2}, \theta)$. First, recall that

$$L(u, \omega) = \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \log \frac{u_i}{p_i(\omega)} + \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2q_i} (u_i - q_i)^2$$

so $L(u, \omega) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $u = p(\omega) = q$. Near $\mathcal{V}(L)$, the proof of Theorem 1.2 shows that $\sum_i u_i \log(u_i/p_i)$ is comparable to $\sum_i (u_i - p_i)^2$. Also, $\sum_i (u_i - q_i)^2/2q_i$ is comparable to $\sum_i (u_i - q_i)^2$. Thus, $L(u, \omega)$ is comparable to $\sum_i (u_i - p_i)^2 + \sum_i (u_i - q_i)^2$ and by Proposition 4.4, they have the same RLCT. Now, the $u_i - p_i(\omega)$ and $u_i - q_i$ generate the same ideal as the $p_i(\omega) - q_i$ and $u_i - q_i$, hence their RLCTs are again equal.

Theorem 1.2 tells us $(\lambda, \theta) = \text{RLCT}_{\Omega}(\langle p_i(\omega) - q_i \rangle; \varphi)$. By Proposition 4.6, it suffices to show that $\text{RLCT}_{\Delta_{k-1}} \langle u_i - q_i \rangle = (\frac{k-1}{2}, 1)$. Indeed, because $\mathcal{V}(\langle u_i - q_i \rangle)$ consists of only one point $x = (u_i) = (q_i)$ in the interior of Δ_{k-1} , so

$$\text{RLCT}_{\Delta_{k-1}} \langle u_i - q_i \rangle = \text{RLCT}_x \langle u_i - q_i \rangle = \text{RLCT}_0 \langle x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle.$$

To complete the proof, we apply Proposition 4.6 to the fact that for each indeterminate x_i , we have $\text{RLCT}_0(x_i) = (1, 1)$. \square

5 Newton Polyhedra and Nondegeneracy

Given an analytic function $f \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we pick local coordinates $\{w_1, \dots, w_d\}$ in a neighborhood of the origin. This allows us to represent f as a power series $\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \omega^{\alpha}$ where $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d)$ and each $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Define its *Newton polyhedron* $\Gamma(f) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the convex hull

$$\Gamma(f) = \text{conv} \{ \alpha + \alpha' : c_{\alpha} \neq 0, \alpha' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \}.$$

A subset $\gamma \subset \Gamma(f)$ is a *face* if there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\gamma = \{ \alpha \in \Gamma(f) : \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \leq \langle \alpha', \beta \rangle \text{ for all } \alpha' \in \Gamma(f) \}.$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard dot product. Dually, the *normal cone* at γ is the set of all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the above condition. Each β lies in the non-negative orthant $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ because otherwise, the linear function $\langle \cdot, \beta \rangle$ does not have a minimum over the unbounded set $\Gamma(f)$. As a result, the union of all the normal cones gives a partition $\mathcal{F}(f)$ of the non-negative orthant called the *normal fan*. Now, given a face γ of $\Gamma(f)$, define the *face polynomial*

$$f_{\gamma} = \sum_{\alpha \in \gamma} c_{\alpha} \omega^{\alpha}.$$

Recall that f_γ is singular at a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if $\text{ord}_x f \geq 2$, i.e.

$$f_\gamma(x) = \frac{\partial f_\gamma}{\partial \omega_1}(x) = \cdots = \frac{\partial f_\gamma}{\partial \omega_d}(x) = 0.$$

We say that f is *nondegenerate* if f_γ is non-singular at all points in the torus $(\mathbb{R}^*)^d$ for all compact faces γ of $\Gamma(f)$, otherwise we say f is *degenerate*. Now, we define the *distance* l of $\Gamma(f)$ to be the smallest $t \geq 0$ such that $(t, t, \dots, t) \in \Gamma(f)$. The *multiplicity* θ of l is the codimension of the face of $\Gamma(f)$ at this intersection of the diagonal with $\Gamma(f)$. However, if $l = 0$, we set $\theta = \infty$.

We now extend the above notions to ideals. For any ideal $I \subset \mathcal{A}_0$, define

$$\Gamma(I) = \text{conv} \{ \alpha + \alpha' : \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \omega^{\alpha} \in I, c_{\alpha} \neq 0, \alpha' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \}.$$

Related to this geometric construction is the monomial ideal

$$\text{mon}(I) = \langle \omega^{\alpha} : \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \omega^{\alpha} \in I, c_{\alpha} \neq 0 \rangle.$$

Note that I and $\text{mon}(I)$ have the same Newton polyhedron, and if I is generated by f_1, \dots, f_r , then $\text{mon}(I)$ is generated by monomials ω^{α} appearing in the f_i . One consequence is that $\Gamma(f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2)$ is the scaled polyhedron $2\Gamma(I)$. More importantly, the threshold of I is bounded by that of $\text{mon}(I)$.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $I \subset \mathcal{A}_0$ be a finitely generated ideal and $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nearly analytic at the origin. Then,*

$$\text{RLCT}_0(I; \varphi) \leq \text{RLCT}_0(\text{mon}(I); \varphi).$$

Proof. Given $f = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \omega^{\alpha}$, let S be the set of exponents α such that ω^{α} is a monomial in f not divisible by any other monomial in f . Then, there is a positive constant c such that $|f| \leq c \sum_{\alpha \in S} \omega^{\alpha}$ in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin [11, Cor 2.1]. Now, by the AM-QM inequality, $f^2 \leq c' \sum_{\alpha \in S} \omega^{2\alpha}$ for some $c' > 0$. Therefore, if f_1, \dots, f_r generate I , then $f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2$ is bounded by a constant multiple of the sum of squares of monomials generating $\text{mon}(I)$. The result now follows from Propostion 4.3. \square

Given a face γ of $\Gamma(I)$, define the *face ideal*

$$I_{\gamma} = \langle f_{\gamma} : f \in I \rangle.$$

If f_1, \dots, f_r generates I , it is in general not true that $f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma}$ generates I_{γ} unless the f_i form a Gröbner basis with respect to the weight order $>_{\beta}$ for some β in the normal cone at γ . See [18] or [5, §15] for a treatment of Gröbner theory. Lastly, we say that I is *sos-nondegenerate* if there is a generating set whose sum of squares is nondegenerate. It is important to note that the nondegeneracy of a function f need not imply the sos-nondegeneracy of the ideal $\langle f \rangle$, e.g. $f = x + y$. The next result makes it easier to check if an ideal is sos-nondegenerate.

Proposition 5.2. *An ideal I is sos-nondegenerate if and only if for all compact faces $\gamma \subset \Gamma(I)$, the variety $\mathcal{V}(I_{\gamma})$ does not intersect the torus $(\mathbb{R}^*)^d$.*

Proof. Given some $f = f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2$, note that $f_\gamma = f_{1\gamma}^2 + \dots + f_{r\gamma}^2$ and

$$\frac{\partial f_\gamma}{\partial \omega_i} = 2f_{1\gamma} \frac{\partial f_{1\gamma}}{\partial \omega_i} + \dots + 2f_{r\gamma} \frac{\partial f_{r\gamma}}{\partial \omega_i}$$

so f is nondegenerate if and only if $\mathcal{V}(\langle f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma} \rangle) \cap (\mathbb{R}^*)^d = \emptyset$. Now, suppose $\mathcal{V}(I_\gamma) \cap (\mathbb{R}^*)^d = \emptyset$ for all γ . Let f_1, \dots, f_r be a universal Gröbner basis for I , so $I_\gamma = \langle f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma} \rangle$ for all γ . Then, $f = f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2$ is nondegenerate, and the same is true of I . On the other hand, if f_1, \dots, f_r are generators whose sum of squares is nondegenerate, then $\mathcal{V}(\langle f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma} \rangle) \cap (\mathbb{R}^*)^d = \emptyset$ for all γ . But $\langle f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma} \rangle \subset I_\gamma$ so $\mathcal{V}(I_\gamma) \subset \mathcal{V}(\langle f_{1\gamma}, \dots, f_{r\gamma} \rangle)$. Hence, $\mathcal{V}(I_\gamma) \cap (\mathbb{R}^*)^d = \emptyset$ for all γ , finishing the proof. \square

The statement and proof of this next corollary is due to Piotr Zwiernik.

Corollary 5.3. *Monomial ideals are sos-nondegenerate.*

Proof. Let $f = f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2$ where f_1, \dots, f_r are monomials generating I . For each face γ of $\Gamma(I)$, f_γ is also a sum of squares of monomials, so f_γ does not have any zeros in $(\mathbb{R}^*)^d$ and the result follows. \square

We recall some basic facts about toric varieties. We say a polyhedral cone σ is generated by vectors $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if $\sigma = \{\sum_i \lambda_i v_i : \lambda_i \geq 0\}$. If σ is generated by lattice vectors $v_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then σ is *rational*. If the origin is a face of σ , then σ is *pointed*. A *ray* is a pointed one-dimensional cone. Every rational ray has a lattice generator of minimal length called the *minimal generator*. Similarly, every pointed rational polyhedral cone σ is generated by the minimal generators of its edges. If these minimal generators generate all lattice points $\sigma \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ over \mathbb{Z} , then σ is smooth. A cone is *simplicial* if its minimal generators are linearly independent over \mathbb{R} . A collection \mathcal{F} of pointed rational polyhedral cones in \mathbb{R}^d is a *fan* if the faces of every cone in \mathcal{F} are in \mathcal{F} and the intersection of any two cones in \mathcal{F} are again in \mathcal{F} . The *support* of \mathcal{F} is the union of its cones as subsets of \mathbb{R}^d . If the support of \mathcal{F} is the non-negative orthant, then \mathcal{F} is *locally complete*. If every cone of \mathcal{F} is smooth (resp. simplicial), then \mathcal{F} is *smooth* (resp. *simplicial*). A fan \mathcal{F}_1 is a *refinement* of another fan \mathcal{F}_2 if the cones of \mathcal{F}_1 come from partitioning the cones of \mathcal{F}_2 . See [7] for more details.

Given a smooth simplicial locally complete fan \mathcal{F} , we have a smooth toric variety $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F})$ covered by open affines $U_\sigma \simeq \mathbb{R}^d$, one for each maximal cone σ of \mathcal{F} . Furthermore, we have a *blow-up* $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ defined as follows: for each maximal cone σ of \mathcal{F} minimally generated by v_1, \dots, v_d with $v_i = (v_{i1}, \dots, v_{id})$, we have monomial maps $\rho_\sigma : U_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ on the open affines.

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d) &\mapsto (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d) \\ \omega_1 &= \mu_1^{v_{11}} \mu_2^{v_{21}} \dots \mu_d^{v_{d1}} \\ \omega_2 &= \mu_1^{v_{12}} \mu_2^{v_{22}} \dots \mu_d^{v_{d2}} \\ &\vdots \\ \omega_d &= \mu_1^{v_{1d}} \mu_2^{v_{2d}} \dots \mu_d^{v_{dd}} \end{aligned}$$

Let $v = v_\sigma$ be the matrix (v_{ij}) where each minimal generator v_i forms a row of v . We represent the above monomial map by $\omega = \mu^v$. If v_{i+} represents the i -th row sum of v , the Jacobian determinant of this map is

$$(\det v)\mu_1^{v_{1+}-1} \cdots \mu_d^{v_{d+}-1}.$$

We are now ready to connect these concepts. The next two theorems are due to Varchenko, see [20] and [2, §8.3]. His notion of degeneracy is weaker than ours because it does not include the condition $f_\gamma = 0$, but his proof [2, Lemma 8.9] actually supports the stronger notion. The set up is as follows: suppose f is analytic in a neighborhood W of the origin. Let \mathcal{F} be any smooth simplicial refinement of the normal fan $\mathcal{F}(f)$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}$ be the blow-up associated to \mathcal{F} . Set $M = \rho_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}(W)$. Let l be the distance of $\Gamma(f)$ and θ its multiplicity.

Theorem 5.4. *If f is nondegenerate, then $(M, W, \rho_{\mathcal{F}})$ desingularizes f at 0.*

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose $(M, W, \rho_{\mathcal{F}})$ desingularizes f at 0. If f has a maximum or minimum at 0, then $\text{RLCT}_0 f = (1/l, \theta)$.*

We extend Theorem 5.5 to compute $\text{RLCT}_0(f; \omega^\tau)$ for monomials ω^τ . Given a polyhedron $\Gamma(f) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a vector $\tau = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_d)$ of non-negative integers, let the τ -distance l_τ be the smallest $t \geq 0$ such that $t(\tau_1 + 1, \dots, \tau_d + 1) \in \Gamma(f)$ and let the multiplicity θ_τ be the codimension of the face at this intersection.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose $(M, W, \rho_{\mathcal{F}})$ desingularizes f at 0. If f has a maximum or minimum at 0, then $\text{RLCT}_0(f; \omega^\tau) = (1/l_\tau, \theta_\tau)$.*

Proof. We follow roughly the proof in [2, §8] of Theorem 5.5. Let σ be a maximal cone of \mathcal{F} . Because \mathcal{F} refines $\mathcal{F}(f)$, σ is a subset of some maximal cone σ' of $\mathcal{F}(f)$. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the vertex of $\Gamma(f)$ dual to σ' . Let v be the matrix whose rows are minimal generators of σ and ρ the monomial map $\mu \mapsto \mu^v$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\omega)^{-z} \omega^\tau d\omega &= f(\rho(v))^{-z} \rho(\mu)^\tau |\rho'(\mu)| d\mu \\ &= (\det v) g(\mu)^{-z} \mu^{-v\alpha z} \mu^{v\tau} \mu_1^{v_{1+}-1} \cdots \mu_d^{v_{d+}-1} \end{aligned}$$

for some function $g(\mu)$. Because f has a maximum or minimum at 0, this ensures that $g(\mu) \neq 0$ on the affine chart U_σ . Thus, for the cone σ ,

$$(\lambda_\sigma, \theta_\sigma) = (\min S, \#\min S), \quad S = \left\{ \frac{\langle v_i, \tau + 1 \rangle}{\langle v_i, \alpha \rangle} : 1 \leq i \leq d \right\}$$

where $\tau + 1 = (\tau_1 + 1, \dots, \tau_d + 1)$. We now give an interpretation for the elements of S . Fixing i , let P be the affine hyperplane normal to v_i passing through α . Then, $\langle v_i, \alpha \rangle / \langle v_i, \tau + 1 \rangle$ is the distance of P from the origin along the ray $\{t(\tau + 1) : t \geq 0\}$. Since $\text{RLCT}_0(f; \omega^\tau) = \min_\sigma (\lambda_\sigma, \theta_\sigma)$, the result follows. \square

We now come to the main theorem of this section. As a special case, we have a formula for the RLCT of a monomial ideal with respect to a monomial amplitude function. The analogous formula for *complex* log canonical thresholds of monomial ideals was discovered and proved by Howald [13].

Theorem 5.7. *If $I \subset \mathcal{A}_0$ is a finitely generated ideal, then*

$$\text{RLCT}_0(I; \omega^\tau) \leq (1/l_\tau, \theta_\tau)$$

where l_τ is the τ -distance of $\Gamma(I)$ and θ_τ its multiplicity. Equality occurs when I is monomial or, more generally, sos-nondegenerate.

Proof. If I is sos-nondegenerate, the equality follows from Theorem 5.6. For all other ideals, the inequality follows from Proposition 5.1 and Corollary 5.3. \square

Remark 5.8. Define the principal part f_Γ of f to be $\sum_\alpha c_\alpha \omega^\alpha$ where the sum is over all α lying in some compact face γ of $\Gamma(f)$. The above theorems imply that if f is nondegenerate, then $\text{RLCT}_0 f = \text{RLCT}_0 f_\Gamma$. However, the latter is not true in general. For instance, if $f = (x + y)^2 + y^4$, then $f_\Gamma = (x + y)^2$ but $\text{RLCT}_0 f = (3/4, 1)$ and $\text{RLCT}_0 f_\Gamma = (1/2, 1)$.

Our first corollary shows that the BIC is a special case of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 5.9. *If $f \in \mathcal{A}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has a local minimum at the origin with $f(0) = 0$ and its Hessian $(\partial^2 f / \partial \omega_i \partial \omega_j)$ is full rank, then $\text{RLCT}_0 f = (d/2, 1)$.*

Proof. Because its Hessian is full rank, there is a linear change of variables such that $f = \omega_1^2 + \cdots + \omega_d^2 + O(\omega^3)$. Thus, f is nondegenerate and the Newton polyhedron $\Gamma(f)$ has distance $l = 2/d$ with $\theta = 1$. \square

Corollary 5.10. *Let I be generated by f_1, \dots, f_s and suppose the Jacobian matrix $(\partial f_i / \partial \omega_j)$ has rank r at 0. Then, $\text{RLCT}_0 I \leq (\frac{1}{2}(r + d), 1)$.*

Proof. Because the rank of $(\partial f_i / \partial \omega_j)$ is r , there is a linear change of variables such that the only linear monomials appearing in I are $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r$. It follows that $\Gamma(I)$ lies in the halfspace $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_r + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_{r+1} + \cdots + \alpha_d) \geq 1$ and its distance is at least $1/(r + \frac{d-r}{2}) = 2/(r + d)$. \square

6 Applications to Statistical Models

In this section, we use our tools to compute learning coefficients of a statistical model coming from a survey of 132 schizophrenic patients [6]. Let us make a few remarks about our approach. Firstly, combining Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 4.2c, the learning coefficient (λ, θ) of the statistical model \mathcal{P} is given by

$$(2\lambda, \theta) = \min_{\omega^* \in \Omega} \text{RLCT}_{\omega^*} \langle p(\omega) - q \rangle = \min_{\omega^* \in p^{-1}(q)} \text{RLCT}_0 \langle p(\omega + \omega^*) - p(\omega^*) \rangle.$$

Our strategy is to compute $\text{RLCT}_0 \langle p(\omega + \omega^*) - p(\omega^*) \rangle$ as ω^* varies over all of Ω before restricting our considerations to the fiber $p^{-1}(q)$.

Secondly, in our computations, we will often be choosing different generators for our ideal and making suitable changes of variables. In choosing generators, we want functions with few terms and small total degree. Another useful trick is to multiply or divide the generators by functions $f(\omega)$ satisfying $f(0) \neq 0$. Such functions are units in the ring \mathcal{A}_0 of real analytic functions so this multiplication or division will not change the ideal generated. Our next lemma comes in handy.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ be semianalytic. Let I be a monomial ideal and φ a monomial function in x_1, \dots, x_r . If there exists a vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-r}$ such that $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \subset \Omega$ for sufficiently small ε where*

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1 &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in [0, \varepsilon]^r\} \\ \Omega_2 &= \{(x_{r+1}, \dots, x_d) = t(\xi + \xi') \text{ for all } t \in [0, \varepsilon], \xi' \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]^{d-r}\},\end{aligned}$$

then $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_0}(I; \varphi) = \text{RLCT}_0(I; \varphi)$.

Proof. Because I and $|\varphi|$ remain unchanged by the flipping of signs of x_1, \dots, x_r , the threshold of $(I; \varphi)$ does not depend on the choice of orthant, so $\text{RLCT}_{\Omega_1}(I; \varphi) = \text{RLCT}_0(I; \varphi)$. The lemma now follows from Proposition 4.6 and the fact that the threshold of the zero ideal over the cone neighborhood Ω_2 is (∞, ∞) . \square

In this example, we study a naïve Bayesian network with two ternary random variables and two hidden states. It was used by Evans, Gilula and Guttman [6] to investigate connections between the recovery time (in years Y) of schizophrenic patients and the frequency of visits by their relatives. We present their data in the following 3×3 contingency table, to give an idea of the statistics involved.

	$2 \leq Y < 10$	$10 \leq Y < 20$	$20 \leq Y$	Totals
Visited regularly	43	16	3	62
Visited rarely	6	11	10	27
Visited never	9	18	16	43
Totals	58	45	29	132

The model is parametrized by the map

$$\begin{aligned}p: \quad \Omega &= \Delta_1 \times \Delta_2 \times \Delta_2 \times \Delta_2 \times \Delta_2 \quad \rightarrow \quad \Delta_8 \\ (t, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2) &\mapsto (p_{ij}) \\ p_{ij} &= ta_i b_j + (1-t)c_i d_j, \quad i, j, k \in \{1, 2, 3\}\end{aligned}$$

where $a_3 = 1 - a_1 - a_2$, $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \Delta_2$ and similarly for b, c and d . The marginal likelihood integral of the above data set under this model was computed exactly by Sturmfels, Xu and the author [16]. We now present the asymptotics of the marginal likelihood integral, as described by the learning coefficient.

First, let us consider the 3×3 matrix $P = (p_{ij})$. Because of its parametrization, the rank of P is at most 2. Let S_i denote the set of rank i matrices. Let $S_{21} \subset S_2$ be the set of matrices where there are permutations of the rows and of the columns such that $p_{11} = 0$ and p_{12}, p_{21}, p_{22} are all non-zero. Let $S_{22} \subset S_2$ be the set where up to permutations, $p_{11} = p_{22} = 0$ and p_{12}, p_{21} are non-zero.

Theorem 6.2. *The learning coefficient (λ, θ) of the model is given by*

$$(\lambda, \theta) = \begin{cases} (5/2, 1) & \text{if } P \in S_1, \\ (7/2, 1) & \text{if } P \in S_2 \setminus (S_{21} \cup S_{22}), \\ (4, 1) & \text{if } P \in S_{21} \setminus S_{22}, \\ (9/2, 1) & \text{if } P \in S_{22}. \end{cases}$$

The theorem follows from the next proposition whose proof shows the subtle interplay between the RLCT and the boundary conditions. Let us define subsets $\Omega_u = \{\omega^* \in \Omega : t^* \in \{0, 1\}\}$, $\Omega_m = \{\omega^* \in \Omega : t^* \notin \{0, 1\}\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_{m0} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_m : a^* = c^*, b^* = d^*\} \\
\Omega_{m0kl} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_{m0} : \#\{i : a_i^* = 0\} = k, \#\{i : b_i^* = 0\} = l\} \\
\Omega_{m1} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_m : (b^* \neq d^*, a^* = c^*) \text{ or } (a^* \neq c^*, b^* = d^*)\} \\
\Omega_{m10} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_{m1} : (a^* = c^*, \exists i a_i^* = 0) \text{ or } (b^* = d^*, \exists i b_i^* = 0)\} \\
\Omega_{m2} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_m : a^* \neq c^*, b^* \neq d^*\} \\
\Omega_{m2ad} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_{m2} : \exists i, j a_i^* = d_j^* = 0, c_i^* \neq 0, b_j^* \neq 0\} \\
\Omega_{m2bc} &= \{\omega^* \in \Omega_{m2} : \exists i, j b_i^* = c_j^* = 0, d_i^* \neq 0, a_j^* \neq 0\} \\
\Omega_{m21} &= \Omega_{m2ad} \cup \Omega_{m2bc} \\
\Omega_{m22} &= \Omega_{m2ad} \cap \Omega_{m2bc}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6.3. *Given $\omega^* \in \Omega$, let I be the ideal $\langle p(\omega + \omega^*) - p(\omega^*) \rangle$. Then,*

$$\text{RLCT}_0 I = \begin{cases} (5, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_u, \\ (6, 2) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m000}, \\ (6, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m010} \cup \Omega_{m001} \cup \Omega_{m020} \cup \Omega_{m002}, \\ (7, 2) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m011}, \\ (7, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m012} \cup \Omega_{m021}, \\ (8, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m022}, \\ (6, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m1} \setminus \Omega_{m10}, \\ (7, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m10}, \\ (7, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m2} \setminus \Omega_{m21}, \\ (8, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m21} \setminus \Omega_{m22}, \\ (9, 1) & \text{if } \omega^* \in \Omega_{m22}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The ideal I is generated by $g_{ij} = f_{ij}(\omega + \omega^*) - f_{ij}(\omega^*)$ where

$$f_{ij} = ta_i b_j + (1-t)c_i d_j, \quad i, j, k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$$

and $a_0 = b_0 = c_0 = d_0 = 1$. One can check that I is also generated by $g_{10}, g_{20}, g_{01}, g_{02}$, and $g_{ij} - (d_j + d_j^*)g_{i0} - (a_i + a_i^*)g_{0j}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ which expand to give

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_1(t_1^* - t) + a_1(t_0^* + t) + tu_1^* \\
&c_2(t_1^* - t) + a_2(t_0^* + t) + tu_2^* \\
&d_1(t_1^* - t) + b_1(t_0^* + t) + tv_1^* \\
&d_2(t_1^* - t) + b_2(t_0^* + t) + tv_2^* \\
&a_1 d_1 - a_1 t_0^* v_1^* + d_1 t_1^* u_1^* \\
&a_1 d_2 - a_1 t_0^* v_2^* + d_2 t_1^* u_1^* \\
&a_2 d_1 - a_2 t_0^* v_1^* + d_1 t_1^* u_2^* \\
&a_2 d_2 - a_2 t_0^* v_2^* + d_2 t_1^* u_2^*
\end{aligned}$$

where $t_0^* = t^*$, $t_1^* = 1 - t^*$, $u_i^* = a_i^* - c_i^*$, $v_i^* = b_i^* - d_i^*$. Note that $\sum (a_i + a_i^*) = 1$ and $\sum a_i^* = 1$ so $\sum a_i = 0$ and similarly for b, c, d . Also, $\sum u_i^* = \sum a_i^* - c_i^* = 0$. The same is true for v^* . We now do a case-by-case analysis.

Case 1: $\omega^* \in \Omega_m$.

This implies $t_0^* \neq 0$ and $t_1^* \neq 0$. Since the indeterminates b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2 appear only in the first four polynomials, this suggests the change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= (c'_i - tu_i^* - a_i(t_0^* + t))/(t_1^* - t), & i = 1, 2 \\ b_i &= (b'_i - tv_i^* - d_i(t_1^* - t))/(t_0^* + t), & i = 1, 2 \end{aligned}$$

with new indeterminates $t, a_1, a_2, b'_1, b'_2, c'_1, c'_2, d_1, d_2$. In view of Proposition 4.7, the Jacobian determinant of this substitution is a constant.

Case 1.1: $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m1}$.

This implies $u^* \neq 0, v^* = 0$ or $u^* = 0, v^* \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $v^* = 0, u_1^* > 0$ and substitute

$$d_i = (d'_i + a_1 t_0^* v_i^*)/(t_1^* u_1^* + a_1), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The resulting pullback ideal is $\langle b'_1, b'_2, c'_1, c'_2, d'_1, d'_2 \rangle$. If ω^* lies in the interior of Ω , we use either Newton polyhedra or Proposition 4.6 to show that the RLCT of this monomial ideal is $(6, 1)$. If ω^* lies on the boundary of Ω , the situation is more complicated. Because we are considering a subset of a neighborhood of ω^* , the corresponding Laplace integral from Proposition 4.2a is smaller so the threshold is at least $(6, 1)$. To compute it exactly, we need blowups to separate the coordinate hyperplanes and the hypersurfaces defining the boundary.

Because $-u_1^* = u_2^* + u_3^*$, we cannot have $u_2^* = u_3^* = 0$. Suppose $u_2^* \neq 0$ and $u_3^* \neq 0$. We consider a blowup where one of the charts is given by the monomial map $t = s, a_i = sa'_i, c'_1 = rs, c'_2 = rsc''_2, b'_i = rsb''_i, d'_i = rsd''_i$. Here, the pullback pair is $(\langle rs \rangle; r^5 s^8)$. Now, we study the inequalities which are *active* at ω^* . For instance, if $b_1^* = 0$, then ω^* lies on the boundary defined by $0 \leq b_1 + b_1^*$. After the various changes of variables, the inequalities are as shown below, where $b_3'' = -b_1'' - b_2''$ and similarly for c_3', d_3' and a_3' . Note that the inequality for $a_1^* = 0$ is omitted because $a_1^* = 0$ implies $u_1^* = -c_1^* \leq 0$. Similar conditions on the u_i^*, v_i^* hold for the other inequalities.

$$\begin{aligned} b_i^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq rs(b_i'' - d_i''(t_1^* - s)/(t_1^* u_1^* + sa'_1))/(t_0^* + s) \\ d_i^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq rsd_i''/(t_1^* u_1^* + sa'_1) \\ c_1^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq s(-u_1^* + a'_1(t_0^* + s) + r)/(t_1^* - s) \\ c_2^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq s(-u_2^* + a'_2(t_0^* + s) + rc_2'')/(t_1^* - s) & u_2^* > 0 \\ c_3^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq s(-u_3^* + a'_3(t_0^* + s) - r - rc_2'')/(t_1^* - s) & u_3^* > 0 \\ a_2^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq sa'_2 & u_2^* < 0 \\ a_3^* = 0 : & \quad 0 \leq sa'_3 & u_3^* < 0 \end{aligned}$$

In applying Lemma 6.1, the choice of coordinates is important. For instance, if $b_2^* = b_3^* = 0$, we choose coordinates b_2'' and b_3'' and set $b_1'' = -b_2'' - b_3''$. The same is done for the d_i'' . The pullback pair is unchanged by these choices. Now, with coordinates (r, s) and $(b''_i, b''_{i_2}, d''_{j_1}, d''_{j_2}, c''_2, a'_2, a'_3)$, we apply the lemma with the vector $\xi = (2, 2, u_1^*, u_1^*, 1, 1, 1)$, so the threshold is $\text{RLCT}_0(rs; r^5 s^8) = (6, 1)$.

Now, if only one of u_2^*, u_3^* is zero, suppose $u_2^* = 0, u_3^* \neq 0$ without loss of generality. If $a_2^* = c_2^* \neq 0$, then the arguments of the previous paragraph show that the RLCT is again $(6, 1)$. If $a_2^* = c_2^* = 0$, we blow up the origin in \mathbb{R}^7 and consider the chart where $a_2 = s, c'_i = sc''_i, b'_i = sb''_i, d'_i = sd''_i$. The pullback pair is $(\langle sb''_1, sb''_2, sc''_1, sc''_2, sd''_1, sd''_2 \rangle; s^6)$. The active inequalities for $a_2^* = c_2^* = 0$ are

$$\begin{aligned} c_2^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq s(c''_2 - t_0^* + t)/(t_1^* - t) \\ a_2^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq s. \end{aligned}$$

Near the origin in $(s, b''_1, b''_2, c''_1, c''_2, d''_1, d''_2) \in \mathbb{R}^7$, these inequalities imply $s = 0$ so the new region \mathcal{M} defined by the active inequalities is not full at the origin. Thus, we can ignore the origin in computing the RLCT. All other points on the exceptional divisor of this blowup lie on some other chart of the blowup where the pullback pair is $(s; s^6)$, so the RLCT is at least $(7, 1)$. In the chart where $c_2 = s, c_1 = sc''_1, a_2 = sa'_2, b'_i = sb''_i, d'_i = sd''_i$, we have the active inequalities below. Note that $c_3^* \neq 0$ because $u_3^* = -u_1^* < 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} b_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq s(b''_i - d''_i(t_1^* - t)/(t_1^* u_1^* - (sa'_2 + a_3)))/(t_0^* + t) \\ d_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq sd''_i/(t_1^* u_1^* - (sa'_2 + a_3)) \\ c_1^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq (sc''_1 - tu_1^* + (sa'_2 + a_3)(t_0^* + t))/(t_1^* - t) \\ c_2^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq s(1 - a'_2(t_0^* + t))/(t_1^* - t) \\ a_2^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq sa'_2 \\ a_3^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq a_3 \end{aligned}$$

Again, choosing suitable coordinates in the b''_i and d''_i , we use Lemma 6.1 with the vector $\xi = (2, 2, u_1^*, u_1^*, 1, 1, 1, -1)$ in coordinates $(b''_{i_1}, b''_{i_2}, d''_{j_1}, d''_{j_2}, a'_2, a_3, c''_1, t)$ to show that the RLCT is $(7, 1)$.

Case 1.2: $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m2}$.

This implies $u^* \neq 0, v^* \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, suppose that $u_1^* \neq 0$. If $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m21}$, we further assume that $a_1^* = d_j^* = 0, u_1^* \neq 0, v_j^* \neq 0$. Substituting

$$\begin{aligned} d_i &= (d''_i + a_1 t_0^* v_i^*)/(a_1 + t_1^* u_1^*), \quad i = 1, 2 \\ a_2 &= (a'_2 + a_1 u_2^*)/u_1^*, \end{aligned}$$

the pullback ideal is $\langle a'_2, b'_1, b'_2, c'_1, c'_2, d'_1, d'_2 \rangle$ so the RLCT is at least $(7, 1)$. Note that $a_i = (a'_2 w_i^* + a_1 u_i^*)/u_1^*$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ where $w_i^* = 0, 1, -1$ respectively. If ω^* is not in Ω_{m21} , we consider the blowup chart $a'_2 = s, b'_i = sb''_i, c'_i = sc''_i, d'_i = sd''_i$. The active inequalities are as follows. The symbol $v-$ denotes $v_i^* \leq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} b_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq [sb''_i - tv_i^* - (sd''_i + a_1 t_0^* v_i^*)(t_1^* - t)/(t_1^* u_1^* + a_1)]/(t_0^* + t) & v- \\ c_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq [sc''_i - tu_i^* - (sw_i^* + a_1 u_i^*)(t_0^* + t)/u_1^*]/(t_1^* - t) & u+ \\ a_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq (sw_i^* + a_1 u_i^*)/u_1^* & u- \\ d_i^* = 0: & \quad 0 \leq (sd''_i + a_1 t_0^* v_i^*)/(t_1^* u_1^* + a_1) & v+ \end{aligned}$$

The crux to understanding the inequalities is this: if $a_i^* = d_j^* = 0, u_i^* \neq 0, v_j^* \neq 0$, the coefficient of a_1 appears with different signs in the inequalities for $a_i^* = 0$

and $d_j^* = 0$. This makes it difficult to choose a suitable vector ξ for Lemma 6.1. Similarly, if $b_i^* = c_j^* = 0, v_i^* \neq 0, u_j^* \neq 0$, the coefficient of $u_1^* t + t_0^* a_1$ appears with different signs. Fortunately, since $\omega^* \notin \Omega_{m21}$, we do not have such obstructions and it is an easy exercise to find the vector ξ . Thus, the RLCT is (7, 1).

If $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m21} \setminus \Omega_{m22}$, we blowup $a_1 = s, a_2 = sa_2', b_i = sb_i', c_i = sc_i', d_i = sd_i'$. The active inequalities for $a_1^* = d_j^* = 0$ imply that the new region \mathcal{M} is not full at the origin of this chart. Thus, we shift our focus to the other charts of the blowup where the pullback pair is $(s; s^7)$, so the RLCT is at least (8, 1). In the chart where $a_2' = s, a_1 = sa_1', b_i = sb_i', c_i = sc_i', d_i = sd_i'$, we do not have obstructions coming from any $b_i^* = c_j^* = 0, v_i^* \neq 0, u_j^* \neq 0$ so it is again easy to find the vector ξ for Lemma 6.1. The threshold is exactly (8, 1).

If $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m22}$, consider the following two charts out of the nine charts in the blowup of the origin in \mathbb{R}^9 .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Chart 1: } & a_1 = s, t = st', a_2' = sa_2'', b_i = sb_i'', c_i = sc_i'', d_i = sd_i'' \\ \text{Chart 2: } & t = s, a_1 = sa_1', a_2' = sa_2'', b_i = sb_i'', c_i = sc_i'', d_i = sd_i'' \end{aligned}$$

The inequalities for $a_i^* = d_j^* = 0, u_i^* \neq 0, v_j^* \neq 0$ and $b_i^* = c_j^* = 0, v_i^* \neq 0, u_j^* \neq 0$ imply that the new region \mathcal{M} is not full at points outside of the other seven charts, so we may ignore these two charts in computing the RLCT. Indeed, for Chart 1, the active inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s(a_2'' w_i^* + u_i^*)/u_1^* & u- \\ d_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s(d_i'' + t_0^* v_i^*)/(t_1^* u_1^* + s) & v+ \end{aligned}$$

tell us that a_2'' or d_i'' must be non-zero for \mathcal{M} to be full. In Chart 2, suppose \mathcal{M} is full at some point x where $a_2'' = b_1'' = b_2'' = c_1'' = c_2'' = d_1'' = d_2'' = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s(a_2'' w_i^* + a_1' u_i^*)/u_1^* & u- \\ d_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s(d_i'' + a_1' t_0^* v_i^*)/(t_1^* u_1^* + sa_1') & v+ \end{aligned}$$

imply that $a_1' = 0$ at x . However, if this is the case, the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} b_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s[b_i'' - v_i^* - (d_i'' + a_1' t_0^* v_i^*)(t_1^* - s)/(t_1^* u_1^* + sa_1')]/(t_0^* + s) & v- \\ c_i^* = 0 : & 0 \leq s[c_i'' - u_i^* - (a_2'' w_i^* + a_1' u_i^*)(t_0^* + s)/u_1^*]/(t_1^* - s) & u+ \end{aligned}$$

forces b_i'' or c_i'' to be non-zero for some i , a contradiction. Thus, we shift our focus to the other seven charts where the pullback pair is $(s; s^8)$ and the RLCT is at least (9, 1). In the chart for $a_2' = s, a_1 = sa_1', t = st', b_i = sb_i', c_i = sc_i', d_i = sd_i'$, note that we cannot have both $a_2^* = 0$ and $a_3^* = 0$ because we assumed $a_1^* = 0$. It is now easy to find the vector ξ for Lemma 6.1, so the threshold is (9, 1).

Case 1.3: $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m0}$.

This implies $u_i^* = v_i^* = 0$ for all i . The pullback ideal can be written as

$$\langle b_1', b_2', c_1', c_2' \rangle + \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle$$

whose RLCT over an interior point of Ω is (6, 2) by Proposition 4.6. This occurs in Ω_{m000} where none of the inequalities are active. Now, suppose the only active

inequalities come from $a_1^* = c_1^* = 0$. We blow up the origin in $\{(a_1, c_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$. In the chart given by $a_1 = a'_1, c_1 = a'_1 c''_1$, the new region \mathcal{M} is not full at the origin, so we only need to study the chart where $c'_1 = c''_1, a_1 = c''_1 a'_1$. The pullback pair becomes $(\langle c''_1 \rangle + \langle b'_1, b'_2, c'_2 \rangle + \langle a_2 \rangle \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle; c''_1)$, and a simple application of Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 4.6 shows that the threshold is $(6, 1)$.

In this fashion, we study the different scenarios and summarise the pullback pairs and thresholds in the table below.

Inequalities	Pullback pair	RLCT
–	$(\langle b'_1, b'_2, c'_1, c'_2 \rangle + \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle; 1)$	$(6, 2)$
$a_1^* = 0$	$(\langle b'_1, b'_2, c''_1, c'_2 \rangle + \langle a_2 \rangle \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle; c''_1)$	$(6, 1)$
$a_1^* = 0, b_1^* = 0$	$(\langle b''_1, b'_2, c''_1, c'_2 \rangle + \langle a_2 \rangle \langle d_2 \rangle; b''_1 c''_1)$	$(7, 2)$
$a_1^* = 1$	$(\langle b'_1, b'_2, c''_1, c'_2 \rangle; c''_1 c''_2)$	$(6, 1)$
$a_1^* = 1, b_1^* = 0$	$(\langle b''_1, b'_2, c''_1, c'_2 \rangle; b''_1 c''_1 c''_2)$	$(7, 1)$
$a_1^* = 1, b_1^* = 1$	$(\langle b''_1, b''_2, c''_1, c'_2 \rangle; b''_1 b''_2 c''_1 c''_2)$	$(8, 1)$

For example, the case $a_3^* = c_3^* = 1$ corresponds to $a_1^* = a_2^* = c_1^* = c_2^* = 0$. Here, we blow up the origins in $\{(a_1, c_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$ and $\{(a_2, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$. As before, we can ignore the other charts and just consider the one where $a_1 = c''_1 a'_1, c_1 = c''_1, a_2 = c''_2 a'_2, c_2 = c''_2$. The pullback pair is $(\langle c''_1 \rangle + \langle c''_2 \rangle + \langle b'_1, b'_2 \rangle, c''_1 c''_2)$. If $b_i^* \neq 0$ for all i , the RLCT is $(6, 1)$ by Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 4.6.

Case 2: $\omega^* \in \Omega_u$.

Without loss of generality, assume $t^* = 0$ and substitute

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &= (c'_i - t(a_i + u_i^*)) / (1 - t) & i = 1, 2 \\ d_i &= (d'_i - t(b_i + v_i^*)) / (1 - t) & i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

The pullback ideal is the sum of $\langle c'_1, c'_2, d'_1, d'_2 \rangle$ and

$$\langle t \rangle \langle a_1 + u_1^*, a_2 + u_2^* \rangle \langle b_1 + v_1^*, b_2 + v_2^* \rangle.$$

Since $c'_3 = -c'_1 - c'_2$ and similarly for the d'_i, a_i, b_i, u_i^* and v_i^* , it is useful to write this ideal more symmetrically as the sum of $\langle c'_1, c'_2, c'_3 \rangle, \langle d'_1, d'_2, d'_3 \rangle$ and

$$\langle t \rangle \langle a_1 + u_1^*, a_2 + u_2^*, a_3 + u_3^* \rangle \langle b_1 + v_1^*, b_2 + v_2^*, b_3 + v_3^* \rangle.$$

Meanwhile, the inequalities are

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^* = 0 &: 0 \leq a_i \\ c_i^* = 0 &: 0 \leq (c'_i - t(a_i + u_i^*)) / (1 - t) & u_i^* \geq 0 \\ b_j^* = 0 &: 0 \leq b_j \\ d_j^* = 0 &: 0 \leq (d'_j - t(b_j + v_j^*)) / (1 - t) & v_j^* \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We now relabel the indices of the a_i and c'_i , without changing the b_j and d'_j , so that the active inequalities are among those from $a_1^* = 0, a_2^* = 0, c_{i_1}^* = 0, c_{i_2}^* = 0$. The b_j and d'_j are thereafter also relabeled so that the inequalities come from

$b_1^* = 0, b_2^* = 0, d_{j_1}^* = 0, d_{j_2}^* = 0$. We claim that the new region \mathcal{M} contains, for small ε , the orthant neighborhood

$$\{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_{i_1}, c_{i_2}, d_{j_1}, d_{j_2}, -t) \in [0, \varepsilon]^9\}.$$

Indeed, the only problematic inequalities are

$$\begin{aligned} c_3^* = 0 &: 0 \leq (c_3' - t(-a_1 - a_2 + u_i^*)) / (1 - t) & u_3^* = 0 \\ d_3^* = 0 &: 0 \leq (d_3' - t(-b_1 - b_2 + v_j^*)) / (1 - t) & v_3^* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

However, these inequalities cannot occur because for instance, $u_3^* = 0$ and $c_3^* = 0$ implies $a_3^* = 0$, a contradiction since the a_i were relabeled to avoid this. Finally, the threshold of $\langle t \rangle$ is $(1, 1)$ while that of $\langle a_1 + u_1^*, a_2 + u_2^* \rangle$ and $\langle b_1 + v_1^*, b_2 + v_2^* \rangle$ are at least $(2, 1)$ each. By Proposition 4.6, the RLCT of their product is $(1, 1)$ and that of the pullback ideal is $(5, 1)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Given a matrix $P = (p_{ij})$, the learning coefficient (λ, θ) of the model at P is the minimum of RLCTs at points $\omega^* \in \Omega$ where $p(\omega^*) = P$. Since $p(\Omega_u) = S_1$, it follows from Proposition 6.3 that $(\lambda, \theta) = (5, 1)$ for $P \in S_1$. The images $p(\Omega_{m0})$ and $p(\Omega_{m1})$ are contained in S_1 , so we do not have to consider them. Meanwhile, among the rank 2 matrices, it is easy to check that $p(\Omega_{m21}) \subset S_{22}$. Now, if $p(\omega^*) = P \in S_{22}$, then $p_{11} = t^* a_1^* b_1^* + (1 - t^*) c_1^* d_1^* = 0$ implies that $a_1^* = 0$ or $b_1^* = 0$ because the parameters are positive. Without loss of generality, assume $a_1^* = 0$. Because $p_{12} \neq 0$, we have $c_1^* \neq 0$ which leads us to $d_1^* = 0$ and $b_1^* \neq 0$. The condition $p_{22} = 0$ then shows that $b_2^* = c_2^* = 0, a_2^* \neq 0, d_2^* \neq 0$. Therefore, $\omega^* \in \Omega_{m22}$ and $p(\Omega_{m22}) = S_{22}$. This argument also proves that $p(\Omega_{m21}) = S_{21}$, and the theorem follows. \square

Acknowledgements. Shaowei Lin was supported by graduate fellowship from A*STAR (Agency for Science, Technology and Research, Singapore). The author wishes to thank Christine Berkesch, Mathias Drton, Anton Leykin, Bernd Sturmfels, Zach Teitler, Sumio Watanabe and Piotr Zwiernik for many useful suggestions and discussions.

References

- [1] M. Aoyagi and S. Watanabe: Stochastic complexities of reduced rank regression in Bayesian estimation, *Neural Networks* **18** (2005) 924–933.
- [2] V. I. Arnol'd, S. M. Guseĭn-Zade and A. N. Varchenko: *Singularities of Differentiable Maps*, Vol. II, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1985.
- [3] M. Blickle, R. Lazarsfeld: An informal introduction to multiplier ideals, *Trends in Commutative Algebra*, MSRI Publications **51** (2004) 87–114.

- [4] M. Drton, B. Sturmfels and S. Sullivant: *Lectures on Algebraic Statistics*, Oberwolfach Seminars **39**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2009.
- [5] D. Eisenbud: *Commutative Algebra with a view towards Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **150**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [6] M. Evans, Z. Gilula and I. Guttman: Latent class analysis of two-way contingency tables by Bayesian methods, *Biometrika* **76** (1989) 557–563.
- [7] W. Fulton: *Introduction to Toric Varieties*, Annals of Mathematics Studies **131**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1993.
- [8] D. Geiger and D. Rusakov: Asymptotic model selection for naive Bayesian networks, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **6** (2005) 1–35.
- [9] M. Greenblatt: An elementary coordinate-dependent local resolution of singularities and applications, *J. Funct. Anal.* **255** (2008) 1957–1994.
- [10] M. Greenblatt: Resolution of singularities, asymptotic expansions of integrals, and related phenomena, submitted, [arXiv:math.CA/0709.2496](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0709.2496).
- [11] M. Greenblatt: Oscillatory integral decay, sublevel set growth, and the Newton polyhedron, submitted, [arXiv:math.CA/0804.1579](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0804.1579).
- [12] H. Hironaka: Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero I, II, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **79** (1964) 109–203.
- [13] J. A. Howald: Multiplier ideals of monomial ideals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc* **353** (2001) 2665–2671.
- [14] J. Kollár: Singularities of pairs, in *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, 221–287, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **62**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997.
- [15] R. Lazarsfeld: *Positivity in Algebraic Geometry I, II*, A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics **48–49**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [16] S. Lin, B. Sturmfels and Z. Xu: Marginal likelihood integrals for mixtures of independence models, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **10** (2009) 1611–1631.
- [17] M. Saito: On real log canonical thresholds, [arXiv:math.AG/0707.2308](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0707.2308).
- [18] B. Sturmfels: *Gröbner Bases and Convex Polytopes*, University Lecture Series **8**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1996.
- [19] K. Tanabe, M. Sagae: An exact Cholesky decomposition and the generalized inverse of the variance-covariance matrix of the multinomial distribution, with applications, *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* **54** (1992) 211–219.
- [20] A. N. Varchenko: Newton polyhedra and estimation of oscillating integrals, *Funct. Anal. Appl.* **10** (1977) 175–196.

- [21] S. Watanabe: Algebraic analysis for nonidentifiable learning machines, *Neural Computation* **13** (2001) 899–933.
- [22] S. Watanabe: *Algebraic Geometry and Statistical Learning Theory*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics **25**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [23] K. Yamazaki and S. Watanabe: Singularities in mixture models and upper bounds of stochastic complexity, *International Journal of Neural Networks* **16** (2003) 1029–1038.
- [24] K. Yamazaki and S. Watanabe: Newton diagram and stochastic complexity in mixture of binomial distributions, *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, 350–364, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. **3244**, Springer, Berlin, 2004.