

Symmetric and Asymmetric Tendencies resulting from Eigenvalue bounds of the Community Matrix

James P.L. Tan^{1,2}

¹Interdisciplinary Graduate School, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue, Block S2-B3a-01, Singapore 639798, Republic of Singapore

²Complexity Institute, Nanyang Technological University, 60 Nanyang View, Singapore 639673, Republic of Singapore

Abstract

The stability of ecosystems has always been a topic of great interest. However, theoretical understanding of the structures that contribute to stability leaves much to be desired. Here, by studying the eigenvalue bounds of the community matrix, we show that under a conservation of interaction strengths, ecosystems will favor mutual relationships with symmetrical dependencies and predatory-prey relationships with asymmetrical dependencies, in agreement with real-world observations. Furthermore, while interdependencies between populations can improve stability, we find that increasing interdependence diversity destabilizes the ecosystem. We determine that this effect is more pronounced in mutualistic networks than trophic networks which is also in agreement with real-world observations. Because of the generality of the model used, this analysis may carry over to a wide array of other real-world complex systems when the assumptions of the model are valid.

Critical transitions are ubiquitous in nature, and its associated early-warning signals have been detected in systems as disparate as the climate, housing market, ecosystems and human depression [1–7]. Critical transitions start from stable regimes that have undergone loss of stability over time. The loss of stability allows the complex system to transition toward contrasting regimes. Such transitions are often highly non-linear, resulting in large and abrupt changes to a complex system. Thus, these transitions can have huge adverse impact on the complex system in question. While statistical early warning signals have been used to detect loss of stability preceding critical transitions [1,3], an important research question remains that has not been adequately answered in the literature: What is the structure of stable complex systems and how can we ensure the stability of such systems?

The stability of complex systems has always been a field of interest, particularly in ecology [8]. Mays theoretical results went against prevailing wisdom at that time in showing that a large complex system can become more unstable when there is an increasing amount of interaction between species (variables), and as the interaction strengths increase [9]. May studied the Jacobian of a dynamical system $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x})$ described by arbitrary non-linear differential equations $\dot{x}_i = f_i(\mathbf{x})$, where x_i is a variable in the dynamical system, \dot{x}_i is the time derivative of x_i , \mathbf{x} is a vector of all variables, $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is an index of variables and n is the number of variables. Let \mathbf{x}^* be an equilibrium point i.e. $f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \mathbf{0}$. Then the stability of the equilibrium point may be studied by a first order approximation of $f(\mathbf{x}^*)$ i.e. the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{B} of the dynamical system evaluated at \mathbf{x}^* . The equilibrium point is stable when the real parts of all the eigenvalues of \mathbf{B} are negative. Calculating the eigenvalues of \mathbf{B} requires solving the polynomial equation $\det(\mathbf{B} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) = 0$, where λ is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{B} while \det is the determinant. Studying how matrix elements of the Jacobian interfere with the eigenvalues is not a straightforward problem in part because there is no general algebraic expression for the roots of polynomials of the 5th degree or higher. This is a well-known result from Galois theory. May resorted to Random Matrix Theory (RMT) but this approach has been criticized on grounds that real networks have structure [10–12]. Allesina et al. improved on Mays work using RMT by considering random matrices with particular structures of mutual and inverse relationships [13]. A minor shortcoming is that this approach does not satisfactorily generalize the structure of stable matrices. In this paper, we study the eigenvalues using eigenvalue bounds and obtain a simpler approach that may offer insights on the structure of stable complex systems. Given a multiset of eigenvalues from , an upper and lower bound respectively for the largest real part out of all the eigenvalues are,

$$\lambda_+ = \bar{\lambda} + \sqrt{n-1}\sigma_\lambda \quad (1)$$

$$\lambda_- = \bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n-1}}\sigma_\lambda \quad (2)$$

Here, $\bar{\lambda}$ is the mean while σ_λ is the standard deviation of the real parts of the eigenvalues. The result for the upper bound is a more well-known one and was probably first discovered by Laguerre but is more commonly known as Samuelsons inequality [14, 15]. The lower bound is due to Brunk [16]. As a further note, $\lambda_+ < 0$ and $\lambda_- > 0$ are sufficient conditions for stability and instability respectively. For large n , the bounds may be approximated by a simplified expression in terms of $\{b_{ij} : i, j = 1, \dots, n\}$, the matrix components of \mathbf{B} (Supplementary Information),

$$\lambda_\pm = \frac{1}{n}\chi_{\text{diag}} + n^{-1/2\pm 1/2}\sqrt{\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} + h} \quad (3)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) + n^{-1/2\pm 1/2}\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^2) + h}, \quad (4)$$




Figure 1: The random matrices used by May are known from RMT to be unstable when the variance of the matrix elements is large enough [13]. Here, we generate 1000 20x20 unstable random matrices with diagonal elements at -2 and off-diagonal elements drawn from a standard normal distribution. We employ three different strategies to minimize the maximum real part out of all eigenvalues (vertical axis). The Random strategy randomly increases or decrease the magnitude of an element. The Variance minimizing strategy decreases the magnitude of an element. The Minimizing strategy decreases the magnitude for a mutual pair and increases the magnitude for an inverse pair. The line plots are the mean of the maximum real eigenvalues of the 1000 random matrices at each iteration step.

where $\chi_{\text{diag}} = \sum_i b_{ii}$ is the diagonal sum, $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} = \sum_i b_{ii}^2$ is the squared diagonal sum and $h = \sum_i [\text{Im}(\lambda_i)]^2$ is a non-negative number that is positive when the imaginary components are non-zero and 0 otherwise. $\chi_{\text{off}} = 2 \sum_i \sum_{j=i+1} b_{ij} b_{ji}$ is the sum of products of off-diagonal symmetric matrix elements. For brevity, we shall refer to $b_{ij} b_{ji}$ as a symmetric pair. $b_{ij} b_{ji} > 0$ is a mutual pair whereas $b_{ij} b_{ji} < 0$ is an inverse pair. Thus, all diagonal elements form mutual pairs. Henceforth, where it is mentioned that the systems stability increases or decreases, we are referring to the case where the lower bound of the eigenvalue increases or the upper bound decreases respectively. From the expressions λ_+ and λ_- for constant n , we can roughly conclude that small χ_{diag} , χ_{sdiag} and χ_{off} are necessary conditions for stability whereas large χ_{diag} , χ_{sdiag} or χ_{off} are sufficient conditions for instability in the system. For the purpose of stabilizing the system, Δh , the change in h must be known since it is not enough that χ_{diag} , χ_{sdiag} and χ_{off} be small. This is not a problem in systems where the eigenvalues are all real so that $h = 0$ (e.g. symmetric matrices). For systems with complex eigenvalues ($h > 0$), the change in the imaginary components of the eigenvalues must be measured. This is simply the change in the angular frequencies of the decaying perturbations to the system since the angular frequencies are the imaginary components of these eigenvalues. If only the sign of Δh is known, then Δh can be $\Delta h \leq 0$ if the system is to be stabilized. The restrictions on Δh may be further




Figure 2: This graph shows the boundaries of values possible for C and S . The blue line is the maximum symmetric correlation attainable under fixed interdependence diversity. The red line is the minimum symmetric correlation attainable under fixed interdependence diversity. Both line plots are calculated by numerical optimization techniques (Supplementary Information). As a further note, the set of C for a fixed S is not necessarily continuous within the boundaries (e.g. at $S = -2m$).

relaxed if the overall change in λ_+ can be quantified. Alternatively, the real parts of the eigenvalues may be measured instead to directly determine if the changes to the system are stabilizing or destabilizing [1, 17]. This notion is illustrated in Fig. 1, where we prune unstable random matrices for stability using different strategies. The strategies consists of iterations where at each iteration step, a randomly chosen interaction element (an off-diagonal matrix element) is modified (by a factor of $3/2$) and the resulting eigenvalues calculated after the modification. The modification is accepted only when the largest real part out of all eigenvalues is smaller than before the modification.

A consequence of these bounds may be seen in mutualistic networks. In mutualistic networks like plant-pollinator networks, a plant (population variable x_P) has a positive directional dependence on a pollinator animal (population variable x_A) i.e. $\frac{\partial f_P}{\partial x_A}(\mathbf{x}^*) = b_{PA} \geq 0$, and the pollinator animal also has a positive directional dependence on the plant i.e. $\frac{\partial f_A}{\partial x_P}(\mathbf{x}^*) = b_{AP} \geq 0$. Hence, if the system is to be stable and there exists sizeable interactions within the system, we expect these interactions to be highly asymmetric because these pairs are mutual i.e. $b_{AP}b_{PA} \geq 0$. This asymmetry in interactions is indeed what is observed in real-world mutualistic plant-pollinator networks [10, 18, 19]. Asymmetric interactions has the overall effect that increasing interaction in mutual pairs and diagonal elements do not necessarily destabilize the system. However, asymmetric interactions demand that the variables in the system be more interdependent on each other if the interaction strengths within a system are conserved. This means that while such a system can become more stable (depending on Δh), any instability that happens may

involve more variables, since these variables are more interdependent. Which variables initially affected by such an instability depend on the eigenvector(s) of the eigenvalue(s) going above zero. Whether a not such an initial instability will eventually lead to system-wide instability depends on a multitude of factors including the structure of the network connecting these variables and how the system responds to this initial instability. The effect of initial instability on the whole system is a topic of great interest in network science [20–23].

We formalize the notion of a conserved interaction within the system with a model of interdependence among similar variables such that the interactions/dependencies are constrained. To do this, we consider the sets of similar variables $\{y_k : k = 1, \dots, m\} \subset x$ and $\{z_l : l = 1, \dots, m\} \subset x$, where x is the set of all variables. For each $y_k = Y_k(\mathbf{x})$, all z_l in $Y_k(\mathbf{x})$ must form at least an instance of the linear combination $\alpha_k = \sum_l d_{kl} z_l$. Similarly, for each $z_l = Z_l(\mathbf{x})$, all y_k in $Z_l(\mathbf{x})$ must form at least an instance of the linear combination $\beta_l = \sum_k e_{lk} y_k$. Here, d_{kl} and e_{lk} are weights such that $\sum_l d_{kl} = 1$, $\sum_k e_{lk} = 1$ and $0 \leq d_{kl}, e_{lk} \leq 1$. Additionally, $\frac{\partial Y_k}{\partial \alpha_k}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \alpha$ and $\frac{\partial Z_l}{\partial \beta_l}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \beta$ for all k and l . Finally, we require the variables within each set to have the same value at the equilibrium point \mathbf{x}^* i.e. y_k^* and z_l^* for all y_k^* and z_l^* , where y_k^* and z_l^* denotes the equilibrium value of y_k and z_l respectively. Hence, the equilibrium point will stay the same under any variation of the weights. In the Jacobian \mathbf{B} , we may find the matrix elements $\frac{\partial Y_k}{\partial z_l}(\mathbf{x}^*) = d_{kl}\alpha$ and $\frac{\partial Z_l}{\partial y_k}(\mathbf{x}^*) = e_{lk}\beta$ for all k and l . We are now concerned with minimizing the eigenvalue bounds with respect to the distribution of the weights d_{kl} and e_{lk} for all k and l . Minimizing the bounds requires minimizing $\{\chi_{\text{diag}}, \chi_{\text{sdiag}}, \chi_{\text{off}}\}$ and/or h . The bounds can be minimized by significant changes in h but we cannot consider this case because the bounds do not give us any information on how to minimize h . Furthermore, there is a limit to minimizing h because h is always non-negative. This suggests that stable complex systems should possess structures that are, to a certain extent, described by minimizing $\{\chi_{\text{diag}}, \chi_{\text{sdiag}}, \chi_{\text{off}}\}$. Therefore, the following results are for the context that $\Delta h \approx 0$.

The eigenvalue bounds are linear functions of the mean and standard deviation of the real parts of the eigenvalues. We are first concerned with the term $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}}$, which is proportional to the variance. The summands of $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}}$ which are variable are $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} = m\alpha\beta C + \dots$. The term

$$C = m^{-1} \sum_k \sum_l d_{kl} e_{lk} = m^{-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{E}) \quad (5)$$

is a correlation between the distributions of symmetric weight elements $\{d_{kl}\}$ and $\{e_{lk}\}$. Here, d_{kl} is a matrix element of \mathbf{D} with row index k and column index l while e_{lk} is a matrix element of \mathbf{E} with row index l and column index k . Thus, $\alpha\mathbf{D}$ and $\beta\mathbf{E}$ are submatrices of \mathbf{B} . This symmetric correlation C is bounded $|C| \leq 1$ for the constraints $|d_{kl}|, |e_{lk}| \leq 1$, $\sum_l |d_{kl}| = 1$ and $\sum_k |e_{lk}| = 1$ (Theorem S2). In the model, $0 \leq d_{kl} \leq 1$ hence C is bounded $0 \leq C \leq 1$ instead (Theorem S1). To minimize χ_{off} for stability, mutual pairs ($\alpha\beta > 0$) will have small symmetric correlation whereas inverse pairs ($\alpha\beta < 0$) will have large symmetric correlation. Next, we define the interdependence diversity, a measure of the diversity of interdependence among the y and z variables in the system as follows

$$S = - \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^m d_{kl}^2 + e_{lk}^2 \quad (6)$$

S is simply the sum of all the squared weight elements. Furthermore, S is bounded because of the weight constraints such that $-2m \leq S \leq -2$. The interdependence diversity is similar to the Herfindahl index in economics or the inverse participation ratio in

physics. Additionally, since $\max(C)$ and $\min(C)$ under fixed S are monotonically decreasing and increasing functions of S respectively (Theorem S3), the capacity of the complex system to stabilize itself decreases with increasing interdependence diversity. This result agrees with the general observation that the degree distribution of real-world systems are often highly asymmetric, with a large number of nodes having a few connections and a small number of nodes with a large number of connections. We may also qualitatively compare our result to modularity and connectance measures of ecological communities in Thèbault et al.s work on mutualistic and trophic networks [12]. Mutualistic communities are characterized by mutual pairs whereas trophic communities are characterized by inverse pairs.

Modularity measures how frequently species in a module interact among themselves than with species from other modules. Because mutual and inverse pairs must be associated with small and large symmetric correlation respectively, the system must be more modular for mutualistic communities since interactions are less reciprocative than trophic communities. This is indeed the case in Thèbault et al.s study. Next, the connectance is a measure of the number of non-zero links compared to the total possible number of links in the network. Hence, the connectance is correlated with the interdependence diversity. Large connectance will tend to result in a large interdependence diversity depending on the actual distribution of weights whereas small connectance will result in a small interdependence diversity. Thèbault et al. found connectance to negatively affect trophic communities more than mutualistic communities. This happens because $\max(C)$ is bounded $m^{-1} \leq \max(C) \leq 1$ while $\min(C)$ is bounded $0 \leq \min(C) \leq m^{-1}$ within the domain of S . Hence, this is in agreement with the observation that trophic communities are more adversely affected by an increasing interdependence diversity.

Finally, the mean of the eigenvalues is $\bar{\lambda} = n^{-1} \chi_{\text{diag}}$. We define the interdependence γ_i of a diagonal element b_{ii} to be $\gamma_i = 1 - w_i$, where w_i is the weight associated with a diagonal element. Thus, increasing interdependence in the positive (negative) diagonal elements stabilizes (destabilizes) the system by decreasing (increasing) the mean of the eigenvalue bounds.

Collectively, the results in this paper provide efficient means of stabilizing or destabilizing a complex system. The results also confirm that mutualistic and inverse relationships manifest in markedly different symmetric structures within a complex, a result that is well-known in ecology [12, 13]. More importantly, these results allows us to generalize known findings from ecology to other stable complex systems. Indeed, it has previously been suggested that increasing connectance is a cause of the 2008 financial crisis [24].

Supplementary Information

1 Derivation of eigenvalue bounds

The eigenvalue bounds for a multiset of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ are

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \bar{\lambda} + (n-1)^{\pm 1/2} \sigma_{\lambda} \quad (7)$$

, where $\bar{\lambda}$ is the mean of all eigenvalues while σ_{λ} is the standard deviation of all real parts of all eigenvalues. Here, $\bar{\lambda} = \sum_i \lambda_i / n$ and

$$\sigma_{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_i (\lambda_i - \bar{\lambda})^2} \quad (8)$$

$$= \sqrt{-\bar{\lambda}^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \lambda_i^2} \quad (9)$$

If we denote the polynomial equation as $\det(\mathbf{I}\lambda - \mathbf{B}) = \lambda^n + c_1 \lambda^{n-1} + c_2 \lambda^{n-2} + \dots$, then we find using Viète's formulas and the complex conjugate root theorem that $c_1 = -\sum_i \lambda_i$ and $c_2 = \sum_i \sum_{j=i+1} \lambda_i \lambda_j + h/2$, where $h = \sum_i [\text{Im}(\lambda_i)]^2$. Then λ_{\pm} becomes

$$\lambda_{\pm} = -\frac{c_1}{n} + \frac{(n-1)^{1/2 \pm 1/2}}{n} \sqrt{c_1^2 + \frac{2n}{n-1} (h/2 - c_2)}. \quad (10)$$

Expanding the Leibniz formula for determinants gives us $c_1 = -\sum_i b_{ii}$ and $c_2 = \sum_i \sum_{j=i+1} b_{ii} b_{jj} - b_{ij} b_{ji}$, hence for large n ,

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i b_{ii} + n^{-1/2 \pm 1/2} \sqrt{\sum_i b_{ii}^2 + 2 \sum_i \sum_{j=i+1} b_{ij} b_{ji} + h} \quad (11)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}) + n^{-1/2 \pm 1/2} \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^2) + h} \quad (12)$$

2 Obtaining the numerical results of Fig. 2

To obtain the two curves, we first construct the distributions described by Theorem S1 which is when S is at the minimum of $-2m$. Then we use these distributions as initial starting points for a nonlinear constrained optimization algorithm implemented in MATLAB (fmincon function with sqp algorithm). The maximum distribution is the initial starting distribution for maximizing C while the minimum distribution is the initial starting distribution for minimizing C . The constraints for the optimization problem are the weight constraints $0 \leq d_{kl}, e_{lk} \leq 1$, $\sum_k d_{kl} = 1$ and $\sum_l e_{lk} = 1$, and the interdependence diversity constraint (fixing the interdependence diversity at $-2m + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is the next discrete point along the horizontal axis). Once a solution is found, the solution is then used as the initial distribution for the next optimization where the interdependence diversity is fixed at a positive increment ϵ from the previous optimization. This step is repeated until the maximum interdependence diversity is reach at -2 .

3 Supplementary Results

Using $\lambda_-(h = 0)$ as a crude lower bound

We may use $\lambda_-(h = 0)$ as a crude lower bound even when complex roots exist if we additionally define the term under the square root to be 0 when $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} < 0$ i.e. $\lambda_- = n^{-1}\chi_{\text{diag}} + \sqrt{g(\chi_{\text{sdiag}}, \chi_{\text{off}}, h)}$, where

$$g(\chi_{\text{sdiag}}, \chi_{\text{off}}, h) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}}} & \text{if } \chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} < 0 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Additionally, when $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} < 0$, we may also say that the system's stability decreases from change(s) in the matrix element(s) even when λ_- does not change. In this case, the stability decreases in the sense that λ_- will eventually increase if such change(s) in the system is large and/or numerous enough. As a further note, when $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} < 0$, complex eigenvalue(s) necessarily exist since $\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} + h \geq 0$.

If $\lambda_+ < 0$, then $\chi_{\text{off}} < 0$

Proof. If $\lambda_+ < 0$, then $\chi_{\text{diag}} < 0$ since $\sqrt{\chi_{\text{sdiag}} + \chi_{\text{off}} + h} \geq 0$ by Equation 11. We first suppose $\chi_{\text{off}} \geq 0$. Then let $\chi_{\text{diag}} = -\beta$, where $\beta > 0$. For any fixed β and varying b_{ii} , χ_{sdiag} has no upper limit but is minimized when $b_{ii} = -\beta/n = -\gamma$. In this lower limit, $\lambda_+ = -\gamma + \sqrt{n\gamma^2 + \chi_{\text{off}} + h}$ but $\sqrt{n\gamma^2 + \chi_{\text{off}} + h} > \gamma$ since $n > 1$, $\chi_{\text{off}} \geq 0$ and $h \geq 0$. Hence $\lambda_+ > 0$ which violates our starting condition and so $\chi_{\text{off}} < 0$. \square

4 Proofs

A proof that $|C| \leq 1$

Definition S1 C is defined as

$$C = m^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{l=1}^m w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = m^{-1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2), \quad (14)$$

where k and l are indices such that $k, l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and m is a positive integer i.e. $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The weights w_1^{kl} satisfy the constraints $\sum_k |w_1^{kl}| = 1$, $\sum_l |w_2^{lk}| = 1$ and $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$. Additionally, w_1^{kl} is a matrix element of \mathbf{W}_1 with row index k and column index l . Similarly, w_2^{lk} is a matrix element of \mathbf{W}_2 with row index l and column index k .

We shall first prove $0 \leq C \leq 1$ for the case where $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$ before generalizing to the case where $|C| \leq 1$ for the constraints $|w_1^{kl}|, |w_2^{lk}| \leq 1$

Proposition S1 If $x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 \geq x_2 y_1 + x_1 y_2$ and $y_1 > y_2$, where $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, then $x_1 \geq x_2$. If $x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 \leq x_2 y_1 + x_1 y_2$ and $y_1 > y_2$, then $x_1 \leq x_2$.

Proof. If $x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 \geq x_2 y_1 + x_1 y_2$, then $(y_1 - y_2)(x_1 - x_2) \geq 0$. Since $y_1 > y_2$, then $x_1 \geq x_2$. Similarly, if $x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 \leq x_2 y_1 + x_1 y_2$, then $(y_1 - y_2)(x_1 - x_2) \leq 0$. Since $y_1 > y_2$, then $x_1 \leq x_2$. \square

Definition S2 The matrix pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is maximally ordered if and only if both \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 are maximally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$. In the pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$, \mathbf{W}_1 is maximally ordered if and only if for any pair of matrix elements on the row k of \mathbf{W}_1 , $w_1 = w_1^{kl}$ and $w_2 = w_1^{kl'}$, the corresponding pair in \mathbf{W}_2 , i.e. $w_3 = w_2^{lk}$ and $w_4 = w_2^{l'k}$ is such that $w_1w_3 + w_2w_4 \geq w_2w_3 + w_1w_4$. This leads to the same definition for \mathbf{W}_2 i.e. \mathbf{W}_2 is maximally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ if and only if for any pair of matrix elements on the row l of \mathbf{W}_2 , $w_1 = w_2^{lk}$ and $w_2 = w_2^{lk'}$, the corresponding pair in \mathbf{W}_1 , i.e. $w_3 = w_1^{kl}$ and $w_4 = w_1^{kl'}$ is such that $w_1w_3 + w_2w_4 \geq w_2w_3 + w_1w_4$.

Similarly, the matrix pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is minimally ordered if and only if both \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 are minimally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$. In the pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$, \mathbf{W}_1 is minimally ordered if and only if for any pair of matrix elements on the row k of \mathbf{W}_1 , $w_1 = w_1^{kl}$ and $w_2 = w_1^{kl'}$, the corresponding pair in \mathbf{W}_2 , i.e. $w_3 = w_2^{lk}$ and $w_4 = w_2^{l'k}$ is such that $w_1w_3 + w_2w_4 \leq w_2w_3 + w_1w_4$. This leads to the same definition for \mathbf{W}_2 i.e. \mathbf{W}_2 is minimally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ if and only if for any pair of matrix elements on the row l of \mathbf{W}_2 , $w_1 = w_2^{lk}$ and $w_2 = w_2^{lk'}$, the corresponding pair in \mathbf{W}_1 , i.e. $w_3 = w_1^{kl}$ and $w_4 = w_1^{kl'}$ is such that $w_1w_3 + w_2w_4 \leq w_2w_3 + w_1w_4$.

Definition S3 Let W_1 be the set of matrices exhibiting the same multiset of matrix elements in each row i.e. $W_1 = \{\mathbf{W}_1 : w_1^{kl} \in W_1^k\}$, where W_1^k is a multiset of weights that satisfy the weight constraints in Definition S1 i.e. they sum to 1 and each is between 0 and 1. Hence, W_1^k denotes the multiset of matrix elements in row k of \mathbf{W}_1 , for any $\mathbf{W}_1 \in W_1$. Let W_2 be a second set of matrices under the same definition. Then let $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ denote the maximum value and minimum value respectively that can be obtained from $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ for any $\mathbf{W}_1 \in W_1$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in W_2$. We shall also refer to any W_1 defined in this way as a weight distribution.

Proposition S2 If $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$, then $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is maximally ordered. If $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$, then $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is minimally ordered.

Proof. Suppose that $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is not maximally ordered. Then \mathbf{W}_1 and/or \mathbf{W}_2 is not maximally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that \mathbf{W}_1 is not maximally ordered in $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$. Then there is at least an instance of w_1^{kl} and $w_1^{kl'}$ in row k of \mathbf{W}_1 where $w_1^{kl}w_2^{lk} + w_1^{kl'}w_2^{l'k} < w_1^{kl'}w_2^{lk} + w_1^{kl}w_2^{l'k}$. There also exists a $\mathbf{W}'_1 \in W_1$ that is equivalent to \mathbf{W}_1 except that the matrix elements w_1^{kl} and $w_1^{kl'}$ in \mathbf{W}_1 are swapped. Hence, $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}'_1\mathbf{W}_2) > \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ and $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \neq \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$. We can apply a similar argument for $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ to find that $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is minimally ordered. \square

Definition S4 An incremental change δ to the weight distribution W_1 occurs if $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = w_1^{k\alpha} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\beta} - \delta$ so that it satisfies $0 \leq \hat{w}_1^{k\alpha}, \hat{w}_1^{k\beta} \leq 1$. for any $w_1^{k\alpha}, w_1^{k\beta} \in W_1^k$. Also, $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} \in \hat{W}_1^k$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} \in \hat{W}_1^k$ refer to the new weight elements where the ($\hat{\cdot}$) notation is used to denote variables after the incremental change (e.g. \hat{W}_1 and $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_1$). Without loss of generality, we choose the convention where $w_1^{k\alpha} \geq w_1^{k\beta}$ when describing any incremental change.

Proposition S3 For any two matrix elements $w_1^{k\alpha}$ and $w_1^{k\beta}$ in W_1^k , without loss of generality, we assume $w_1^{k\alpha} \geq w_1^{k\beta}$. Let there be an incremental change in value δ to the pair. We denote the change in $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ as $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$. Then,

- (a) If $\delta > 0$, then $w_1^{k\alpha} < 1$, $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$ and $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \leq 0$.
- (b) If $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$, then $w_1^{k\alpha} \neq w_1^{k\beta}$, $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \leq 0$ and $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$.

Proof. Let \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 be such that $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$. Then there exists a pair of matrix elements w_1^{kl} and $w_1^{kl'}$ such that $w_1^{kl} = w_1^{k\alpha}$ and $w_1^{kl'} = w_1^{k\beta}$.

(a) Since $\sum_l w_1^{kl} = 1$, w_1^{kl} cannot exceed 1. Hence, if $\delta > 0$, then $w_1^{kl} < 1$. First, we consider the inequality case $w_1^{kl} > w_1^{kl'}$. By Proposition S2, $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ is maximally ordered. Hence, $w_1^{kl}w_2^{lk} + w_1^{kl'}w_2^{l'k} \geq w_1^{kl'}w_2^{lk} + w_1^{kl}w_2^{l'k}$ and $w_2^{lk} \geq w_2^{l'k}$ by Proposition S1. After the change δ , it follows that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ changes by an amount $\delta(w_2^{lk} - w_2^{l'k})$. Then, $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq \delta(w_2^{lk} - w_2^{l'k})$. Since $w_2^{lk} \geq w_2^{l'k}$, it follows that if $\delta > 0$, then $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$. Next, we consider the equality case $w_1^{kl} = w_1^{kl'}$. Then either $w_2^{lk} \geq w_2^{l'k}$ or $w_2^{l'k} > w_2^{lk}$. If $w_2^{lk} \geq w_2^{l'k}$, then it follows that $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$ from before. However, if $w_2^{l'k} > w_2^{lk}$, then we consider the matrix $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1 \in W_1$ where its matrix elements are the same as \mathbf{W}_1 with the exception that w_1^{kl} and $w_1^{kl'}$ are swapped. Hence the summands of $\text{Tr}(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ we are interested in are $w_1^{kl'}w_2^{lk} + w_1^{kl}w_2^{l'k}$. It follows that $\text{Tr}(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ changes by an amount $\delta(w_2^{l'k} - w_2^{lk})$. Because $w_2^{l'k} > w_2^{lk}$ and $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2) = \text{Tr}(\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$, then for $\delta > 0$, $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$. Following a similar argument where we let \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 be such that $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ instead, we can also find that $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \leq 0$. \square

(b) If $\frac{w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$, then $w_1^{kl} \neq w_1^{kl'}$ because $\delta < 0$. Hence we are left with the inequality condition $w_1^{kl} > w_1^{kl'}$ to prove. Let $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_2$ be matrices in the sets W_1 and W_2 other than \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 (i.e. $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_2 : \underline{\mathbf{W}}_1, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_2 \in W_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1 \neq \mathbf{W}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_2 \neq \mathbf{W}_2$) with the matrix elements \underline{w}_1^{kl} and \underline{w}_2^{lk} respectively. Let \underline{l} denote the index such that $\underline{w}_1^{kl} = w_1^{kl}$ and $\underline{w}_1^{kl'} = w_1^{kl'}$. Then let $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1$ and $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2$ represent the matrices $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_2$ after the incremental change δ , whereby $\hat{\underline{w}}_1^{kl} = \underline{w}_1^{kl} + \delta$ and $\hat{\underline{w}}_1^{kl'} = \underline{w}_1^{kl'} - \delta$ are matrix elements of $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1$ and $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2$ affected by the incremental change. Let's suppose that $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1$ and $\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2$ additionally fulfill the conditions $\max[\text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2)] = \text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2)$ and $\text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2) > \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$, contradicting the statement to be proven. Then, $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2) = \text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2) - \delta(w_2^{lk} - w_2^{l'k})$. Since $\{\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1, \hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2\}$ is maximally ordered, then $0 < \delta \leq (w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl})/2$ and $w_2^{lk} \geq w_2^{l'k}$ by Proposition S1. It follows that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2) \geq \text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2)$. This implies $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2) > \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ which is false. Hence $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2) \geq \text{Tr}(\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_1\hat{\underline{\mathbf{W}}}_2)$ and $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \leq 0$. Following a similar argument where we let \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 be such that $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1\mathbf{W}_2)$ instead, we can also find that $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)] \geq 0$. \square

Proposition S4 Any change $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ in $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ or any change $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ in $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ can be distributed over corresponding incremental changes in W_1 and W_2 . An incremental change is $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = w_1^{k\alpha} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\beta} - \delta$, where $w_1^{k\alpha}, w_1^{k\beta} \in W_1^k$ and the $(\hat{\cdot})$ notation denotes the new weight elements after the change. $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ are also independent of the specific incremental changes so long as the corresponding incremental changes in $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ add up to $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\Delta \min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$.

Proof. Since $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ are only dependent on the distribution of weights W_1 and W_2 , any change in $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ or $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ occurs only if a change in W_1 and/or W_2 occurs. Any change in the distribution of weights can be implemented in increments of $\hat{w}_1^{kl} = w_1^{kl} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{kl'} = w_1^{kl'} - \delta$. Since $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ and $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ are functions of W_1 and W_2 , any change in $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ or $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1W_2)]$ is path independent of the incremental changes δ to weight distribution. \square

Proposition S5 Without loss of generality with regards to changes to W_1 , we may consider for any incremental change δ to weight distribution, only the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$

and (ii) $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$. Here, $w_1^{k\alpha}, w_1^{k\beta} \in W_1^k$, where $w_1^{k\alpha}$ and $w_1^{k\beta}$ refer to the pair affected by the incremental change.

Proof. The pair of weight elements after the incremental change $(w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2 \leq \delta < 0$ is $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = w_1^{k\alpha} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\beta} - \delta$ for $w_1^{k\beta} \neq w_1^{k\alpha}$. Additionally, we also define a $\underline{\delta} < 0$ to represent the incremental change where it is possible for $\underline{\delta}$ to go lower than $(w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2$, then the new pair of weight elements representing this incremental change are $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\beta} - \underline{\delta}$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = w_1^{k\alpha} + \underline{\delta}$. When $\delta = \underline{\delta} = (w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2$, then $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = \hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = \hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = \hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2$. When $\underline{\delta} < (w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2$ such that $\underline{\delta} = (w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2 - \epsilon$, where $0 < \epsilon \leq (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2$, then $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2 - \epsilon$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2 + \epsilon$. However, for $\delta = (w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2 + \epsilon$, then $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2 + \epsilon$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = (w_1^{k\alpha} + w_1^{k\beta})/2 - \epsilon$. Hence, $\underline{\delta}$ gives a new pair of weight elements that differs from the weight elements given by δ by only a commutation i.e. $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = \hat{w}_1^{k\beta}$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = \hat{w}_1^{k\alpha}$. Following the same analysis, for $w_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\alpha}$, it is straightforward to show that $\delta > 0$ and $\delta < 0$ gives the same pair of new weight elements that differ by a commutation. Since W_1 is not dependent on the order of weight elements in W_1^k , then we may only consider the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $(w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha})/2 \leq \delta < 0$ without loss of generality with regards to changes to W_1 . \square

Corollary S1 *Without loss of generality with regards to changes to $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$ or $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$, we may consider for any incremental change δ to weight distribution, only the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$. Here, $w_1^{k\alpha}$ and $w_1^{k\beta}$ refer to the pair affected by the incremental change.*

Proof It directly follows from Proposition S4 and Proposition S5 that it is sufficient to consider only the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$. \square

Lemma 1 *The set of matrix pairs $\text{argmax}_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$ is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$, where argmax_w denotes the set of matrices that globally maximizes $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$ under a variation of the distribution of weight elements. Furthermore, this maximum is*

$$\max_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = m. \quad (15)$$

Proof. From Proposition S3, it follows that $\Delta \max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)] > 0$ if only if $\delta > 0$. Hence, the set of matrix pairs $W_1 = \{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : \max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)] = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2) \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ must be at the global maximum. Let $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in W_1$. Because of the constraint $\sum_k w_1^{kl} = 1$, there must exist exactly one element equal 1 in each row k and l of \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 respectively. $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ must be maximally ordered according to Proposition S2. Hence, if there is also exactly one element equal 1 in each column l and k of \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 respectively, then $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2) = m$. Since there are exactly m number of 1s in each matrix, then each column that has $\gamma + 1$ elements equal to 1 necessarily reduces $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2)$ by γ , where $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the set of matrix pairs that additionally satisfy the conditions $\forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk}$ is at the global maximum i.e. $W_1 = \{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$.

Let W_2 denote the set of matrix pairs satisfying the conditions $\exists w_1^{kl} \notin \{0, 1\}$ or $\exists w_2^{lk} \notin \{0, 1\}$. Let's suppose that $\exists \{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in W_2$ such that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2)$ is a global maximum. Then we may execute a finite sequence of positive incremental changes $(\delta_\gamma > 0)_{\gamma=1}^N$ where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ eventually satisfies the condition $\forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let $\{\hat{\mathbf{W}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_2\}$ represent the matrix pair after this sequence of incremental changes. Since $\forall \hat{w}_1^{kl}, \hat{w}_2^{lk} : \hat{w}_1^{kl}, \hat{w}_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}$, then $\{\hat{\mathbf{W}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_2\} \in W_1$ because $\{\hat{\mathbf{W}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_2\}$ must be at a global maximum. However for γ_N , the corresponding change in $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2)$ is larger than zero because $\{\hat{\mathbf{W}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_2\} \in W_1$. This means that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2)$ is not at a global maximum and that W_1 is the complete set of matrix pairs that are at the global maximum of m . \square

Lemma 2 *The set of matrix pairs $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$ is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 0\}$, where argmin_w denotes the set of matrices that globally minimizes $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$ under a variation of the distribution of weight elements. This minimum is*

$$\min_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = 0. \quad (16)$$

Proof. Since the weights are all non-negative, then $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) \geq 0$. Let $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in \text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$. Then each summand $w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 0$ if and only if $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = 0$. A set of matrix pairs that satisfy $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = \{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 0\}$ is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = 1 \text{ and } w_2^{lk} = 0\}$. \square

Theorem S1 *C is bounded $0 \leq C \leq 1$ and the set of matrix pairs at the upper bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ while the set of matrix pairs at the lower bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 0\}$.*

Proof. Since any matrix pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ at the upper or lower bound must belong to some weight distributions $\mathbf{W}_1 \in W_1$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in W_2$, then by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, C is bounded $0 \leq C \leq 1$ and the set of matrix pairs at the upper bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ while the set of matrix pairs at the lower bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 0\}$. \square

Now, we shall prove that $\min_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = -1$ for the case where the weights satisfy the constraint $|w_1^{kl}|, |w_2^{lk}| \leq 1$ instead. Hence, $|C| < 1$.

Lemma 3 *When we replace the constraint $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$ with $|w_1^{kl}|, |w_2^{lk}| \leq 1$, then the set of matrix pairs $\text{argmax}_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$ is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$. This maximum is*

$$\max_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = m. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Let P_{old} be the set of all matrix pairs under the previous constraint and P_{new} be the set of all matrix pairs under the new constraint. Also, let \underline{W}_1 and \underline{W}_2 represent two distributions from the set of all distributions under the old constraint and W_1 and W_2 represent two distributions from the set of all distributions under the new constraint. Then for any $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in P_{\text{old}} \setminus P_{\text{new}}$, we may find an equivalent matrix pair $\{\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_2\} \in P_{\text{old}}$ by changing all the signs of the matrix elements of $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ to positive. Thus, from Lemma 1, we can conclude that $\max_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = m$. Now let $P_{\text{old}}^{\text{max}} = \text{argmax}_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$ and $P_{\text{new}}^{\text{max}} = \text{argmax}_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$, then $P_{\text{old}}^{\text{max}} \setminus P_{\text{new}}^{\text{max}}$ is the set of matrix pairs that additionally satisfy the condition $\exists w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} = -1$. Hence $\text{argmax}_w(\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = \{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} = 1 \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ is the set of matrix pairs at the global maximum of m . \square

Lemma 4 *When we replace the constraint $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$ with $|w_1^{kl}|, |w_2^{lk}| \leq 1$, then the set of matrix pairs $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$ is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = -w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$. This minimum is*

$$\min_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = -m. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Let P_{old} be the set of all matrix pairs under the previous constraint and P_{new} be the set of all matrix pairs under the new constraint. Also, let \underline{W}_1 and \underline{W}_2 represent two distributions from the set of all distributions under the old constraint and W_1 and W_2 represent two distributions from the set of all distributions under the new constraint. For $P_{\text{new}}^{\min} = \text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)])$, all matrix pairs $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in P_{\text{new}}^{\min}$ must satisfy the condition $\forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} \leq 0$ because for any $w_1^{kl} w_2^{lk} > 0$, the sign of either w_1^{kl} or w_2^{lk} may be flipped so that $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_2)$ decreases. Additionally, any $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \in P_{\text{new}}$ may be obtained from a $\{\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1, \underline{\mathbf{W}}_2\} \in P_{\text{old}}$ by changing the signs of zero or more matrix elements of $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_1$ and $\underline{\mathbf{W}}_2$. Hence, $\min_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = -\max_w(\max[\text{Tr}(\underline{W}_1 \underline{W}_2)]) = -m$. Then, the matrix pairs at the global minimum are $\text{argmin}_w(\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]) = \{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = -w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$. \square

Theorem S2 *When we replace the constraint $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$ with $|w_1^{kl}|, |w_2^{lk}| \leq 1$, then C is bounded $|C| \leq 1$ and the set of matrix pairs at the upper bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ while the set of matrix pairs at the lower bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = -w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$.*

Proof. Since any matrix pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ at the upper or lower bound must belong to some weight distributions $\mathbf{W}_1 \in W_1$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in W_2$, then by Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, C is bounded $|C| \leq 1$ and the set of matrix pairs at the upper bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$ while the set of matrix pairs at the lower bound is $\{\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\} \mid \forall w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} : w_1^{kl} = -w_2^{lk} \text{ and } w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \in \{0, 1\}\}$. \square

A proof that $\max(C)$ and $\min(C)$ under fixed S are monotonically decreasing and increasing functions of S respectively

Here, we revert to the old weight constraint $0 \leq w_1^{kl}, w_2^{lk} \leq 1$ for this proof.

Definition S5 *We define the measure of interdependency S as*

$$S = -\sum_k \sum_l \left(w_1^{kl} \right)^2 + \left(w_2^{lk} \right)^2 \quad (19)$$

$$= -\text{Tr}(\mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{W}_1^{\text{T}} + \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{W}_2^{\text{T}}) \quad (20)$$

which is the negative sum of all the squared matrix elements of W_1 and W_2 of which \mathbf{W}_1 and \mathbf{W}_2 are elements respectively.

Proposition S6 *Any change ΔS in S can be distributed over incremental changes in W_1 and W_2 such that an incremental change is $\hat{w}_1^{k\alpha} = w_1^{k\alpha} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{k\beta} = w_1^{k\beta} - \delta$, where $w_1^{k\alpha} \in W_1^k$ and $w_1^{k\beta} \in W_1^k$ and the $(\hat{\cdot})$ notation denotes the new weight elements after the change. ΔS is independent of the specific incremental changes so long as the corresponding incremental changes in S add up to ΔS .*

Proof. Since S is only dependent on the distribution of weights W_1 and W_2 , any change in S occurs only if a change in W_1 and/or W_2 occurs. Any change in the distribution of weights can be implemented in increments of $\hat{w}_1^{kl} = w_1^{kl} + \delta$ and $\hat{w}_1^{kl'} = w_1^{kl'} - \delta$. Also, S is a function of W_1 and W_2 so that any change in S is path independent of the incremental changes δ to weight distribution. \square

Proposition S7 *S decreases if and only if $\delta > 0$. S increases if and only if $(w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl})/2 \leq \delta < 0$.*

Proof. The change in S from δ is $\Delta S = -2\delta[\delta + (w_1^{kl} - w_1^{kl'})]$. Since $w_1^{kl} \geq w_1^{kl'}$, then $\Delta S < 0$ if $\delta > 0$. Because S is only dependent on W_1 and W_2 , then the reverse is also true i.e. if $\Delta S < 0$, then $\delta > 0$.

For $\delta < 0$, then $\Delta S(i, j) < 0$ if and only if $\delta < w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl}$. Hence if $(w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl})/2 \leq \delta < 0$, then $\Delta S(i, j) > 0$. Because S is only dependent on W_1 and W_2 , then the reverse is also true i.e. if $\Delta S > 0$, then $(w_1^{kl'} - w_1^{kl})/2 \leq \delta < 0$. \square

Corollary S2 *Without loss of generality with regards to changes to S , we may consider for any incremental change δ to weight distribution, only the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$. Here, $w_1^{k\alpha}$ and $w_1^{k\beta}$ refer to the pair affected by the incremental change.*

Proof Since S is only dependent on W_1 and W_2 , then it directly follows from Proposition S5 and Proposition S6 that it is sufficient to consider only the cases where (i) $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $\frac{w_1^{k\beta} - w_1^{k\alpha}}{2} \leq \delta < 0$. \square

Theorem S3 *$\max(C)$ and $\min(C)$ under fixed S are monotonically decreasing and increasing functions of S respectively.*

Proof. From Proposition S3, Proposition S7, Corollary S1 and Corollary S2, we can deduce that $\max[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$ is a monotonically decreasing function of S and $\min[\text{Tr}(W_1 W_2)]$ is a monotonically increasing function of S . Since any matrix pair $\{\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2\}$ at $\max(C)$ and $\min(C)$ under fixed S belongs to some weight distributions $\mathbf{W}_1 \in W_1$ and $\mathbf{W}_2 \in W_2$, then $\max(C)$ and $\min(C)$ under fixed S are monotonically decreasing and increasing functions of S respectively. \square

References

- [1] M. Scheffer et al. Anticipating Critical Transitions. *Science*, 338(6105):344–348, 2012.
- [2] S.R. Carpenter et al. Early Warnings of Regime Shifts: A Whole-Ecosystem Experiment. *Science*, 332(6033):1079–1082, 2011.
- [3] V. Dakos et al. Methods for Detecting Early Warnings of Critical Transitions in Time Series Illustrated Using Simulated Ecological Data. *Plos One*, 7(7), 2012.
- [4] V. Dakos et al. Slowing down as an early warning signal for abrupt climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105(38):14308–14312, 2008.
- [5] I.A. van de Leemput et al. Critical slowing down as early warning for the onset and termination of depression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(1):87–92, 2014.
- [6] J.P.L. Tan et al. Critical slowing down associated with regime shifts in the US housing market. *European Physical Journal B*, 87(2), 2014.
- [7] AJ Veraart et al. Recovery rates reflect distance to a tipping point in a living system. *Nature*, 481(7381):357–U137, 2012.
- [8] S.L. Pimm. The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature*, 307(5949):321–326, 1984.
- [9] R.M. May. Will a large complex system be stable. *Nature*, 238(5364):413, 1972.

- [10] J. Bascompte et al. The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(16):9383–9387, 2003.
- [11] S.L. Pimm et al. Food web patterns and their consequences. *Nature*, 350(6320):669–674, 1991.
- [12] E. Thebault et al. Stability of Ecological Communities and the Architecture of Mutualistic and Trophic Networks. *Science*, 329(5993):853–856, 2010.
- [13] S. Allesina et al. Stability criteria for complex ecosystems. *Nature*, 483(7388):205–208, 2012.
- [14] S. T. Jensen et al. Some comments and a bibliography on the Laguerre-Samuelson inequalities with extensions and applications to statistics and matrix theory. *Mathematics and Its Applications*, 478:151–182, 1999.
- [15] P.A. Samuelson. How deviant can you be. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 63(324):1522, 1968.
- [16] H.D. Brunk. Note on two papers of K.R. Nair. *Journal of the Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics*, 11:186–189, 1959.
- [17] M. Scheffer et al. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461(7260):53–59, 2009.
- [18] J.P. Bascompte et al. Asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science*, 312(5772):431–433, 2006.
- [19] P. Jordano. Patterns of mutualistic interactions in pollination and seed dispersal - connectance, dependence asymmetries, and coevolution. *American Naturalist*, 129(5):657–677, 1987.
- [20] F. Allen et al. Financial Contagion. *Journal of Political Economy*, 108(1):1–33, 2000.
- [21] D.J. Watts. A simple model of global cascades on random networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 99(9):5766–5771, 2002.
- [22] A.E. Motter et al. Cascade-based attacks on complex networks. *Physical Review E*, 66(6), 2002.
- [23] S.V. Buldyrev et al. Catastrophic cascade of failures in interdependent networks. *Nature*, 464(7291):1025–1028, 2010.
- [24] A.G. Haldane et al. Systemic risk in banking ecosystems. *Nature*, 469(7330):351–355, 2011.