

A Tighter Approximation Guarantee for Greedy Minimum Entropy Coupling

Spencer Compton
 MIT-IBM Watson AI Lab
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Cambridge, USA
 scompton@mit.edu

arXiv:2203.05108v1 [cs.LG] 10 Mar 2022

Abstract—We examine the minimum entropy coupling problem, where one must find the minimum entropy variable that has a given set of distributions $S = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ as its marginals. Although this problem is NP-Hard, previous works have proposed algorithms with varying approximation guarantees. In this paper, we show that the greedy coupling algorithm of [Kocaoglu et al., AAAI’17] is always within $\log_2(e)$ (≈ 1.44) bits of the minimum entropy coupling. In doing so, we show that the entropy of the greedy coupling is upper-bounded by $H(\bigwedge S) + \log_2(e)$. This improves the previously best known approximation guarantee of 2 bits within the optimal [Li, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory ’21]. Moreover, we show our analysis is tight by proving there is no algorithm whose entropy is upper-bounded by $H(\bigwedge S) + c$ for any constant $c < \log_2(e)$. Additionally, we examine a special class of instances where the greedy coupling algorithm is exactly optimal.

I. INTRODUCTION

An instance of the minimum entropy coupling problem is represented by a set S of m distributions, each with n states (i.e., $S = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$). The objective is to find a variable of minimum entropy that “couples” S , meaning its marginals are equal to S . Equivalently, this can be described as finding a minimum entropy joint distribution over variables p_1, \dots, p_m .

This has a variety of applications, including areas such as causal inference [1]–[4] and dimension reduction [5], [6]. In the context of random number generation as discussed in [7], the minimum entropy coupling is equivalent to determining the minimum entropy variable such that one sample from this variable enables us to generate one sample from any distribution of S .

While the problem is NP-Hard [8], previous works have designed algorithms with varying approximation guarantees. [9] showed a 1-additive algorithm for $m = 2$ and $\lceil \log(m) \rceil$ -additive for general m . [1] introduced the greedy coupling algorithm, [2] showed this is a local optima and [10] showed this is a 1-additive algorithm for $m = 2$. Most recently, [7] introduced a new $(2 - 2^{2-m})$ -additive algorithm.

Our Contributions: Our work provides novel perspectives and analytical tools to demonstrate a tighter approximation guarantee for the greedy coupling algorithm. In Section III, we show a closed-form characterization that lower-bounds each state of the greedy coupling. In Section IV, we study a class of instances where the greedy coupling is exactly optimal and the lower-bound characterization given in Section III is

tight. Finally, in Section V we show the greedy coupling is always within $\log_2(e)$ bits of the optimal coupling by proving it is upper-bounded by $H(\bigwedge S) + \log_2(e)$. This improves the best-known approximation guarantee for the minimum entropy coupling problem, and we accomplish this by developing techniques involving a stronger notion of majorization and splitting distributions in an infinitely-fine manner. We show how this analysis is tight and that no algorithm can be upper-bounded by $H(\bigwedge S) + c$ for any constant $c < \log_2(e)$. This resolves that the largest possible gap between $H(\bigwedge S)$ and $H(\text{OPT}_S)$ is $\log_2(e)$.

TABLE I
 BEST-KNOWN ADDITIVE APPROXIMATION GUARANTEE

	Algorithm (prior/now)		
	Greedy (prior)	Best (prior)	Greedy/Best (now)
$m = 2$	1 [10]	1 [9]	1 [9], [10]
$m > 2$	$\lceil \log(m) \rceil^a$ [9], [10]	$2 - 2^{2-m}$ [7]	$\log_2(e) \approx 1.44$

^a Not explicitly shown before to our knowledge, but can combine [9], [10].

II. BACKGROUND

Notation: The base of \log is always 2. H denotes Shannon entropy. The states of any distribution p are sorted such that $p(1) \geq \dots \geq p(|p|)$. $[n]$ denotes $\{1, \dots, n\}$. OPT_S denotes the minimum entropy coupling of a set of distributions S .

Greedy Minimum Entropy Coupling: We show approximation guarantees for the greedy coupling algorithm of [1] (formally described in Algorithm 1). At a high-level, the algorithm builds a coupling by repeatedly creating a state of the coupling output that corresponds to the currently largest state of each distribution $p_i \in S$, with weight corresponding to the smallest of these m maximal states. Intuitively, this greedily adds the largest possible state to the coupling at each step. We use \mathcal{G}_S to denote the sequence of states produced by the algorithm. The algorithm runs in $O(m^2 n \log(n))$ time.

Majorization: We use ideas from majorization theory [11]. A distribution p is majorized by another distribution q (i.e., $p \preceq q$) if $\sum_{j=1}^i p(j) \leq \sum_{j=1}^i q(j) \forall i \in [|p|]$. It is known that if $p \preceq q$ then $H(q) \leq H(p)$ [11]. $\bigwedge S$ denotes the greatest lower-bound in regards to majorization such that $\bigwedge S \preceq p \forall p \in S$. Meaning, for any r where $r \preceq p \forall p \in S$, it must

Algorithm 1 Greedy Coupling (pseudocode from [2])

1: **Input:** Marginal distributions of m variables each with n states $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m\}$.
2: Initialize the tensor $\mathbf{P}(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) = 0, \forall i_j \in [n], \forall j \in [n]$.
3: Initialize $r = 1$.
4: **while** $r > 0$ **do**
5: $(\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in [m]}, r) = \text{UpdateRoutine}(\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i \in [m]}, r)$
6: **end while**
7: **return** \mathbf{P} .
8: **UpdateRoutine**($\{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m\}, r$)
9: Find $i_j := \arg \max_k \{\mathbf{p}_k(j)\}, \forall j \in [m]$.
10: Find $u = \min_{k \in [n]} \{\mathbf{p}_k(i_k)\}$.
11: Assign $\mathbf{P}(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) = u$.
12: Update $\mathbf{p}_k(i_k) \leftarrow \mathbf{p}_k(i_k) - u, \forall k \in [m]$.
13: Update $r = \sum_{k \in [n]} \mathbf{p}_1(k)$
14: **return** $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m\}, r$

hold that $r \preceq \bigwedge S$. For ease of notation, we also use \mathcal{M}_S to refer to $\bigwedge S$. It is known that $\mathcal{M}_S(i) = \min_{p \in S} \sum_{j=1}^i p(j) - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{M}_S(j)$ [12] and that $H(\bigwedge S) \leq H(\text{OPT}_S)$ [9].

III. CHARACTERIZATION OF GREEDY COUPLING

To help analyze the performance of the greedy coupling algorithm, we show this closed-form characterization that lower-bounds each element of its output:

Theorem 1. $\mathcal{G}_S(i) \geq \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j}$

Proof. We denote p_ℓ before the t -th step of \mathcal{G}_S as p_ℓ^t . We observe that $\mathcal{G}_S(i)$ is determined by Line 10 of Algorithm 1 to be $\min_\ell \max_k p_\ell^i(k)$. We will lower-bound this quantity:

Claim 1. $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_\ell^i(k) \geq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j} \quad \forall j, \ell$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_\ell^i(k) & (1) \\ & \geq \max_{1 \leq k \leq j} p_\ell^i(k) & (2) \\ & \geq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j p_\ell^i(k)}{j} & (3) \\ & = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j p_\ell^1(k) - \sum_{k=1}^j (p_\ell^1(k) - p_\ell^i(k))}{j} & (4) \\ & \geq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j} & (5) \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of \mathcal{G}_S and Claim 1, our theorem holds. \square

IV. MINIMUM ENTROPY COUPLING OF MAJORIZING SETS

Many related works show guarantees for the minimum entropy coupling problem by showing a relation to the lower-bound of $H(\bigwedge S)$. It is natural to wonder, if we only fix $\bigwedge S$, what is the most challenging that S can be? We introduce a special-case of the minimum entropy coupling problem, where for a fixed value of $\bigwedge S$ we consider the set S to include all distributions that are consistent with $\bigwedge S$ (i.e., all distributions that majorize $\bigwedge S$). More formally, in this

variant $S = \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p) = \{p' | p \preceq p'\}$ for some p . This corresponds to coupling the set of all distributions that majorize a given distribution. We show that in this setting, the greedy coupling produces the optimal solution:

Theorem 2. When $S = \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)$ for some p , then $H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\text{OPT}_S)$.

Proof. First, we clarify:

Claim 2. $\mathcal{M}_S = p$

Proof. For sake of notation, suppose $p(0) = \mathcal{M}_S(0) = 0$. We will inductively show $\mathcal{M}_S(i) = p(i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. First:

$$\mathcal{M}_S(i) \tag{6}$$

$$= \left(\min_{p' \in \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)} \sum_{j=1}^i p'(j) \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{M}_S(j) \right) \tag{7}$$

$$\geq \left(\min_{p' \in \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)} \sum_{j=1}^i p(j) \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) \tag{8}$$

$$= p(i) \tag{9}$$

(8) follows as all $p' \in \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)$ majorize p . Next:

$$\mathcal{M}_S(i) \tag{10}$$

$$= \left(\min_{p' \in \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)} \sum_{j=1}^i p'(j) \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{M}_S(j) \right) \tag{11}$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^i p(j) \right) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p(j) \right) = p(i) \tag{12}$$

(12) follows as $p \in \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(p)$. \square

We now define a distribution \mathcal{G}'_S that mirrors Theorem 1:

Definition 1. $\mathcal{G}'_S(i) = \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)}{j}$

Clearly \mathcal{G}'_S is a valid distribution as $\mathcal{G}'_S(i) \leq 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)$ and each $\mathcal{G}'_S(i) \geq \frac{1 - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)}{n}$. We show that any coupling for S must be majorized by \mathcal{G}'_S :

Lemma 1. If a distribution \mathcal{C}_S couples S , then $\mathcal{C}_S \preceq \mathcal{G}'_S$.

Proof. For sake of contradiction, suppose $\mathcal{C}_S \not\preceq \mathcal{G}'_S$. Then, there must exist an i' where $\sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{C}_S(k) > \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)$. Let i' be the earliest such value. Additionally, let $j' = \arg \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)}{j}$. We use these to define a distribution $\tilde{p} \in S$ such that \mathcal{C}_S cannot couple \tilde{p} :

Definition 2. $\tilde{p}(k)$ is $\sum_{\ell=1}^{i'} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell)$ for $k = 1$, is $\mathcal{G}'_S(i')$ for $1 < k \leq j'$, and is $\mathcal{M}_S(k)$ for $k > j'$

Claim 3. \tilde{p} is a valid probability distribution.

Proof. All states are non-negative. Also, they sum to 1:

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^n \tilde{p}(\ell) \tag{13}$$

$$= \tilde{p}(1) + \sum_{\ell=2}^{j'} \tilde{p}(\ell) + \sum_{\ell=j'+1}^n \tilde{p}(\ell) \quad (14)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{i'} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell) \right) + ((j' - 1) \times \mathcal{G}'_S(i')) + \left(\sum_{\ell=j'+1}^n \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \right) \quad (15)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell) + \sum_{\ell=j'+1}^n \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \quad (16)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^n \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) = 1 \quad (17)$$

(16) is obtained by definition of $\mathcal{G}'_S(i')$ and j' . \square

Claim 4. $p \preceq \tilde{p}$

Proof. We will show that p is majorized by \tilde{p} . To begin:

Subclaim 1. For $k \geq j'$, it holds that $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell)$

Proof.

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) \quad (18)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \tilde{p}(\ell) + \sum_{\ell=j'+1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) \quad (19)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell) + j' \times \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell)}{j'} \right) + \sum_{\ell=j'+1}^k \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell) \quad (21)$$

(21) is obtained by Claim 2. \square

Still, we must show this holds for $k < j'$. We start with:

Subclaim 2. If $j' > 1$, it holds that $\mathcal{G}'_S(i') \leq \mathcal{M}_S(j')$.

Proof. For sake of contradiction, suppose $\mathcal{G}'_S(i') > \mathcal{M}_S(j')$:

$$\mathcal{G}'_S(i') \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell)}{j'} \quad (23)$$

$$= \frac{j' - 1}{j'} \times \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{j'-1} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell)}{j' - 1} + \frac{1}{j'} \times \mathcal{M}_S(j') \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \frac{j' - 1}{j'} \times \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{j'-1} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(\ell)}{j'} + \frac{1}{j'} \times \mathcal{M}_S(j') \quad (25)$$

$$= \frac{j' - 1}{j'} \times \mathcal{G}'_S(i') + \frac{1}{j'} \times \mathcal{M}_S(j') \quad (26)$$

$$< \frac{j' - 1}{j'} \times \mathcal{G}'_S(i') + \frac{1}{j'} \times \mathcal{G}'_S(i') = \mathcal{G}'_S(i') \quad (27)$$

This is a contradiction. (25) follows by definition of j' and (27) by supposing $\mathcal{G}'_S(i') > \mathcal{M}_S(j')$. \square

Using this, we take the next step:

Subclaim 3. If $1 \leq k < j'$, then $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} p(\ell)$

Proof.

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell) \quad (28)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} p(\ell) + (p(k+1) - \tilde{p}(k+1)) \quad (29)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} p(\ell) + (\mathcal{M}_S(k+1) - \mathcal{G}'_S(i')) \quad (30)$$

$$\geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} p(\ell) + (\mathcal{M}_S(j') - \mathcal{G}'_S(i')) \quad (31)$$

$$\geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} p(\ell) \quad (32)$$

(32) is obtained by Subclaim 2. \square

We now show majorization for smaller indices:

Subclaim 4. If $1 \leq k < j'$, then $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell)$

Proof. We can equivalently write this subclaim as how it must hold that for $1 \leq k < j'$, it holds that $\sum_{\ell=1}^k \tilde{p}(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^k p(\ell) \geq 0$. By Subclaim 1, this holds for $k = j'$. By Subclaim 3, the left-hand side is non-decreasing as we decrease k from j' to 1. Thus, our subclaim is shown inductively. \square

It follows from Subclaim 1 and Subclaim 4 that $p \preceq \tilde{p}$. \square

As we now know $\tilde{p} \in S$, we show that \mathcal{C}_S cannot couple \tilde{p} :

Claim 5. \mathcal{C}_S cannot couple \tilde{p}

Proof. We have designed \tilde{p} such that all states other than $\tilde{p}(1)$ will be too small for any of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ to be assigned to them in a valid coupling. Additionally, we have set $\tilde{p}(1)$ to be small enough such that not all of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ can all be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$ simultaneously. We prove as follows:

Subclaim 5. $\mathcal{C}_S(1) \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{C}_S(i') > \mathcal{G}'_S(i')$

Proof. This holds if $\mathcal{C}_S(i') > \mathcal{G}'_S(i')$:

$$\mathcal{C}_S(i') \quad (33)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{C}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{C}_S(k) \quad (34)$$

$$\geq \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{C}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k) \quad (35)$$

$$> \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{G}'_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i'-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k) \quad (36)$$

$$= \mathcal{G}'_S(i') \quad (37)$$

(36) is obtained by definition of i' . \square

Subclaim 6. For any coupling of \tilde{p} with \mathcal{C}_S , all of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ must be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$.

Proof. By definition, $\tilde{p}(2), \dots, \tilde{p}(n) \geq \mathcal{G}'_S(i')$. By Subclaim 5, we then know $\mathcal{C}_S(1) \geq \dots \geq \mathcal{C}_S(i') > \tilde{p}(2), \dots, \tilde{p}(n)$. As such, all of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ could only be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$. \square

Further, not all of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ can be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$:

Subclaim 7. $\tilde{p}(1) < \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{C}_S(k)$

Proof. $\tilde{p}(1) = \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{G}'_S(k) < \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{C}_S(k)$. \square

By Subclaim 6 all of $\mathcal{C}_S(1), \dots, \mathcal{C}_S(i')$ can only be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$, yet by Subclaim 7 they cannot all be assigned to $\tilde{p}(1)$ simultaneously. Accordingly, \mathcal{C}_S cannot couple \tilde{p} . \square

Thus, by contradiction, $\mathcal{C}_S \preceq \mathcal{G}'_S$ for any valid \mathcal{C}_S . \square

By Lemma 1, we conclude $H(\text{OPT}_S) \geq H(\mathcal{G}'_S)$. Now, we show how in this setting \mathcal{G}_S is exactly \mathcal{G}'_S :

Lemma 2. For all i , it holds that $\mathcal{G}_S(i) = \mathcal{G}'_S(i)$.

Proof. We show this inductively. Using Theorem 1 we know $\mathcal{G}_S(i) \geq \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j} = \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k)}{j} = \mathcal{G}'_S(i)$. Using Lemma 1 we know $\mathcal{G}_S(i) = \sum_{k=1}^i \mathcal{G}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^i \mathcal{G}'_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k) = \sum_{k=1}^i \mathcal{G}'_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}'_S(k) = \mathcal{G}'_S(i)$. \square

Thus, $H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\text{OPT}_S)$, meaning \mathcal{G}_S is optimal. \square

We emphasize that in Lemma 2 we have shown how in this setting, the characterization of Theorem 1 is actually exact.

V. GREEDY COUPLING IS A $\log_2(e) \approx 1.44$ ADDITIVE APPROXIMATION FOR MINIMUM ENTROPY COUPLING

We now show our primary result:

Theorem 3. $H(\mathcal{G}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e)$

Proof. We will split $\wedge S$ in a particular way, and show that \mathcal{G}_S majorizes this modified distribution. Moreover, we will show that it majorizes said distribution in a very strong manner. This will enable a good approximation guarantee for \mathcal{G}_S . To split $\wedge S$, we introduce the geometric distribution with parameter γ as $\text{GEOM}_\gamma(x) = \gamma \times (1 - \gamma)^{x-1}$. We split $\wedge S$ as follows:

Definition 3. $\mathcal{M}_S^\gamma = (\wedge S) \times \text{GEOM}_\gamma$

We will show that \mathcal{G}_S not only majorizes \mathcal{M}_S^γ for particular γ , but also satisfies the following stronger notion:

Definition 4. A distribution p is α -strongly majorized by a distribution q (i.e., $p \preceq_\alpha q$) if for all $i \in [p]$ there exists a j such that $\sum_{k=1}^i p(k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^j q(k)$ and $\alpha \times p(i) \leq q(j)$.

In other words, p is α -strongly majorized by q if for every prefix of $p(1), \dots, p(i)$ there is a prefix of q that has at least the same sum, and only contains values at least a factor of α greater than $p(i)$. We show that as we decrease γ to split $\wedge S$ more finely, it is increasingly strongly majorized by \mathcal{G}_S :

Lemma 3. For any integer $z \geq 2$, $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z} \preceq_{z-1} \mathcal{G}_S$

Proof. We will prove this by contradiction. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z} \not\preceq_{z-1} \mathcal{G}_S$. This means there exists an i, j such that $\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{G}_S(k) < \sum_{k=1}^i \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(k)$ and $\mathcal{G}_S(j+1) < (z-1) \times \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i)$. We show that this cannot occur:

Claim 6. For integer $z \geq 2$ and any i', j' , if $\sum_{k=1}^{j'} \mathcal{G}_S(k) < \sum_{k=1}^{i'} \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(k)$, then $\mathcal{G}_S(j'+1) \geq (z-1) \times \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i')$.

Proof. Every element of $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}$ corresponds to the product of an element of $\wedge S$ and an element of $\text{GEOM}_{1/z}$. We define:

Definition 5. $\text{INDEX}_{\wedge S}(k)$ is the corresponding index of $\wedge S$ for $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(k)$. Likewise, $\text{INDEX}_{\text{GEOM}_{1/z}}(k)$ is the corresponding index of $\text{GEOM}_{1/z}$ for $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(k)$.

We define a set $\mathcal{T}^{i'}(k)$ for each index k of $\wedge S$, denoting the set of indices of $\text{GEOM}_{1/z}$ in $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(1), \dots, \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i')$ corresponding to the k -th element of $\wedge S$:

Definition 6. $\mathcal{T}^{i'}(k) = \{\ell \mid \exists i \leq i' : \text{INDEX}_{\wedge S}(i) = k, \text{INDEX}_{\text{GEOM}_{1/z}}(i) = \ell\}$

Also, we define the set \mathcal{N} as the set of non-empty $\mathcal{T}^{i'}$:

Definition 7. $\mathcal{N} = \{k \in [n] \mid |\mathcal{T}^{i'}(k)| > 0\}$

Finally, we show our claim by:

$$\mathcal{G}_S(j'+1) \quad (38)$$

$$\geq \max_k \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^k \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \mathcal{G}_S(\ell)}{k} \quad (39)$$

$$\geq \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{|\mathcal{N}|} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell)}{|\mathcal{N}|} - \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{j'} \mathcal{G}_S(\ell)}{|\mathcal{N}|} \quad (40)$$

$$> \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{|\mathcal{N}|} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell)}{|\mathcal{N}|} - \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{i'} \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(\ell)}{|\mathcal{N}|} \quad (41)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{i'} \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(\ell) \right) \quad (42)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\mathcal{M}_S(\ell) - \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \times \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}^{i'}(\ell)} \text{GEOM}_{1/z}(k) \right) \quad (43)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \left(\sum_{k=\max(\mathcal{T}^{i'}(\ell))+1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \times \text{GEOM}_{1/z}(k) \right) \quad (44)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{(1-1/z) \times \mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \times \text{GEOM}_{1/z}(\max(\mathcal{T}^{i'}(\ell)))}{1 - (1-1/z)} \quad (45)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \times \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{(1-1/z) \times \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i')}{1-(1-1/z)} \quad (46)$$

$$= (z-1) \times \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i') \quad (47)$$

(39) follows from Theorem 1. (41) follows from the conditions of Claim 6. (43) follows by definition of $\mathcal{T}^{i'}$. (46) follows from $\mathcal{M}_S(\ell) \times \text{GEOM}_{1/z}(\max(\mathcal{T}^{i'}(\ell))) \geq \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i')$ because by definition of $\mathcal{T}^{i'}$ there is an element in the prefix of $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(1), \dots, \mathcal{M}_S^{1/z}(i')$ that corresponds to the ℓ -th element of \mathcal{M}_S and the $\max(\mathcal{T}^{i'}(\ell))$ -th element of $\text{GEOM}_{1/z}$. \square

Thus, this contradiction shows that $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/z} \preceq_{z-1} \mathcal{G}_S$. \square

We could use Lemma 3 to immediately conclude (by setting $z = 2$) that $\mathcal{M}_S^{1/2} \preceq \mathcal{G}_S$ and thus $H(\mathcal{G}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + 2$, giving a 2-additive approximation. However, we can do better.

Lemma 4. *If $p \preceq_\alpha q$, then $H(q) \leq H(p) - \log(\alpha)$*

Proof. For any distribution D , we define $\beta_D(x)$ as the set of all indices of D corresponding to the minimum length prefix required to sum to at least x . More formally:

Definition 8. $\beta_D(x) = \{i \in [|D|] \mid \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} D(j) < x\}$

With this, we show:

$$H(q) \quad (48)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{|q|} q(i) \log\left(\frac{1}{q(i)}\right) \quad (49)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{|p|} \sum_{j \in (\beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^i p(k)) \setminus \beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} p(k)))} q(j) \log\left(\frac{1}{q(j)}\right) \quad (50)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|p|} \sum_{j \in (\beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^i p(k)) \setminus \beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} p(k)))} q(j) \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha \times p(i)}\right) \quad (51)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{|p|} \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha \times p(i)}\right) \times \sum_{j \in (\beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^i p(k)) \setminus \beta_q(\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} p(k)))} q(j) \quad (52)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|p|} \log\left(\frac{1}{\alpha \times p(i)}\right) \times p(i) \quad (53)$$

$$= H(p) - \log(\alpha) \quad (54)$$

(53) is obtained by noticing how the sequence of the values of the inner summation must majorize p by definition of β_q . As the inner summation's coefficient is non-decreasing, the equation is maximized when sequence of the values of the inner summation is exactly p . \square

Corollary 1. *For $z \geq 2$, it holds that $H(\mathcal{G}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + H(\text{GEOM}_{1/z}) - \log(z-1)$*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3 and Lemma 4. \square

We show this upper-bound approaches $\log_2(e)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$:

Claim 7. $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} H(\text{GEOM}_{1/z}) - \log(z-1) = \log_2(e)$

Proof.

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} H(\text{GEOM}_{1/z}) - \log(z-1) \quad (55)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-1/z)^i}{z} \times \log\left(\frac{z}{(1-1/z)^i}\right) - \log(z-1) \quad (56)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-1/z)^i}{z} \times i \times \log\left(\frac{1}{1-1/z}\right) + \log\left(\frac{z}{z-1}\right) \quad (57)$$

$$= \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} (z-1) \times \log\left(\frac{1}{1-1/z}\right) + \log\left(\frac{z}{z-1}\right) \quad (58)$$

$$= \log_2(e) \quad (59)$$

\square

Finally, we show that $H(\mathcal{G}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e)$ by contradiction. Suppose there exists an S where $H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e) + \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. By combining Corollary 1 and Claim 7 we can immediately conclude there is a sufficiently large z where we can bound $H(\mathcal{G}_S) < H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e) + \varepsilon$. This is a contradiction, so it must hold for all S that $H(\mathcal{G}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e)$. \square

Moreover, this gap between $H(\mathcal{G}_S)$ and $H(\wedge S)$ is tight:

Theorem 4. *There exists no algorithm \mathcal{A} where it holds for all S that $H(\mathcal{A}_S) \leq H(\wedge S) + c$ for any $c < \log_2(e)$.*

Proof. Consider the instance $S = \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(\mathcal{U}_n)$ where \mathcal{U}_n is the uniform distribution over n states.

Claim 8. *If $S = \mathcal{U}_n$, $\mathcal{G}_S(i) = (1-1/n)^{i-1} \times 1/n \forall i \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, we know $\mathcal{G}_S(i) = \max_j \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j \mathcal{M}_S(k) - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{j/n - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{j} = 1/n - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{n}$. For $i = 1$, $\mathcal{G}_S(1) = 1/n - \frac{0}{n} = (1-1/n)^0 \times 1/n$. For $i > 1$ we can inductively show, $\mathcal{G}_S(i) = 1/n - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \mathcal{G}_S(k)}{n} = 1/n - \frac{n((1/n) - (1-1/n)^{i-1}/n)}{n} = 1/n - \frac{1-(1-1/n)^{i-1}}{n} = (1-1/n)^{i-1} \times 1/n$. \square

Claim 9. *If $S = \mathcal{U}_n$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e)$*

Proof. Using Claim 8 we determine that $H(\mathcal{G}_S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_S(i) \times \log\left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{G}_S(i)}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1-1/n)^{i-1} \times 1/n \times \log\left(\frac{1}{(1-1/n)^{i-1} \times 1/n}\right) = \log(n) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1-1/n)^{i-1} \times 1/n \times i \times \log\left(\frac{1}{1-1/n}\right) = \log(n) + (n-1) \times \log\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) = H(\wedge S) + (n-1) \times \log\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)$. Finally, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\wedge S) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n-1) \times \log\left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) = H(\wedge S) + \log_2(e)$. \square

By Theorem 2, we know $H(\mathcal{G}_S) = H(\text{OPT}_S)$. Accordingly, for any $c < \log_2(e)$ there exists an n where if $S = \text{MAJORIZING-SET}(\mathcal{U}_n)$ then $H(\text{OPT}_S) > H(\wedge S) + c$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Kocaoglu, A. G. Dimakis, S. Vishwanath, and B. Hassibi, "Entropic causal inference," in *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [2] —, "Entropic causality and greedy minimum entropy coupling," in *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1465–1469.
- [3] Spencer Compton, Murat Kocaoglu, Kristjan H. Greenewald, and Dmitry Katz, "Entropic causal inference: Identifiability and finite sample results," in *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [4] M. A. Javidian, V. Aggarwal, F. Bao, and Z. Jacob, "Quantum entropic causal inference," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.11764*, 2021.
- [5] M. Vidyasagar, "A metric between probability distributions on finite sets of different cardinalities and applications to order reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 2464–2477, 2012.
- [6] F. Cicalese, L. Gargano, and U. Vaccaro, "Approximating probability distributions with short vectors, via information theoretic distance measures," in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1138–1142.
- [7] C. T. Li, "Efficient approximate minimum entropy coupling of multiple probability distributions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2021.
- [8] M. Kovačević, I. Stanojević, and V. Šenk, "On the entropy of couplings," *Information and Computation*, vol. 242, pp. 369–382, 2015.
- [9] F. Cicalese, L. Gargano, and U. Vaccaro, "Minimum-entropy couplings and their applications," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 65, no. 6, pp. 3436–3451, 2019.
- [10] M. Rossi, "Greedy additive approximation algorithms for minimum-entropy coupling problem," in *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1127–1131.
- [11] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications*. Springer, 1979, vol. 143.
- [12] F. Cicalese and U. Vaccaro, "Supermodularity and subadditivity properties of the entropy on the majorization lattice," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 933–938, 2002.