

ENTROPIC COVARIANCE MODELS

BY PIOTR ZWIERNIK^a 

Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto, ^apiotr.zwiernik@utoronto.ca

In covariance matrix estimation, one of the challenges lies in finding a suitable model and an efficient estimation method. Two commonly used modelling approaches in the literature involve imposing linear restrictions on the covariance matrix or its inverse. Another approach considers linear restrictions on the matrix logarithm of the covariance matrix. In this paper, we present a general framework for linear restrictions on different transformations of the covariance matrix, including the mentioned examples. Our proposed estimation method solves a convex problem and yields an M -estimator, allowing for relatively straightforward asymptotic (in general) and finite sample analysis (in the Gaussian case). In particular, we recover standard $\sqrt{n/d}$ rates, where d is the dimension of the underlying model. Our geometric insights allow to extend various recent results in covariance matrix modelling. This includes providing unrestricted parametrizations of the space of correlation matrices, which is alternative to a recent result utilizing the matrix logarithm.

1. Introduction. Estimating the covariance matrix is a fundamental problem in many fields, including multivariate statistics, spatial statistics, finance, and machine learning. The literature offers a wide range of models that have been considered for this purpose; e.g. [Anderson \(1970\)](#); [Jennrich and Schluchter \(1986\)](#); [Boik \(2002\)](#); [Pourahmadi \(2013\)](#). One popular approach involves exploiting linear restrictions on factors in a decomposition of Σ or its transformation [Pourahmadi \(2011\)](#). For instance, in linear structural equation models, specific entries of the matrix L in the LDL decomposition $\Sigma^{-1} = LDL^\top$ are set to zero.

Since modelling via the LDL decomposition heavily relies on the variable ordering in the system, as an alternative, linear restrictions can be directly imposed on the covariance matrix Σ or some transformation of it; e.g. [Anderson \(1970\)](#); [Dempster \(1972\)](#); [Sturmfels and Uhler \(2010\)](#). This approach has gained attention due to the prevalence of such structures in multiple applications. Examples include Toeplitz matrices or block-Toeplitz matrices in time series and spatial statistics [Anderson \(1978\)](#), linear structures encoded by trees in Brownian motion tree models [Zwiernik, Uhler and Richards \(2017\)](#), and other types of symmetries [Szatrowski \(2004\)](#). Gaussian graphical models, which enforce sparsity on the inverse of Σ , and their colored versions have also been widely used in multivariate statistics and machine learning [Dempster \(1972\)](#); [Lauritzen \(1996\)](#); [Højsgaard and Lauritzen \(2008\)](#). These models are popular due to their interpretability, as the entries of Σ and its inverse correspond after normalization to correlations or partial correlations.

Another type of restriction considered in the literature involves linear constraints on the matrix logarithm of the covariance matrix [Leonard and Hsu \(1992\)](#); [Chiu, Leonard and Tsui \(1996\)](#); [Battay \(2017\)](#). While the interpretation of such constraints is generally less clear, these models have gained popularity because modelling the matrix logarithm $\log(\Sigma)$ does not require handling the positivity constraints. When Σ is diagonal, these models can be viewed as extensions of classical log-linear models for heterogeneous variances. The

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62H99; secondary 62H22,62R01.

Keywords and phrases: covariance matrix estimation, spectral sums, convex analysis, positive definite matrices, linear covariance models, Bregman divergence.

matrix logarithm of the covariance matrix has found applications in stochastic volatility models, medical imaging, spatial statistics, and quantum geometry [Kawakatsu \(2006\)](#); [Ishihara, Omori and Asai \(2016\)](#); [Asai and So \(2015\)](#); [Bauer and Vorkink \(2011\)](#); [Zhu et al. \(2009\)](#); [LeSage and Pace \(2007\)](#); [Pavlov, Sturmfels and Telen \(2022\)](#).

Notably, the fact that the matrix logarithm of a covariance matrix is an unrestricted symmetric matrix has important theoretical implications. For instance, in recent work [Archakov and Hansen \(2021\)](#) have shown that the logarithm of the *correlation* matrix has properties similar to Fisher’s Z-transformation. Having an unrestricted parametrization of correlation matrices is considered a major breakthrough in temporal modelling of correlation matrices, which is critical in the GARCH approach. Leveraging similar ideas, we provide technology to get an unrestricted parameterization of various other covariance models, which may be of independent interest. In this context, we propose to study the mapping $\Sigma \mapsto \Sigma - \Sigma^{-1}$ as a more tractable alternative to the matrix logarithm.

Main goals of this paper: The research on the matrix logarithm has motivated the exploration of linear restrictions on more general functions of the covariance matrix. In this statistical context, functions such as the matrix logarithm are treated as link functions, analogous to generalized linear models (GLMs) [Pourahmadi \(2011\)](#); [Zou et al. \(2017\)](#); [Lin, Müller and Park \(2023\)](#). Our paper contributes to the development of a GLM methodology and a data-based framework for modelling covariance matrices, building on the work initiated by Anderson, Pourahmadi, and others. In our general approach we follow steps of [Barndorff-Nielsen \(1978\)](#); [Banerjee et al. \(2005\)](#) where convex analysis was used to study theoretical properties of exponential families. This is similar to the construction of generalized exponential families and matrix nearness problems [Grünwald and Dawid \(2004\)](#); [Dhillon and Tropp \(2008\)](#), albeit applied to covariance matrices in a broader sense than previously explored.

The main goals of this paper are twofold:

- (i) To propose a general framework for modelling covariance matrices that allows for efficient estimation procedures based on convex optimization.
- (ii) To enhance the understanding of the geometry of covariance matrices and show how convexity simplifies the statistical analysis.

We now briefly describe how these goals are approached.

Entropic covariance models (informal): The key idea is to utilize the gradient mapping $\nabla F(\Sigma)$ of a general strictly convex and differentiable function defined on the positive definite cone. This mapping induces a one-to-one transformation of covariance matrices, and we impose affine (or general convex) restrictions on the result of this transformation. Affine constraints can arise from regression of the covariance matrix (or its transformation) on auxiliary information [Zou et al. \(2017\)](#); [Lin, Müller and Park \(2023\)](#), specific symmetry patterns [Szatrowski \(2004\)](#), or sparsity [Dempster \(1972\)](#); [Hastie, Tibshirani and Wainwright \(2015\)](#).

For a concrete example, consider the set of 3×3 covariance matrices Σ such that $L = \log(\Sigma)$ satisfies $L_{13} = 0$. This example appears later in Section 7. Models with zero restrictions on $\log \Sigma$ have been recently studied in [Rybak and Battey \(2021\)](#); [Pavlov \(2023\)](#). Here the main problem is that simple constraints in L translate to complicated constraint in Σ , which may potentially complicate the estimation process. This is one of the problems we address in this article.

Estimation under linear constraints: Estimating models under linear restrictions on the inverse covariance matrix is relatively straightforward. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be the data matrix with independent rows coming from a mean zero distribution with covariance Σ_0 . A natural approach is to optimize the Gaussian log-likelihood, which, up to additive constants, is given

by

$$(1) \quad \ell(K) = \frac{n}{2} \log \det(K) - \frac{n}{2} \operatorname{tr}(S_n K), \quad S_n = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X},$$

where $K = \Sigma^{-1}$ satisfies the given constraints [Anderson \(1970\)](#); [Sturmfels and Uhler \(2010\)](#); [Barratt and Boyd \(2022\)](#). This optimization problem is convex since $\ell(K)$ is a strictly concave function of K , and the constraints are linear in K . However, in the case of linear constraints on Σ , a canonical estimation approach is less obvious, and the Gaussian log-likelihood becomes multimodal [Zwiernik, Uhler and Richards \(2017\)](#). This has motivated research on alternative estimation methods [Anderson \(1973\)](#); [Christensen \(1989\)](#); [Sturmfels, Timme and Zwiernik \(2019\)](#); [Améndola and Zwiernik \(2021\)](#). One natural approach is to replace the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) with the least squares estimator, which minimizes the Frobenius distance $\|\Sigma - S_n\|_F^2$ over all Σ in the given linear subspace.

In this paper, by utilizing the Bregman divergence [Bregman \(1967\)](#), we generalize both the least squares approach for estimating under linear restrictions on Σ and the problem of minimizing $\ell(K)$ for restrictions that are linear in K . Bregman matrix divergences have been used for matrix estimation and matrix approximation problems; e.g. [Dhillon and Tropp \(2008\)](#); [Ravikumar, Wainwright and Lafferty \(2010\)](#); [Cai and Zhou \(2012\)](#); [Llorens-Terrazas and Brownlees \(2022\)](#). However, in these papers, Bregman divergence was used to analyze existing covariance models. Here, it is studied in the context of new models and to provide more insight in covariance matrix geometry.

For every entropic model the resulting loss function is strictly convex, and its Hessian does not depend on the data. This is similar to the negative log-likelihood function in exponential families, making the theoretical analysis of this estimator rather straightforward following the elegant work of [Niemiro \(1992\)](#). In particular, we show that our proposed estimator, which we call the Bregman estimator, is consistent and asymptotically normal when the sample size goes to infinity. We complementary these results with finite sample analysis in the case when the data come from the Gaussian distribution, which shows that the Bregman estimator remains a good estimator in high-dimensions as long as $\sqrt{d/n}$ remains small, where d is the dimension of the underlying model. This recovers standard parametric rates. Further, in [Section 6](#) we provide various approaches to perform numerical optimization for Bregman estimators.

Geometry of entropic models: One of the contributions of this paper is providing new insights into the geometry of various covariance models that explain and sometimes greatly generalize existing results. One example is a far reaching generalization of [Theorem 1](#) in [Archakov and Hansen \(2021\)](#), which provides an unrestricted parametrization for correlation matrices; see [Section 5.2](#). Another class of insights is related with the Jordan algebras of symmetric matrices, which we discuss in [Section 8](#). These results explain why for certain entropic models the maximum likelihood estimator is available in closed form; e.g. [LeSage and Pace \(2007\)](#). We expect these results will greatly improve our understanding of the linear models on the matrix logarithm of Σ and other entropic models.

The article is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) provides a brief overview of the necessary background in convex analysis and introduces the main definitions and running examples; see also [Appendix A](#). Our proposed estimation method is presented in [Section 3](#), where we also demonstrate the convexity of the underlying optimization problem. [Section 4](#) presents basic statistical analyses of the resulting estimator. [Section 5](#) investigates the geometry of entropic models in connection with convex analysis and mixed parametrizations. [Section 6](#) proposes simple numerical algorithms for computing our estimator. [Section 7](#) focuses on sparsity patterns. [Section 8](#) provides insights into a particular type of linear constraints that define Jordan algebras. We conclude the paper in [Section 9](#) with a short discussion of future research directions.

2. Preliminaries and definitions. Let \mathbb{S}^m denote the real vector space of symmetric $m \times m$ matrices, and let \mathbb{S}_+^m and $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ represent the subsets of matrices that are positive definite and positive semidefinite, respectively. We equip \mathbb{S}^m with the standard inner product $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(AB)$ and the induced Frobenius norm $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\langle A, A \rangle}$.

2.1. Convex functions on \mathbb{S}^m . By $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ denote the set of convex functions $F : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ that are not identically equal to $+\infty$ (these are called sometimes proper convex functions). The domain of $F \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ is the nonempty set $\text{dom}(F) = \{A \in \mathbb{S}^m : F(A) < +\infty\}$. By $\text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ denote the class of all functions in $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ that are lower semicontinuous on \mathbb{S}^m — these are also known as closed convex functions. Recall that F is lower semicontinuous if the lower level-set $\{A : F(A) \leq t\}$ is closed for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Because convex functions are always continuous in the interior of their domain, this involves conditions on how F behaves on the boundary of $\text{dom } F$; see Appendix A.1 for more details and references.

Reserve a special notation \mathcal{E}^m for functions $F : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that:

- (i) $F \in \text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$,
- (ii) $\mathbb{S}_+^m \subseteq \text{dom}(F) \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ or equivalently $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F)) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$,
- (iii) F is strictly convex and continuously differentiable on \mathbb{S}_+^m .

REMARK 2.1. If F satisfies only (i) and (iii), we replace $F(A)$ with

$$F(A) + \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m}(A), \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m}(A) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Because $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ is closed and convex, $\mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m} \in \text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$, and so also $F(A) + \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m}(A) \in \text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$. Moreover, the interior of the domain of $F(A) + \mathbf{i}_{\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m}(A)$ is \mathbb{S}_+^m . For brevity we often include the indicator function only implicitly.

In our running examples below, we define the function $F(\Sigma)$ for $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. The function is then extended by lower semicontinuity to the boundary of $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$, and it is equal to $+\infty$ for all other points. The following are our running examples:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{(A)} & F_A(\Sigma) = -\log \det \Sigma \\ \text{(B)} & F_B(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) \\ \text{(C)} & F_C(\Sigma) = -\text{tr}(\Sigma - \Sigma \log \Sigma) \\ \text{(D)} & F_D(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}) \end{array}$$

and the details on the lower semicontinuous extension are provided in Appendix A.3. The function $-F_A$ is called the Gaussian entropy. The function $2F_B$ is the squared Frobenius norm of Σ . The function $-F_C$ is the von Neumann entropy. Both (B) and (D) can be easily generalized:

$$\text{(B')} \quad F_{B,p}(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\Sigma^p) \quad \text{for } p \geq 1 \quad \text{(D')} \quad F_{D,p}(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{p} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-p}) \quad \text{for } p \geq 0.$$

Note that $pF_{B,p}$ is the p -Schatten norm of Σ raised to power p , $F_{B,p}(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{p} \|\Sigma\|_p^p$, where denoting by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m$ the eigenvalues of $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ we have

$$(2) \quad \|\Sigma\|_p = \sqrt[p]{\lambda_1^p + \dots + \lambda_m^p}.$$

Although we keep our theory as general as possible, we note that all our running examples are spectral functions of the form $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ where $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the notation $\phi(\Sigma)$ means the corresponding matrix function, that is, if $\Sigma = U\Lambda U^\top$ is the spectral decomposition of Σ then $\phi(\Sigma) = U\phi(\Lambda)U^\top$, where ϕ in $\phi(\Lambda)$ is applied to each diagonal entry of Λ ; see, e.g., Higham (2008). We call such functions spectral sums and, in Appendix A, we present useful results which make working with this function class particularly easy.

2.2. *Entropic covariance models.* We are now ready to describe our set-up. The main object in our analysis is the gradient ∇F of F . We start with the following well-known fact.

LEMMA 2.2. *If $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$, then $\nabla F : \mathbb{S}_+^m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^m$ defines a one-to-one function on \mathbb{S}_+^m .*

PROOF. Fix $A \in \mathbb{S}^m$ and note that the function $\langle A, \Sigma \rangle - F(\Sigma)$ is strictly concave and continuously differentiable on \mathbb{S}_+^m . Thus, if its maximum in \mathbb{S}_+^m exists, it must be a stationary point and so it must satisfy $\nabla F(\Sigma) = A$. By strict convexity it must be the unique such point. This shows that for each $A \in \mathbb{S}^m$ there exists at most one point $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ such that $\nabla F(\Sigma) = A$. \square

Our modelling technique is to apply the transformation $\nabla F(\Sigma)$ and impose convex restrictions on it. It is useful to denote

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{L}_+^m := \nabla F(\mathbb{S}_+^m).$$

Lemma 2.2 motivates the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.3 (Linear Entropic Covariance Model). Fix an affine subspace $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$. The corresponding linear entropic model is

$$M_F(\mathcal{L}) := \{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m : \nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

More generally, we define $M_F(\mathcal{C})$ for any general closed convex constraints $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$.

REMARK 2.4. As we argue in this paper, this definition unifies many well known examples and leads to some new ones. Not all proposed models have a clear statistical interpretation but they may still be useful. For example, the matrix logarithm allows us to regress the covariance matrix on external data [Chiu, Leonard and Tsui \(1996\)](#). So here \mathcal{L} will be not fixed by the modeller but will be generated by the external data.

In the definition we implicitly assumed that $M_F(\mathcal{L})$ is non-empty. This is a recurrent assumption of this paper.

ASSUMPTION 1: The mapping $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ and the subspace $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$ satisfy $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m \neq \emptyset$.

Some interesting examples of the function F are given by popular matrix entropy functions like the negative Gaussian entropy (A) and the negative von Neumann entropy (C) (hence the name). More examples will be discussed later in the paper. For now, F is relevant for us only through the mapping $\nabla F(\Sigma)$, which defines a suitable reparametrization of the covariance matrix. In the following examples, we refer to Proposition A.4 for a simple technique to compute $\nabla F(\Sigma) = \nabla \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ by computing the derivative of ϕ :

$$\text{if } F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma)) \quad \text{then} \quad \nabla F(\Sigma) = \phi'(\Sigma).$$

EXAMPLE 2.5 (A). Since $-\log \det(\Sigma) = -\text{tr}(\log(\Sigma))$, here $\phi_A(x) = -\log(x)$ if $x > 0$ and so $\phi'_A(x) = -\frac{1}{x}$. By Proposition A.4, $\nabla F_A(\Sigma) = \phi'_A(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-1}$. The model $M_{F_A}(\mathcal{L})$ is described by all $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ such that $-\Sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{L}$. Here $\mathbb{L}_+^m = -\mathbb{S}_+^m$. Models of this form are classically known in statistics as linear concentration models [Dempster \(1972\)](#); [Anderson \(1973\)](#); see also the introduction for a more comprehensive literature overview.

Although linear restrictions on the inverse covariance matrix have many applications, there are important areas (e.g. signal processing) where it is more natural to impose linear symmetry restrictions directly on the covariance matrix. This leads to our second example.

$F(\Sigma)$	$\nabla F(\Sigma)$	$F^*(L)$	$D_F(S, L)$
$-\log \det(\Sigma)$	$-\Sigma^{-1}$	$-m - \log \det(-L)$	$-\log \det((-L)S) + \text{tr}((-L)S - I_m)$
$\frac{1}{2}\ \Sigma\ _F^2$	Σ	$\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(L^2)$	$\frac{1}{2}\ L - S\ _F^2$
$\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})$	$-\Sigma^{-2}$	$-2\text{tr}(\sqrt{-L})$	$\text{tr}(S^{-1}) - 2\text{tr}(\sqrt{-L}) + \text{tr}((-L)S)$
$-\text{tr}(\Sigma - \Sigma \log(\Sigma))$	$\log(\Sigma)$	$\text{tr}(e^L)$	$-\text{tr}(S - S \log(S)) + \text{tr}(e^L) - \text{tr}(LS)$
$\frac{1}{p}\ \Sigma\ _p^p, p \geq 1$	Σ^{p-1}	$\frac{1}{q}\ L\ _q^q, q = \frac{p}{p-1}$	$\frac{1}{p}\ S\ _p^p + \frac{1}{q}\ L\ _q^q - \text{tr}(LS)$
$\frac{1}{p}\ \Sigma^{-1}\ _p^p, p > 0$	$-\Sigma^{-p-1}$	$-\frac{1}{q}\ L\ _q^q, q = \frac{p}{p+1}$	$\frac{1}{p}\ S^{-1}\ _p^p - \frac{1}{q}\ L\ _q^q + \text{tr}((-L)S)$

TABLE 1

Our running examples with the corresponding gradients, conjugate functions, and the Bregman divergence.

EXAMPLE 2.6 (B). Here $\phi_B(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^2$ for $x > 0$ and so $\phi'_B(x) = x$. This gives $\nabla F_B(\Sigma) = \phi'_B(\Sigma) = \Sigma$. The corresponding entropic model is given by all $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ such that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{L}$. Here $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \mathbb{S}_+^m$. This imposes linear restrictions on the covariance matrix as discussed in the introduction. This example can be generalized to the p-th Schatten norm of $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, $\nabla F_{B,p}(\Sigma) = \Sigma^{p-1}$, which allows us to model linear restrictions on an arbitrary positive power of Σ .

This setting is however completely general and, as we argue below, it is a natural framework to discuss the generalized models for covariance matrices [Pourahmadi \(2000\)](#); [Zou et al. \(2017\)](#); [Lin, Müller and Park \(2023\)](#). Example (C) again links to a model well studied in the literature.

EXAMPLE 2.7 (C). We have $\phi_C(x) = -x(1 - \log(x))$ for $x > 0$ and so $\phi'_C(x) = \log(x)$. Thus, $\nabla F_C(\Sigma) = \phi'_C(\Sigma) = \log(\Sigma)$ and the model is given by all Σ such that $\log(\Sigma) \in \mathcal{L}$. This imposes linear restrictions on the matrix logarithm of the covariance matrix. Although such linear restrictions are hard to interpret statistically, one of the reasons, why this model is useful is because every matrix $L \in \mathbb{S}^m$ is a matrix logarithm of some $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. In other words, $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \mathbb{S}^m$ and so $\log(\Sigma)$ can be suitably regressed on external information [Chiu, Leonard and Tsui \(1996\)](#). In the introduction we provide an extensive literature overview for this model. In Section 5 and in Section 9 we discuss alternatives to this transformation with much better algebraic properties.

We discuss one more example whose relevance will be explained later.

EXAMPLE 2.8 (D). In this example, we have $\phi_D(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ for $x > 0$ and so $\phi'_D(x) = -\frac{1}{x}$. This gives $\nabla F_D(\Sigma) = \phi'_D(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-2}$ and the model is given by all $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ such that $\Sigma^{-2} \in \mathcal{L}$. This example has a straightforward generalization: $\nabla F_{D,p}(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-p-1}$ for any $p \geq 0$, which allows to impose linear restrictions on powers of Σ^{-1} . In Section 9 we briefly motivate such models with zero restrictions. In Example 7.2 we motivate zero restrictions in $\Sigma^{-1/2}$, which, as we argue later, is a very closely related model.

All our examples are summarized in Table 1. The gradient is provided in the second column and the other columns will be discussed in detail later.

2.3. *Dual construction of $M_F(\mathcal{L})$.* We note the following dual construction. Suppose $\pi : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, for some $d \geq 1$ is an affine function. In the spirit of (generalized) exponential

families [Barndorff-Nielsen \(1978\)](#); [Grünwald and Dawid \(2004\)](#), we refer to π as a sufficient statistics. Given $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, consider the optimization problem

$$(4) \quad \text{minimize } F(\Sigma) - \langle A_0, \Sigma \rangle \quad \text{subject to } \pi(\Sigma) = b,$$

where $A_0 \in \mathbb{S}^m$ is a fixed matrix. If $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ then this problem has at most one optimal solution in \mathbb{S}_+^m . Since the set $\mathbb{S}_+^m \cap \{\Sigma : \pi(\Sigma) = b\}$ is relatively open (in the affine subspace $\{\Sigma : \pi(\Sigma) = b\}$), this optimal point $\hat{\Sigma}$, if it exists, must satisfy the regular first order conditions: we must have $\pi(\hat{\Sigma}) = b$ and, for every $U \in \mathbb{S}^m$ such that $\pi(U) = 0$, it must hold that $\langle \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) - A_0, U \rangle = 0$, that is, the directional derivatives in all permitted directions must be zero. In other words,

$$(5) \quad \nabla F(\Sigma) - A_0 \in \ker(\pi)^\perp =: \mathcal{L}_0.$$

Note that this equation and the affine space $\mathcal{L} := A_0 + \mathcal{L}_0$ do not depend on the vector b and so the condition $\nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathcal{L}$ describes all such potential optimizers. In fact, a point $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ solves (4) for some $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if and only if $\nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) \in \mathcal{L}$. Indeed, if $\nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) \in \mathcal{L}$ then take $b := \pi(\hat{\Sigma})$ so that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is an optimum of (4) for this b .

If \mathcal{L} is given by zero restrictions on some coordinates, we get an explicit link to positive definite completion problems.

EXAMPLE 2.9 (Positive definite completion). Fix a graph G on m nodes and edge set E . We allow G to have self-loops that is edges from i to i . Let $\pi : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{|E|}$ be given by $\pi(\Sigma) = ((\Sigma_{ij})_{ij \in E})$. In this case $\ker(\pi)$ is the set of symmetric matrices with zeros on the entries corresponding to the edges of G . Thus, \mathcal{L}_0 is the set of symmetric matrices with zero entries for all non-edges of G : $\mathcal{L}_0 = \{L \in \mathbb{S}^m : L_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } ij \notin E\}$. Given $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, the solution to (5) with $b := \pi(S)$ and $A_0 = 0$ is the unique matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ that agrees with S on all the entries $ij \in E$ and such that $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma})$ is zero on the complementary entries.

3. The Bregman estimator. Consider data X_1, \dots, X_n from a centered distribution with a covariance matrix Σ_0 in an entropic model $M_F(\mathcal{L})$. Throughout the paper we assume that the true covariance matrix $\Sigma_0 \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ lies in the given model.

ASSUMPTION 2: $\nabla F(\Sigma_0) \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$.

We can estimate the covariance matrix using the Gaussian log-likelihood (1). In the case of non-Gaussian data, this log-likelihood is considered as one of the suitable loss functions. This gives an asymptotically statistically optimal procedure as long as all fourth order cumulants of the underlying distribution vanish [Browne \(1974\)](#). For the linear concentration model in [Example 2.5](#) this approach is canonical not only because it leads to an efficient estimator but also because it requires solving a convex optimization problem. Indeed, the Gaussian log-likelihood in (1) is a strictly concave function in $K = \Sigma^{-1}$.

The problem for the general entropic model $M_F(\mathcal{L})$ is that optimizing the Gaussian log-likelihood may be quite complicated since the linear constraints in $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$ translate into non-linear constraints in K . This observation has motivated a lot of research on the estimation of the linear covariance models. One valid solution is to use the dual MLE, which provides an efficient alternative to the MLE [Christensen \(1989\)](#); [Kauermann \(1996\)](#); [Lauritzen and Zwiernik \(2022\)](#); [Améndola and Zwiernik \(2021\)](#). The least squares estimator or generalized least squares estimator has also been used [Browne \(1974\)](#).

3.1. *Definition of the Bregman estimator.* In this section, we propose an estimation procedure for linear entropic models, which offers a natural alternative to the MLE. It generalizes the use of Gaussian likelihood for linear concentration models and the least squares estimation for linear covariance models. An important ingredient of our statistical analysis is the Bregman divergence:

$$(6) \quad D_F(S, \Sigma) = F(S) - F(\Sigma) - \langle \nabla F(\Sigma), S - \Sigma \rangle, \quad \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m, S \in \mathbb{S}^m.$$

Note that one of the characterizations of strict convexity for differentiable functions over \mathbb{S}_+^m assures that $D_F(S, \Sigma) \geq 0$ for all $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m, S \in \mathbb{S}^m$ with equality if and only if $S = \Sigma$.

Let S_n be the sample covariance matrix defined in (1). Our proposed estimator is obtained by minimizing the Bregman divergence $D_F(S_n, \Sigma)$ over the entropic model $M_F(\mathcal{L})$.

DEFINITION 3.1. The Bregman estimator $\hat{\Sigma}$ (if it exists) is the global minimizer of $D_F(S_n, \Sigma)$ subject to $\nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$.

There are two crucial aspects regarding the underlying optimization problem that we will formally state later in this section. Firstly, in Section 3.2, we demonstrate that $D_F(S_n, \Sigma)$ is a strictly convex function of $L = \nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$. Secondly, in Theorem 3.12, we establish that if the gradient of $F(\Sigma)$ diverges when Σ approaches the boundary of \mathbb{S}_+^m , then the optimum always exists whenever $S_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. In such cases, there is no explicit need to impose the restriction $\nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$ as first-order optimization methods will naturally remain within \mathbb{S}_+^m . Before formally proving these assertions, we will examine some examples.

EXAMPLE 3.2 (A). In the Gaussian entropy example we have

$$D_{F_A}(S_n, \Sigma) = -\log \det(S_n \Sigma^{-1}) + \text{tr}(S_n \Sigma^{-1} - I_m),$$

which is just the standard Kullback-Leibler divergence between two mean zero Gaussian distributions, with covariances S_n and Σ respectively.

EXAMPLE 3.3 (B). In the Frobenius norm example we have

$$D_{F_B}(S_n, \Sigma) = F_B(S_n) - F_B(\Sigma) - \langle \Sigma, S_n - \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \|\Sigma - S_n\|_F^2.$$

Thus, minimizing $D_{F_B}(S_n, \Sigma)$ over $\Sigma \in \mathcal{L}$ simply gives the orthogonal projection of S_n on \mathcal{L} if this projection is positive definite.

The next example proposes a new way of estimating parameters in models that are linear in $\log(\Sigma)$. This provides an alternative to the maximum likelihood estimation considered in [Chiu, Leonard and Tsui \(1996\)](#).

EXAMPLE 3.4 (C). In the von Neumann case we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{F_C}(S_n, \Sigma) &= -\text{tr}(S_n - S_n \log(S_n)) + \text{tr}(\Sigma - \Sigma \log(\Sigma)) - \langle \log(\Sigma), S_n - \Sigma \rangle \\ &= -\text{tr}(S_n - S_n \log(S_n)) + \text{tr}(\Sigma - S_n \log \Sigma). \end{aligned}$$

The next example provides some curious connections with the empirical score matching loss.

EXAMPLE 3.5 (D). In our last example given by $F_D(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{F_D}(S_n, \Sigma) &= \text{tr}(S_n^{-1}) - \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}) + \langle \Sigma^{-2}, S_n - \Sigma \rangle \\ &= \text{tr}(S_n^{-1}) - 2\text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1} - \Sigma^{-1} S_n \Sigma^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

This function is convex in Σ^{-1} and it corresponds to the empirical score matching loss of [Lin, Drton and Shojaie \(2016\)](#). In the next section we also argue that this function is convex in Σ^{-2} .

3.2. *Convexity of the underlying optimization problem.* We next analyze $D_F(S_n, \Sigma)$ as a function of $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$. The conjugate of $F(\Sigma)$ is

$$(7) \quad F^*(L) := \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m} \{\langle \Sigma, L \rangle - F(\Sigma)\}.$$

The third column of Table 1 contains the convex conjugates for our leading examples. Note that we use notation $\|L\|_q$ introduced in (2) also if $q < 1$, in which case this is formally not a norm. Explicit calculations for spectral functions could be done by utilizing Theorem 2.3 in Lewis (1996a). For the special case of spectral sums we use Lemma A.5: if $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ then $F^*(L) = \text{tr}(\phi^*(L))$.

In the next proposition we collect several known results.

PROPOSITION 3.6. *If $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ then (a) $F^* \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$, (b) F^* is continuously differentiable on $\text{int dom}(F^*)$, (c) $\mathbb{L}_+^m \subseteq \text{dom}(F^*)$, (d) ∇F and ∇F^* are inverses of each other on \mathbb{S}_+^m and \mathbb{L}_+^m .*

PROOF. Statements (a), (b) follow from Theorem E.1.1.2, Theorem E.4.1.1 in Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal (2001). To prove (c), note that if $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $L = \nabla F(S)$ then $\langle \Sigma, L \rangle - F(\Sigma)$ is strictly concave and well-defined over \mathbb{S}_+^m . Since S is a stationary point it must be the optimum and so $F^*(L) < \infty$. Now (d) follows from Corollary E.1.4.4 in Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal (2001). \square

Applying Proposition 3.2 in Bauschke and Borwein (1997), we get that for all $S \in \mathbb{S}^m$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$

$$D_F(S, \Sigma) = F(S) + F^*(\nabla F(\Sigma)) - \langle \nabla F(\Sigma), S \rangle.$$

Let $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$, or equivalently by Proposition 3.6(d), $\Sigma = \nabla F^*(L)$. Slightly abusing notation, from now on, we will write $D_F(S, L)$ to refer to $D_F(S, \nabla F^*(L))$. This notation is also used in the last column of Table 1, where the corresponding Bregman divergences computed above are expressed in terms of L . We thus have,

$$(8) \quad D_F(S, L) = F(S) + F^*(L) - \langle L, S \rangle.$$

In particular, $D_F(S, L)$ is strictly convex and differentiable both in $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $L \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$.

If the sample covariance matrix S_n is not positive definite, the divergence $D_F(S_n, L)$ may not be finite. In analogy to the log-likelihood function, we solve instead

$$(9) \quad \text{maximize } \mathcal{J}_n(L) := -F^*(L) + \langle L, S_n \rangle \quad \text{subject to } L \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m.$$

We easily see that the gradient of \mathcal{J}_n is well defined on \mathbb{L}_+^m and

$$(10) \quad \nabla \mathcal{J}_n(L) = -\nabla F^*(L) + S_n.$$

The KKT conditions are easy to obtain.

THEOREM 3.7. *Suppose that \mathbb{L}_+^m is open. The optimum in (9), if it exists, is uniquely given by the pair $(\hat{\Sigma}, \hat{L}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^m \times \mathbb{L}_+^m$ with $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma})$ satisfying*

$$(11) \quad \hat{L} \in \mathcal{L} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp.$$

PROOF. First note that $\nabla F^*(\hat{L}) = \hat{\Sigma}$ by Proposition 3.6(d). Since \mathbb{L}_+^m is open, $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$ is relatively open, and so $\hat{L} \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$ is optimal if and only if the gradient $\nabla \mathcal{J}_n(\hat{L}) = -\hat{\Sigma} + S_n$ is orthogonal to \mathcal{L} . \square

In certain situations, it may be easier to solve the dual problem.

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Let $A_0 \in \mathcal{L}$. The dual problem to (9) is*

$$(12) \quad \text{minimize } F(\Sigma) - \langle A_0, \Sigma \rangle \quad \text{subject to} \quad \Sigma - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp, \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m.$$

PROOF. This is a convex problem over a relatively open set $(S_n + \mathcal{L}^\perp) \cap \mathbb{S}_+^m$. The optimum, if it exists, must be a stationary point: $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, $\hat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$ and $\nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) - A_0 \in (\mathcal{L}^\perp)^\perp$. Note that \mathcal{L}^\perp is the linear space orthogonal to the affine space \mathcal{L} and so $(\mathcal{L}^\perp)^\perp$ is the linear space parallel to \mathcal{L} . Since $A_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ we recover the condition $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$. This is exactly the same as (11), which proves that the problem in (12) is equivalent to the problem in (9). \square

3.3. *The advantageous essentially smooth case.* The geometry of Bregman divergence optimization is discussed in detail by [Bauschke and Borwein \(1997\)](#). We review now some of this theory to study the problem of existence of the Bregman estimator. These results will be used later in Section 5 in our study of mixed parametrizations. We start with some standard definitions.

DEFINITION 3.9. A function $F \in \text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ with $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F)) \neq \emptyset$ is called essentially smooth if it is differentiable on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F))$ and $\|\nabla F(\Sigma_k)\|_F \rightarrow \infty$ for any sequence (Σ_k) in $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F))$ that converges to the boundary of $\text{dom}(F)$.

In our leading examples, the functions F_A , F_C , and F_D are essentially smooth but F_B is not because $\nabla F_B(\Sigma) = \Sigma$ is well defined also on the boundary of \mathbb{S}_+^m . In example (C) essential smoothness is quite surprising because the function F_C itself extends to $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ (see Appendix A.3).

DEFINITION 3.10. A function $F \in \text{C}\overline{\text{onv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ is called Legendre if: (i) F is essentially smooth, (ii) F is strictly convex and differentiable on $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F))$.

Note that if $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ then condition (ii) is automatically satisfied. Legendre functions are particularly well behaved for our purposes.

PROPOSITION 3.11. *A convex function F is Legendre if and only if F^* is Legendre. In this case, the gradient mapping ∇F is an isomorphism between $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F))$ and $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F^*))$. In particular, if $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth, then it is Legendre and $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F^*)) = \mathbb{L}_+^m$.*

PROOF. The first part follows from Theorem 26.5 in [Rockafellar \(1970\)](#). For the second part, note that if $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ then $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F)) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \nabla F(\mathbb{S}_+^m)$ by definition. The second part follows then from the first part. \square

Importance of Proposition 3.11 will be illustrated in this and the following sections. We start with a basic result on existence of the Bregman estimator. For a given affine subspace $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$ define by $(\mathbb{S}_+^m)_\mathcal{L}$ the image of the orthogonal projection of \mathbb{S}_+^m onto \mathcal{L} . Similarly, for a given $S \in \mathbb{S}^m$ denote by $S_\mathcal{L}$ the orthogonal projection of S on \mathcal{L} .

THEOREM 3.12. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth. Then the optimum of $\mathcal{J}_n(L)$ over $L \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathbb{L}_+^m$ exists if and only if $(S_n)_\mathcal{L}$ lies in $(\mathbb{S}_+^m)_\mathcal{L}$.*

PROOF. By standard linear algebra, every $S \in \mathbb{S}^m$ can be uniquely decomposed as the sum $S_{\mathcal{L}} + S_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}$, where $S_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the orthogonal projection of S onto \mathcal{L} and $S_{\mathcal{L}^\perp}$ lies in the orthogonal space \mathcal{L}^\perp . Thus, we have that $(S_n)_{\mathcal{L}} \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_{\mathcal{L}}$ if and only if there exists $\widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ such that $\langle S_n, L \rangle = \langle \widehat{\Sigma}, L \rangle$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$. In this case $\mathcal{J}_n(L) = \langle \widehat{\Sigma}, L \rangle - F^*(L)$ when restricted to \mathcal{L} . Since $\widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m = \text{int}(\text{dom}(F))$, by Fact 2.11 in [Bauschke and Borwein \(1997\)](#), each sub-level set $\{L \in \mathbb{S}^m : \mathcal{J}_n(L) \geq t\}$ is bounded for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then it follows that $\{L \in \mathcal{L} : \mathcal{J}_n(L) \geq t\}$ is compact for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, nonempty for some t , and so the maximum exists in $\mathcal{L} \cap \text{dom}(F^*)$. Since F is essentially smooth, by [Proposition 3.11](#), so is F^* . In particular, the optimum must be attained in $\text{int}(\text{dom}(F^*)) = \mathbb{L}_+^m$.

To prove the other implication, suppose $(S_n)_{\mathcal{L}} \notin (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_{\mathcal{L}}$ but $\mathcal{J}_n(L)$ is optimized for some $\widehat{L} \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$. Denote $\widehat{\Sigma} = \nabla F^*(\widehat{L}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. Since F^* is essentially smooth, $\widehat{L} \in \text{int}(\text{dom}(F^*)) = \mathbb{L}_+^m$ (c.f. [Proposition 3.11](#)) and the KKT conditions in [Theorem 3.7](#) assure that $\widehat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$, which implies that $(\widehat{\Sigma})_{\mathcal{L}} = (S_n)_{\mathcal{L}}$. This contradicts the assumption that $(S_n)_{\mathcal{L}} \notin (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

Recall that examples (A), (C), and (D) are all essentially smooth. For a quick illustration why essential smoothness is necessary consider the following example.

EXAMPLE 3.13. Let $m = 3$ and consider the function F_B in [\(29\)](#) with $\nabla F_B(\Sigma) = \Sigma$. Suppose \mathcal{L} is given by a single equation $L_{13} = 0$. Consider two matrices

$$S_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} \\ \frac{2}{3} & 1 & \frac{2}{3} \\ \frac{2}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \frac{2}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 1 & \frac{2}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{2}{3} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that S_n is positive definite, $\widehat{L} = \widehat{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{L}$, $\widehat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$. However, $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is not positive definite and so it cannot be a solution to [\(9\)](#). This does not contradict [Theorem 3.12](#) because F_B is not essentially smooth.

Of course, if $S_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, then $(S_n)_{\mathcal{L}} \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_{\mathcal{L}}$ for every linear subspace $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$. If S_n is not positive definite, verifying whether $(S_n)_{\mathcal{L}}$ lies in $(\mathbb{S}_+^m)_{\mathcal{L}}$ may be complicated. Note however that this condition does not depend on F as long as F is essentially smooth and so the conditions for existence of the Bregman estimator are exactly the same as the conditions for existence the MLE in Gaussian linear concentration models. In the case of Gaussian graphical models this has been extensively studied [Buhl \(1993\)](#); [Uhler \(2012\)](#); [Gross and Sullivant \(2018\)](#); [Blekherman and Sinn \(2019\)](#); [Bernstein, Blekherman and Sinn \(2020\)](#); [Bernstein et al. \(2021\)](#). See [Theorem 2.1 in Uhler \(2012\)](#) for the special case of [Theorem 3.12](#) for Gaussian graphical models and [Sturmfels and Uhler \(2010\)](#) for the general linear Gaussian concentration model case.

In [Section 6](#) we discuss how to numerically solve problems [\(9\)](#) and [\(12\)](#). But first we provide some statistical analysis of the underlying estimator.

4. Basic statistical analysis. In this section we fix a parametrization of the affine space \mathcal{L} defining the entropic covariance model:

$$L(\theta) = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i A_i \quad \theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where A_0, A_1, \dots, A_d are fixed matrices in \mathbb{S}^m . For simplicity, we assume that the generators A_i of \mathcal{L} form an orthonormal basis, that is, $\langle A_i, A_j \rangle = 0$ and $\|A_i\|_F = 1$ for $i \neq j$. We also assume $A_0 = 0$, that is, \mathcal{L} is a linear subspace. Although no results in this section depend on this assumption, it significantly simplifies the notation. We also write $\mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ for $\mathcal{J}_n(L(\theta))$.

4.1. *Consistency and asymptotic Gaussianity.* Consider a random sample X_1, \dots, X_n from a zero mean distribution with positive definite covariance matrix $\Sigma_0 = \nabla F^*(L_0)$ with $L_0 = L(\theta_0)$ for some $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The estimator obtained by solving (9) is a *convex M-estimator* and the standard asymptotic theory, as presented in [Haberman \(1989\)](#); [Niemiro \(1992\)](#), can be applied. Indeed, define $m : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ by

$$m(\theta, x) = F^*(L(\theta)) - x^\top L(\theta)x$$

then maximizing $\mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ is equivalent to minimizing the strictly convex function

$$(13) \quad M_n(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(\theta, X_i) = F^*(L(\theta)) - \langle L(\theta), S_n \rangle = -\mathcal{J}_n(\theta).$$

The corresponding minimizer $\hat{\theta}_n$ is still called the Bregman estimator for $M_F(\mathcal{L})$ although now the estimator depends on the choice of basis A_0, A_1, \dots, A_d .

Note that $\mathbb{E}S_n = \Sigma_0$ and the function

$$(14) \quad M(\theta) := \mathbb{E}M_n(\theta) = F^*(L(\theta)) - \text{tr}(L(\theta)\Sigma_0)$$

is strictly convex in the interior of its domain. We have

$$\text{dom}(M) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : L(\theta) \in \text{dom}(F^*)\} \supseteq \{\theta : L(\theta) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m\} =: \Theta_+$$

and we assume $\theta_0 \in \Theta_+$. Note that if \mathbb{L}_+^m is open, so is Θ_+ . Theorem 1 in [Niemiro \(1992\)](#) immediately gives the following result.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ and $\mathbb{E}(S_n) = \Sigma_0 \in M_F(\mathcal{L})$. The Bregman estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ in $M_F(\mathcal{L})$ is a consistent estimator of θ_0 , where θ_0 is the unique point such that $\nabla F^*(L(\theta_0)) = \Sigma_0$.*

The main reason, why such nice results exist follows from the fundamental property of convex functions that pointwise convergence implies uniform convergence; see also Theorem II.1 in [Andersen and Gill \(1982\)](#). In consequence, the statistical analysis is much simpler than for general M-estimators [Geyer \(1994\)](#).

If we assume existence of higher order moments, we obtain a stronger conclusion. Let

$$(15) \quad h(\theta, x) = \nabla_\theta m(\theta, x) = [\langle \Sigma(\theta) - xx^\top, A_i \rangle]_{i=1}^d.$$

PROPOSITION 4.2. *If the distribution of X has finite moments up to order $2r$ (equiv. $\mathbb{E}\|h(\theta, X)\|^r < \infty$) for some $r \geq 1$ then for every $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{k \geq n} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_0\| > \epsilon) = o(n^{1-r}), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

The proof follows immediately from Theorem 2 in [Niemiro \(1992\)](#).

We now turn to proving asymptotic Gaussianity. Denoting $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{V}(X_1 X_1^\top)$ to be the covariance of the matrix $X_1 X_1^\top$, we get

$$(16) \quad \mathbb{V}(S_n) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}(X_i X_i^\top) = \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{S}.$$

Note that \mathcal{S} is a covariance of a matrix valued random variable. Thus, similarly as in the standard vector-valued case, \mathcal{S} is a positive semidefinite and self-adjoint linear map from \mathbb{S}^m to \mathbb{S}^m so that, for all $A, B \in \mathbb{S}^m$, we have

$$\langle A, \mathcal{S}A \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle A, \mathcal{S}B \rangle = \langle \mathcal{S}A, B \rangle.$$

The notation $\mathcal{S}A$ denotes the action of the linear mapping $\mathcal{S} : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^m$ on A ; see, for example, Section 2 and Appendix A in Lauritzen (2023). Equivalently, it defines a bilinear mapping, for all $A, B \in \mathbb{S}^m$,

$$\mathcal{S}[A, B] = \mathbb{E}(\langle X_1 X_1^\top - \Sigma_0, A \rangle \cdot \langle X_1 X_1^\top - \Sigma_0, B \rangle).$$

By (10), we can show that the Hessian $\nabla^2 M_n(\theta)$ of $M_n(\theta)$ does not depend on the data and it is equal to the Hessian of $M(\theta)$. We use the notation

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{I}(\theta) = \nabla^2 M_n(\theta) = \nabla^2 M(\theta) \in \mathbb{S}^d.$$

Since $M(\theta)$ is strictly concave in Θ_+ , for every fixed $\theta \in \Theta_+$, $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ is a positive definite matrix. We write \mathcal{I}_0 for $\mathcal{I}(\theta_0)$.

THEOREM 4.3. *Denote by $\hat{\theta}_n$ the Bregman estimator obtained under data S_n generated from a mean zero distribution with positive definite covariance $\mathbb{E}S_n = \Sigma_0 = \nabla F^*(L(\theta_0))$ and such that $\mathbb{V}(S_n) = \frac{1}{n}\mathcal{S}$ (the fourth order moments are assumed finite). Then*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N_m(0, \mathcal{I}_0^{-1} \Omega \mathcal{I}_0^{-1}),$$

where $\Omega_{ij} = \mathcal{S}[A_i, A_j]$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, m$.

The proof of this and the remaining results of this section is given in Appendix B

4.2. Finite sample bounds. Obtaining finite sample bounds in specific distributional settings is also rather straightforward under additional strong convexity assumptions, but we need to be more careful about the existence of the estimator. In this section, we always assume that the solution to (9) exists. For example, by Theorem 3.12, the optimum exists with probability one if $n \geq m$, F is essentially smooth.

We define centred versions of M and M_n :

$$\overline{M}(\omega) = M(\theta_0 + \omega) - M(\theta_0), \quad \overline{M}_n(\omega) = M_n(\theta_0 + \omega) - M_n(\theta_0).$$

We collect some basic facts about $\overline{M}(\omega)$, which follow immediately by the chain rule.

LEMMA 4.4. *The function $\overline{M}(\omega) = F^*(L_0 + L(\omega)) - F^*(L_0) - \langle \Sigma_0, L(\omega) \rangle$ is strictly convex in the interior of its domain and nonnegative. If F^* is twice continuously differentiable then*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_i} \overline{M}(\omega) = \langle \Sigma(\theta_0 + \omega) - \Sigma_0, A_i \rangle, \quad i = 1, \dots, d.$$

In particular, $\overline{M}(0) = 0$ and $\nabla \overline{M}(0) = 0$. Moreover,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \omega_i \partial \omega_j} \overline{M}(\omega) = \nabla^2 F^*(L_0 + L(\omega))[A_i, A_j], \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d$$

where $\nabla^2 F^*(L) : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^m$ for $\theta \in \Theta_+$ is a self-adjoint positive definite linear operator representing the second derivative of F^* at L .

Define $\Delta^{(n)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ on each coordinate by

$$(18) \quad \Delta_i^{(n)} = \langle S_n - \Sigma_0, A_i \rangle \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, d.$$

LEMMA 4.5. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and suppose that \overline{M} is μ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball, that is, $\overline{M}(\omega) - \frac{\mu}{2}\|\omega\|^2$ is convex on the ϵ -ball. If $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the Bregman estimator based on the sample covariance matrix S_n from the true distribution with covariance corresponding to parameter θ_0 then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq \epsilon) \geq \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\mu\epsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}).$$

By Lemma 4.5, it is now enough to find probabilistic bounds on $\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty$. If the distribution of the sample has a bounded support, finite sample bounds for $\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty$ can be easily obtained using maximal inequalities for sub-Gaussian random variables. However, this strategy is not applicable in the Gaussian case. The following method is an alternative approach that has the potential for extension to other situations.

THEOREM 4.6. Fix $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$, a linear subspace \mathcal{L} generated by an orthonormal basis A_1, \dots, A_d . Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n is a random sample from $N(0, \Sigma_0)$ with $\nabla F(\Sigma_0) \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$. For $\epsilon > 0$, let μ be such that \overline{M} be μ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball. If $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the corresponding Bregman estimator of the true parameter θ_0 then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| > \epsilon) \leq \begin{cases} 2d \exp\left\{-\frac{\mu^2 \epsilon^2 n}{32d\|\Sigma_0\|^2}\right\} & \text{if } \epsilon \leq \frac{2\|\Sigma_0\|^2 \sqrt{d}}{\mu}, \\ 2d \exp\left\{-\frac{\mu \epsilon n}{16\sqrt{d}\|\Sigma_0\|}\right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $n \geq 8 \log(\frac{2d}{\delta})$ then $\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq \frac{4\|\Sigma_0\|}{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{2d}{n} \log(\frac{2d}{\delta})}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

4.3. *Finite sample bounds for spectral sums.* Theorem 4.6 shows that concentration of the Bregman estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ around the true value θ_0 is driven by $d, n, \|\Sigma_0\|$, and μ . We will now show how to further bound μ for our specific examples.

PROPOSITION 4.7. Suppose A_1, \dots, A_d forms an orthonormal basis of the linear space $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$. Suppose $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is of the form $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ with ϕ twice continuously differentiable. If there is an $\ell > 0$ such that

$$(19) \quad \frac{\phi'(a) - \phi'(b)}{a - b} \leq \frac{\ell}{2}(\phi''(a) + \phi''(b)) \quad \text{for all } a \geq b > 0.$$

Then \overline{M} is $\frac{1}{\alpha\ell}$ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball, where $\alpha = \max_{\|\omega\| \leq \epsilon} \|\phi''(\Sigma(\theta_0 + \omega))\|$.

Proposition 4.7 reduced everything to finding α and ℓ . We now briefly present how this result can be used in our three leading examples.

(A) *Linear covariance models.* In this case, $F_B(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ with $\phi(x) = x^2/2$ for $x > 0$, and condition (19) holds with $\ell = 1$. Moreover, $\phi''(x) = 1$ and so $\alpha = \|I_m\| = 1$. By Proposition 4.7, for every $\epsilon > 0$, \overline{M} is μ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball with $\mu = 1$. By Theorem 4.6, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $n \geq 8 \log(\frac{2d}{\delta})$ then

$$\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq 4\|\Sigma_0\| \sqrt{\frac{2d}{n} \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}.$$

(B) *Inverse covariance models.* In this case $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ with $\phi(x) = -\log(x)$ for $x > 0$ and $L = -\Sigma^{-1}$. As for linear covariance models, condition (19) holds with $\ell = 1$. Since

$\phi''(x) = 1/x^2$, $\phi''(\Sigma) = \Sigma^{-2} = L^2$ and we need a bound on $\alpha = \max_{\|\omega\| \leq \epsilon} \|L^2(\theta_0 + \omega)\|$. We have

$$\|L^2(\theta_0 + \omega)\| = \|L(\theta_0 + \omega)\|^2 = \|L_0 + L(\omega)\|^2 \leq (\|L_0\| + \|L(\omega)\|)^2.$$

We also have that $\max_{\|\omega\| \leq \epsilon} \|L(\omega)\| \leq \max_{\|\omega\| \leq \epsilon} \|L(\omega)\|_F \leq \epsilon$ and thus $\alpha \leq (\|L_0\| + \epsilon)^2$. It follows that \overline{M} is μ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball with

$$\mu = \frac{1}{\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{(\|L_0\| + \epsilon)^2} = \frac{\lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma_0)}{(1 + \epsilon\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_0))^2}.$$

By Theorem 4.6, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $n \geq 8 \log(\frac{2d}{\delta})$ then

$$\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq \frac{4\|\Sigma_0\|(1 + \epsilon\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_0))^2}{\lambda_{\min}^2(\Sigma_0)} \sqrt{\frac{2d}{n} \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}.$$

(C) *Models linear in the matrix logarithm.* In this case $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ with $\phi(x) = x \log(x) - x$ for $x > 0$ and $L = \log(\Sigma)$. As for previous two cases, condition (19) holds with $\ell = 1$. Since $\phi''(x) = 1/x$, $\phi''(\Sigma) = \Sigma^{-1} = e^{-L}$ and we get

$$(20) \quad \|e^{-L(\theta_0 + \omega)}\| \leq e^{\|L_0 + L(\omega)\|} \leq e^{\|L_0\| + \|L(\omega)\|}$$

and so $\alpha \leq e^{\|L_0\| + \epsilon}$. To explain the first inequality in (20), denote the eigenvalues of $L(\theta_0 + \omega)$ by $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m$. Then $\|e^{-L(\theta_0 + \omega)}\| = e^{-\lambda_m}$. On the other hand, $\|L(\theta_0 + \omega)\| = \|L(\theta) + L(\omega)\|$ is equal to $\max\{|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_m|\}$. The second inequality follows from the triangle inequality. It then follows that \overline{M} is μ -concave in the ϵ -ball with

$$\mu \geq \frac{1}{e^{\|L_0\| + \epsilon}} = \frac{1}{e^\epsilon \|\Sigma_0\|}.$$

By Theorem 4.6, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $n \geq 8 \log(\frac{2d}{\delta})$ then

$$\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq 4\|\Sigma_0\|^2 e^\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{2d}{n} \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}.$$

5. Mixed convex constraints. It is evident that our analysis extends to models defined by arbitrary (closed) convex restrictions in $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$, preserving the convex nature of the problem stated in equation (9). However, in certain scenarios a portion of the restrictions may be easier expressed in Σ , while another part is better represented in L . We now explore how to handle such situations and present several theoretical implications. Our findings heavily rely on the geometric considerations underlying the mixed parametrization in exponential families [Barndorff-Nielsen \(1978\)](#), as well as the study of the mixed convex exponential family setup of [Lauritzen and Zwiernik \(2022\)](#). Additionally, we provide new, more direct proofs of relevant geometric statements, aiming to make this theory more accessible.

5.1. Mixed parametrization. Consider a split of $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m$ into two parts Σ_A and Σ_B and the corresponding split $L = (L_A, L_B)$. For instance, Σ_A could consist of all the diagonal entries of Σ and Σ_B be the off-diagonal entries. In this section, we consider models that are given by convex restrictions on Σ_A and L_B . We start by discussing some motivating examples.

EXAMPLE 5.1. Lauritzen and Zwiernik (2022) discussed a general family of such examples in the case when $L = -\Sigma^{-1}$. Their main motivation was to study Gaussian graphical models, given by zero restrictions on some entries of L , together with nonnegativity restrictions on the complementary entries of Σ . This framework leads to a natural notion of positive dependence for Gaussian graphical models. Additionally, a similar setting can be employed to test the equality of two Gaussian distributions within a given graphical model, as described in Example 3.6 in Lauritzen and Zwiernik (2022); see also Djordjilović et al. (2018).

EXAMPLE 5.2. Doubly Markov Gaussian models are defined by zero restrictions on Σ and $L = -\Sigma^{-1}$; Boege et al. (2023). Models of this form were first discussed by Pearl and Wermuth (1994) in the context of Gaussian directed acyclic graph (DAG) models. In particular, $(\Sigma^{-1})_{ij} = 0$ if i and j are not connected by an arrow and they have no common child in G . Similarly, $(\Sigma)_{ij} = 0$ if i and j are not connected by an arrow and they have no common ancestor in G . This shows that zeros in Σ and Σ^{-1} carry information about the underlying graph. In Section 9, we briefly motivate in this context also models with zeros in higher powers of Σ^{-1} .

EXAMPLE 5.3. Modelling correlations is used commonly in econometric GARCH models. In a recent paper, Archakov and Hansen (2021) considered a model in which $\Sigma_{ii} = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and potential further linear restrictions are imposed on the off-diagonal entries of $L = \log \Sigma$. Another example of this kind, is to consider correlation matrices with zero restrictions on some off-diagonal entries of their inverse.

For a given subset of entries of a symmetric matrix, we consider the projection of the positive definite cone on those entries

$$(\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A := \{\Sigma_A : \Sigma = (\Sigma_A, \Sigma_B) \in \mathbb{S}_+^m\}.$$

We have a similar definition for $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \nabla F(\mathbb{S}_+^m)$

$$(\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B := \{L_B : L = (L_A, L_B) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m\}.$$

THEOREM 5.4. *Let $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ be essentially smooth with $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$. Then there is a one-to-one map between $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $(\Sigma_A, L_B) \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A \times (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$.*

This result is essentially Theorem 5.34 in Barndorff-Nielsen (1978) but the assumption that $\text{dom}(F)$ is open is replaced with the assumption that F is essentially smooth. Our proof is also more direct than Barndorff-Nielsen (1978).

PROOF. Fix any $\bar{\Sigma}_A \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A$ and any $\bar{L}_B \in (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$. Let $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ be any element such that $S_A = \bar{\Sigma}_A$. Consider the problem: minimize $D(S, L)$ subject to the linear restrictions $L_B = \bar{L}_B$ on L . By Theorem 3.12, this problem has a unique optimum $\hat{\Sigma}$ with $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$ that satisfies the KKT conditions: $\hat{\Sigma}_A = S_A = \bar{\Sigma}_A$ and $\hat{L}_B = \bar{L}_B$. This shows that every $(\bar{\Sigma}_A, \bar{L}_B) \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A \times (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$ can be associated to a unique $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. It is now enough to show that every $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ is an image of some $(\bar{\Sigma}_A, \bar{L}_B) \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A \times (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$, but this is clear: take $\bar{\Sigma}_A = \hat{\Sigma}_A$ and $\bar{L}_B = \hat{L}_B$. \square

Like in the standard exponential families, the most surprising part of this result is the following conclusion.

COROLLARY 5.5 (Variational independence). *Assume conditions of Theorem 5.4 and let $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, $\bar{L} \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$ be arbitrary. There exists a unique positive definite matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ that agrees with S on A -entries and such that $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma})$ agrees with \bar{L} on the B -entries.*

REMARK 5.6. Note that the proof of Theorem 5.4 gives the procedure to obtain the unique $\hat{\Sigma}$ in Corollary 5.5. For the given $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $\bar{L} \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$ minimize $D(S, L)$ subject to $L_B = \bar{L}_B$. Thus, $\hat{\Sigma}$ can be found using any numerical procedure that solves this problem; see Section 6.

For general $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ the conclusion of Theorem 5.4 does not hold. A counterexample can be recovered from Example 3.13. Take $\Sigma_A = (\Sigma_{11}, \Sigma_{22}, \Sigma_{33}, \Sigma_{12}, \Sigma_{23})$ and $L_B = L_{13}$. Take Σ to be S_n from Example 3.13 and let L be the identity matrix. The corresponding (Σ_A, L_B) is the matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$ in Example 3.13 but this one is *not* positive definite. Perhaps it is also useful to see explicitly how this result works in a smaller example when Theorem 5.4 can be applied.

EXAMPLE 5.7. Consider example (A) with $\nabla F_A(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-1}$. Let $m = 2$ and consider the split $\Sigma_A = (\Sigma_{11}, \Sigma_{22})$, $L_B = -(\Sigma^{-1})_{12}$. Here $(\mathbb{S}_+^2)_A = (0, \infty)^2$ and $(\mathbb{S}_+^2)_B = \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $\Sigma_{11} = \Sigma_{22} = 1$ and denote $x = \Sigma_{12}$ and $y = (\Sigma^{-1})_{12}$. The claim is that y can be chosen arbitrarily but here it follows clearly because $y = -x/(1 - x^2)$ is a one-to-one mapping from $(-1, 1)$ to \mathbb{R} .

It is interesting to note that we also have the equivalent of likelihood orthogonality; see Proposition 3.20 in Sundberg (2019). In our setting, fixing the mixed parametrization (Σ_A, L_B) , the claim is that $\nabla_{\Sigma_A} \nabla_{L_B} D(S, L)$ is zero, namely, the Hessian of the Bregman divergence, when expressed in this parametrization, is block diagonal. This follows because $\nabla_{L_B} D(S_n, L) = \nabla_{L_B} F^*(L) - S_B = \Sigma_B - S_B$ and $\nabla_{\Sigma_A} (\Sigma_B - S_B) = 0$ by variational independence.

5.2. Unrestricted parametrization of correlation matrices. Motivated by temporal modelling of correlation matrices, Archakov and Hansen (2021) studied ways to map the set of correlation matrices in \mathbb{S}_+^m into a Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{m(m-1)/2}$. It is not immediately obvious that such a mapping exists but the fact that $\log \Sigma$ maps \mathbb{S}_+^m to \mathbb{S}^m suggested a natural strategy. Their main result states that for any selection of the off-diagonal entries of $L \in \mathbb{S}^m$ there is a unique correlation matrix R such that $L = \log R$.

Our first observation is that this result is a special case of Theorem 5.4. Indeed, $F_C \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth and so this theorem applies. Take Σ_A to be the vector containing the diagonal entries of Σ and L_B to be the vector containing the off-diagonal entries of $L = \log(\Sigma)$. Then there is a one-to-one map from $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ to $(\Sigma_A, L_B) \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A \times (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$. In particular, we can fix $\Sigma_A \in (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A$ to be the vector of ones and $L_B \in (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$ to be an arbitrary real vector to get Theorem 1 in Archakov and Hansen (2021). In this case $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \mathbb{S}^m$ and so

$$(21) \quad (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A = (0, \infty)^m \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B = \mathbb{R}^{m(m-1)/2}.$$

Note that the essential part of the above construction was not that $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \mathbb{S}^m$ (which motivated using the matrix logarithm) but that $(\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B = \mathbb{R}^{m(m-1)/2}$. This latter condition can be obtained for much simpler transformations. Indeed, when $L = -\Sigma^{-1}$ as in Example (A), it is always possible to choose the off-diagonal entries arbitrarily and adjust the diagonal entries to ensure the negative definiteness of L . Consequently, despite the fact that $\mathbb{L}_+^m = -\mathbb{S}_+^m$, we find that $(\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B = \mathbb{R}^{m(m-1)/2}$, which implies that the off-diagonal entries of the matrix inverse serves as an unconstrained parameterization for correlation matrices.

COROLLARY 5.8. *For any choice of the off-diagonal entries there exists a unique correlation matrix R whose inverse has precisely these off-diagonal entries.*

A clear advantage of working with the inverse, rather than with the matrix logarithm, is that this is a well-understood algebraic map with efficient methods to compute it. Explicit numerical procedures are provided in [Améndola and Zwiernik \(2021\)](#); [Llorens-Terrazas and Brownlees \(2022\)](#). To see how it works, let \mathcal{L} be the set of all $L \in \mathbb{S}^m$ with fixed off-diagonal entries L_B . Then \mathcal{L}^\perp is the set of matrices with zeros on the diagonal. Take A_0 to be any matrix in \mathcal{L} and $S_n = I_m$. Solving the dual problem in Proposition 3.8 with $F(\Sigma) = -\log \det(\Sigma)$ we obtain the unique $\hat{\Sigma}$ with ones on the diagonal and such that $\hat{L} \in \mathcal{L}$.

5.3. Estimation under mixed convex constraints. Suppose now that we fix closed convex restrictions \mathcal{C}_A on Σ_A and closed convex restrictions \mathcal{C}_B on L_B . Thus, the model is given by

$$(22) \quad \{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m : \Sigma_A \in \mathcal{C}_A \cap (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A \text{ and } L_B \in \mathcal{C}_B \cap (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B\}.$$

We propose the following 2-step method to fit a model given by convex restriction on Σ_A and convex restrictions on L_B .

(S1) Minimize the Bregman divergence $D_F(S_n, L) = F(S_n) + F^*(L) - \langle L, S_n \rangle$ subject to $L_B \in \mathcal{C}_B \cap (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$. This is a convex optimization problem and denote the corresponding unique optimizer (if it exists) by \hat{L} .

(S2) Given \hat{L} , minimize the Bregman divergence $D_F(\Sigma, \hat{L}) = F(\Sigma) + F^*(\hat{L}) - \langle \hat{L}, \Sigma \rangle$ subject to $\Sigma_A \in \mathcal{C}_A \cap (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A$. This is again a convex optimization problem and denote the corresponding minimizer (if it exists) by $\check{\Sigma}$.

It is clear immediately by construction that $\check{\Sigma}_A$ satisfies the given constraints on Σ_A . We also have the following, perhaps more surprising, result, which shows that $\check{\Sigma}$ satisfies both the restrictions on Σ_A and on L_B .

PROPOSITION 5.9. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth. Let \hat{L} and $\check{\Sigma}$ be as defined above and assume \hat{L} and $L = \nabla F(\check{\Sigma})$ both lie in \mathbb{L}_+^m . Then $\check{L}_B = \hat{L}_B \in \mathcal{C}_B \cap (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$. In other words, $\check{\Sigma}$ lies in the model (22).*

PROOF. If the optimum $\check{\Sigma}$ in (S2) exists, by convexity of the function and the underlying set $\mathcal{C}_A \cap (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A$, $\check{\Sigma}$ must satisfy the KKT conditions

$$\langle \check{L} - \hat{L}, \Sigma - \check{\Sigma} \rangle \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \Sigma \text{ s.t. } \Sigma_A \in \mathcal{C}_A.$$

Since \mathbb{S}_+^m is open, a small perturbation $\check{\Sigma} + T$ also lies in \mathbb{S}_+^m . Assuming that $T_A = 0$ we can even conclude that $\check{\Sigma}_A + T_A \in \mathcal{C}_A \cap (\mathbb{S}_+^m)_A$. Since T with $T_A = 0$ is small but otherwise arbitrary, we conclude that $\check{L}_B = \hat{L}_B$. Moreover, $\hat{L}_B \in \mathcal{C}_B \cap (\mathbb{L}_+^m)_B$ because \hat{L} solves (S1). This concludes the proof. \square

According to Proposition 5.9, our procedure yields a point satisfying both types of constraints by solving two convex problems (S1) and (S2). Some statistical properties of the corresponding estimator can also be obtained following Section 4 above and Section 6 in [Lauritzen and Zwiernik \(2022\)](#). Let the Bregman estimator (BE) be the estimator $\check{\Sigma}$ obtained by minimizing the Bregman divergence $D_F(S_n, \Sigma)$ subject to $\Sigma_A \in \mathcal{C}_A$ and $L_B \in \mathcal{C}_B$ (this is in general a non-convex optimization problem). In a way analogous to Theorem 6.1 in

Lauritzen and Zwiernik (2022) and with essentially the same proof, we expect that the estimations $\tilde{\Sigma}_n$ and $\check{\Sigma}_n$ are asymptotically equivalent, in the sense that $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\Sigma}_n - \check{\Sigma}_n) = o_P(1)$. The importance of this comes from the fact that the Bregman estimator is an M-estimator and so its asymptotics under general restrictions is quite well understood Geyer (1994).

6. Numerical optimization. In this section we discuss numerical strategies to solve the problem (9) or the dual problem (12). In the specific example when $F(\Sigma) = -\log \det \Sigma$ there exist numerous approaches including coordinate descent and block-coordinate algorithms. Here we focus on general purpose solutions.

6.1. Projected gradient descent. In general, the second order information is hard to obtain for most choices of F (c.f. Lewis and Sendov (2001)). We thus first discuss a first-order method. The simplest solution is to perform the projected gradient descent algorithm for the dual problem (12): minimize $F(\Sigma) - \langle A_0, \Sigma \rangle$ subject to $\Sigma - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$. Note that if \mathcal{L} is a linear subspace, we can take $A_0 = 0$, which simplifies the formulas below.

We initiate the algorithm at $\Sigma^{(0)} = S_n$, which is dually feasible at least as long as $S_n \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. The gradient of $F(\Sigma) - \langle A_0, \Sigma \rangle$ is $L - A_0$. Denote by $\Pi_{\mathcal{L}}^\perp(L - A_0)$ the orthogonal projection of $L - A_0 \in \mathbb{S}^m$ to \mathcal{L}^\perp . We move from $\Sigma^{(t)}$ to $\Sigma^{(t+1)}$ using the formula

$$\Sigma^{(t+1)} = \Sigma^{(t)} - s_t \Pi_{\mathcal{L}}^\perp(L^{(t)} - A_0).$$

If $\Sigma^{(t)}$ is feasible, that is, if $\Sigma^{(t)} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$ then $\Sigma^{(t+1)}$ is also feasible and so the algorithm produces a sequence of feasible points. We can set the step size s_t using backtracking, assuring in this way that the value of the function increases at each step. Since F is strictly convex, this algorithm eventually converges to the optimum. This follows from the fact that the projected gradient descent is a special case of proximal gradient algorithms; see Section 10.4 in Beck (2017) for relevant results.

Alternatively, it is possible to solve the primal problem (9). We start by any feasible $L^{(0)} \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$. Then, at each iterate $L^{(t)}$, we project the gradient $-\Sigma^{(t)} + S_n$ onto \mathcal{L} . We denote this projection by $\Pi_{\mathcal{L}}$. Then we move

$$(23) \quad L^{(t+1)} = L^{(t)} - s_t \Pi_{\mathcal{L}}(\Sigma^{(t)} - S_n).$$

Again, the step size can be chosen using backtracking. Note that here in some situations finding a feasible starting point L_0 may be problematic.

The main bottleneck in all these cases is that in each step we need to map between Σ and L . This requires computing the spectral decomposition and so the complexity at each step is at least $O(m^3)$, which may be prohibitive if m is very large. In the special case, when $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ is a spectral sum, Han, Avron and Shin (2018) proposed to study the stochastic gradient descent based on stochastic truncation of the Chebyshev expansion of F (or its conjugate). This and other techniques to approximate F are discussed in Section 4.4 of Higham (2008).

6.2. Iterative Bregman projection. Another possible approach is to employ an iterative projection algorithm as discussed by Bauschke and Borwein (1997); Dhillon and Tropp (2008), which is structurally similar to iterative proportional scaling in exponential families. Observe that, by Theorem 3.7, the minimizer of $D_F(S, L)$ over the hyperplane H given by $\langle B, L \rangle = c$ must satisfy $\hat{\Sigma} - S = \lambda B$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Equivalently, we can solve the one-dimensional problem

$$(24) \quad \text{minimize } F(S + \lambda B) - \lambda c \quad \text{such that } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Suppose now that $\mathcal{L} = \bigcap_{i=1}^k H_i$, where H_i is a hyperplane $\langle B_i, L \rangle = c_i$. We could iteratively “project” on H_1, \dots, H_k by minimizing the Bregman divergence to each H_i . Thus, we could run an iterative algorithm that starts with $\Sigma^{(0)} = S$ and, for $t \geq 0$,

$$L^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{L \in H_i} D_F(\Sigma^{(t)}, L), \quad \Sigma^{(t+1)} = \nabla F^*(L^{(t+1)}),$$

or, equivalently,

$$(25) \quad \lambda^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} F(\Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda B_i) - \lambda c_i, \quad \Sigma^{(t+1)} = \Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda^{(t+1)} B_i,$$

where i cycles around $\{1, \dots, k\}$ in some, potentially random, order. The following result justifies this algorithm.

PROPOSITION 6.1 (Theorem 8.1, [Bauschke and Borwein \(1997\)](#)). *Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth and $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. If $\text{dom}(F) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$ then the algorithm in (25) converges to the global optimum of (9).*

EXAMPLE 6.2. For illustration, we show how this could be used in the case when $F(\Sigma) = -\log \det(\Sigma) + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)$, which we motivate later in Proposition 9.1. Fix a graph G with nodes $\{1, \dots, m\}$ and consider the linear space

$$\mathcal{L}_G = \{L \in \mathbb{S}^m : L_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j \text{ and } ij \notin E\}.$$

In this case the hyperplanes on which we project are defined by $c = 0$ and $B = e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top$ for $i \neq j$ and $ij \notin G$. In the t -th iteration we try to minimize $F(\Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top))$ with respect to $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $A = \{i, j\}$ and $C = \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i, j\}$. We write $\Sigma_{A|C} := \Sigma_{A,A} - \Sigma_{A,C} \Sigma_{C,C}^{-1} \Sigma_{C,A}$. It is useful to observe that standard Schur complement arguments give that

$$\det(\Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top)) = \det(\Sigma_{C,C}^{(t)}) \cdot \det\left(\Sigma_{A|C}^{(t)} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ \lambda & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top))^2) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}((\Sigma^{(t)})^2) + 2\lambda \Sigma_{ij}^{(t)} + \lambda^2.$$

Denote $W = \Sigma_{A|C}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{S}^2$. Then

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} F(\Sigma^{(t)} + \lambda(e_i e_j^\top + e_j e_i^\top)) = \frac{2\lambda + 2W_{12}}{\det(W) - 2\lambda W_{12} - \lambda^2} + 2\Sigma_{ij}^{(t)} + 2\lambda.$$

Equating this to zero results in a cubic polynomial equation, which can be solved exactly. By convexity of the problem, there may be only one real solution $\hat{\lambda}$ that leads to positive definite $\Sigma^{(t+1)}$. The condition is simple to check: $W_{11}W_{22} > (W_{12} + \hat{\lambda})^2$.

7. Sparsity and positive definite completion. One important concept that has been extensively studied in high-dimensional statistics is sparsity [Hastie, Tibshirani and Wainwright \(2015\)](#). In the context of covariance matrix estimation, Gaussian graphical models have proven to be particularly successful [Lauritzen \(1996\)](#). It is customary to encode the sparsity pattern by a graph G with m nodes and edge set E . We denote the corresponding linear subspace by \mathcal{L}_G :

$$\mathcal{L}_G := \{L \in \mathbb{S}^m : L_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } ij \notin E\}.$$

Note that we can take $A_0 = 0$ in this case and \mathcal{L}_G^\perp is given by zero restrictions on the complementary entries of L .

EXAMPLE 7.1 (Gaussian graphical models). The multivariate Gaussian distribution $N_m(0, \Sigma)$ forms an exponential family with canonical parameter $K = \Sigma^{-1}$. Given a sample X_1, \dots, X_n from this model, the sufficient statistics is $S_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top$. Denote the entries of S_n by S_{ij} . For a given graph G , the Gaussian graphical model is given by imposing zero restrictions on some off-diagonal entries of $K = \Sigma^{-1}$

$$M(G) = \{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m : (\Sigma^{-1})_{ij} = 0 \text{ for } ij \notin E\}.$$

Gaussian graphical models have made a significant impact on multivariate statistics and are commonly used even for non-Gaussian data. The elegant SKEPTIC approach introduced by Liu et al. (2012) allows to extend the Gaussian setting to Gaussian copulas with minimal loss of efficiency and no loss of interpretability. Gaussian graphical models are also routinely employed beyond this favourable scenario. In such cases, the Gaussian log-likelihood is considered as a suitable loss function, and the zero restrictions correspond to conditional independence assumptions, albeit under the assumption of linear conditional independence. Interestingly, as demonstrated in Rossell and Zwiernik (2021), some distributional settings, such as elliptical distributions, preserve certain non-linear conditional independence information when partial correlations vanish.

Zero restrictions on Σ have also been explored in the literature, leading to the covariance graph model Pearl and Wermuth (1994); Kauermann (1996); Chaudhuri, Drton and Richardson (2007); Drton and Richardson (2008). More recently, zero restrictions on $\log(\Sigma)$ have been considered in Battey (2017, 2019); Rybak and Battey (2021), with additional geometric motivations presented in Pavlov (2023). All of these models fall under the category of entropic models. We discuss yet another example.

EXAMPLE 7.2 (Spatial autoregressive model (SAR)). This example is adapted from LeSage and Pace (2007). Consider the spatial autoregression model: $Sy = S\beta + \varepsilon$, where the vector y contains m observations on the dependent variable, each associated with one region or point in space. The matrix X represents $m \times k$ full column rank matrix of constants, which correspond to observations of k independent variables for each region. We assume $\varepsilon \sim N_m(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$. The vector β is the vector of parameters. In the SAR model, the matrix S takes the form $S = I_m - \rho D$, where D represents $m \times m$ nonnegative spatial weight matrix and ρ reflects the magnitude of spatial dependence. If i -th unit interacts with the j -th unit in some meaningful way, they are called neighbours, which defined a graph G with m nodes. It is typically assumed that D is symmetric and $D_{ij} = 0$ for units that are not neighbours. Note that in this model the covariance matrix of y takes the form $\Sigma = \sigma^2 (I_m - \rho D)^{-2}$. As a result $\Sigma^{-1/2} \in \mathcal{L}_G$. The corresponding entropic covariance model is generated by $F(\Sigma) = -2 \text{tr}(\sqrt{\Sigma})$ with $L = \nabla F(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-1/2}$; in Table 1 we see that this is the dual construction to one of our running examples $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1})$.

The next result follows from Corollary 3.8.

PROPOSITION 7.3. *Let S_n be the sample covariance matrix and consider the problem of maximizing $\mathcal{J}_n(L) = F^*(L) - \langle S, L \rangle$ subject to $L \in \mathcal{L}_G \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$. The dual problem is to minimize $F(\Sigma)$ subject to $\Sigma_{ij} = S_{ij}$ for all $ij \in E$.*

EXAMPLE 7.4. Suppose $m = 3$ and suppose that $L_{13} = 0$ is the only constraint defining \mathcal{L}_G . Let $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^3$ be given by

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 4 & 3 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad G = \overset{1}{\bullet} - \overset{2}{\bullet} - \overset{3}{\bullet} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 & ? \\ 1 & 4 & 3 \\ ? & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Proposition 7.3, irrespective of the form of F , the Bregman estimator $\hat{\Sigma}$ is equal to S on all the entries apart from the entries (1, 3) and (3, 1). The KKT conditions require that

$$(\nabla F(\hat{\Sigma}))_{13} = 0.$$

We now show how this equation can be solved for our four running examples together with the new example $F_E(\Sigma) = F_A(\Sigma) + F_B(\Sigma)$ introduced later in Proposition 9.1. For $\nabla F_A = -\Sigma^{-1}$ we get $\hat{\Sigma}_{13} = S_{12}S_{22}^{-1}S_{23} = \frac{3}{4}$. For $\nabla F_B(\Sigma) = \Sigma$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{13} = 0$ as the resulting $\hat{\Sigma}$ is positive definite (c.f. Example 3.13). If $F(\Sigma)$ is the negative von Neumann divergence, we need to rely on numerical computations developed in Section 6 obtaining

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} 4.0000 & 1.0000 & \mathbf{0.4298} \\ 1.0000 & 4.0000 & 3.0000 \\ \mathbf{0.4298} & 3.0000 & 4.0000 \end{bmatrix} \quad \hat{L} = \log(\hat{\Sigma}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.3520 & 0.2721 & \mathbf{0.0000} \\ 0.2721 & 0.9305 & 0.9806 \\ \mathbf{0.0000} & 0.9806 & 0.9695 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $\nabla F_D(\Sigma) = -\Sigma^{-2}$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{13} = \frac{1}{3}(64 - \sqrt{3754}) \approx 0.91$. Finally, for $\nabla F_E(\Sigma) = \Sigma - \Sigma^{-1}$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{13} \approx 0.105$.

8. Jordan algebras. In this section we cover a set of particularly nice linear constraints with some history in covariance matrix estimation. This allows us to recognize various scattered results in a unifying way. We start with a definition; see Jensen (1988).

DEFINITION 8.1. A linear space $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$ is called a Jordan algebra of symmetric matrices if

$$(26) \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{L} \quad \frac{1}{2}(AB + BA) \in \mathcal{L}.$$

For a Jordan algebra \mathcal{L} , if $A \in \mathcal{L}$ then $A^2 \in \mathcal{L}$ (or $A^n \in \mathcal{L}$ in general for $n \geq 1$). This condition is in fact equivalent to (26) by the fact that \mathcal{L} is a linear subspace and by the identity $AB + BA = (A + B)^2 - A^2 - B^2$.

To motivate Jordan algebras in statistics we provide the following examples.

EXAMPLE 8.2. Consider the correlation model with an additional restriction that all off-diagonal entries are equal to each other. This is known as the equicorrelation model Améndola and Zwiernik (2021). In Proposition 2 of Archakov and Hansen (2021), it was shown that the logarithm of an equicorrelation matrix has equal off-diagonal entries. This result is a special case of Proposition 8.5 by observing that the set of matrices with equal diagonal entries and equal off-diagonal entries forms a Jordan algebra.

There is a natural way to generalize this example.

EXAMPLE 8.3. Let \mathcal{S}_m be the symmetric group on $\{1, \dots, m\}$, which we identify with the set of permutation matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Fix a subgroup $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_m$ and consider the set

$$\{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m : U\Sigma U^\top = \Sigma \text{ for all } U \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

This set of restrictions has been studied as the RCOP model in Højsgaard and Lauritzen (2008). In the case when $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{S}_m$ we get matrices whose all diagonal elements and all off-diagonal elements are equal.

Another simple example, discussed by Chiu, Leonard and Tsui (1996), is when $\mathcal{L} = \{\alpha I_m + \beta U : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and U is an idempotent matrix ($U^2 = U$), or more generally, $U^2 = \gamma U$ for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Szatrowski (2004) also gives an overview of interesting linear restrictions that correspond to Jordan algebras and motivates them statistically; see also Rubin and Szatrowski (1982). The following example, motivated by spatial modelling, is also interesting.

EXAMPLE 8.4. Recall the spatial autoregressive model (SAR) presented in Example 7.2. The main motivation in [LeSage and Pace \(2007\)](#) was to come up with a version of this model, which is easier to handle statistically and computationally. Their starting observation was that in practice of SAR modelling the matrix D is row normalized so that $D\mathbf{1}_m = \mathbf{1}_m$. Row-stochastic spatial weight matrices have a long history of application in spatial statistics; e.g. [Ord \(1975\)](#). Consider the subspace

$$\mathcal{L} = \{L \in \mathbb{S}^m : \exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \text{ s.t. } L\mathbf{1}_m = \alpha\mathbf{1}_m\}.$$

This \mathcal{L} satisfies conditions of Proposition 8.5. Note that

$$(I_m - \rho D)^{-1} = I_m + \sum_{n \geq 1} \rho^n D^n.$$

In the MESS model of [LeSage and Pace \(2007\)](#), the matrix $S = (I_m - \rho D)$ in usual SAR formulation is replaced with the matrix exponential $\exp(-\alpha D)$, for $\alpha > 0$, in which case

$$(\exp(-\alpha D))^{-1} = \exp(\alpha D) = I_m + \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\alpha^n}{n!} D^n,$$

which corresponds to exponential decrease of influence for higher-order neighbors. Note that the MESS model assumes $\log \Sigma \in \mathcal{L}_G \cap \mathcal{L}$. The fact that \mathcal{L} is a Jordan algebra, greatly simplifies computations.

Szatrowski showed in a series of papers [Szatrowski \(1978, 1980, 2004\)](#) that the MLE for linear Gaussian covariance models has an explicit representation, i.e., it is a known linear combination of entries of the sample covariance matrix, if and only if \mathcal{L} forms a Jordan algebra. Furthermore, Szatrowski proved that for this restrictive model class the MLE is given in the closed form. We will generalize this result here by first generalizing the main result of [Jensen \(1988\)](#).

PROPOSITION 8.5. *Suppose $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ takes the form $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ with ϕ analytic on $(0, +\infty)$. Suppose \mathcal{L} is a linear subspace which satisfies (26) and $I_m \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\Sigma \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{S}_+^m$ if and only if $L = \nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m$.*

PROOF. Since ϕ is analytic on $(0, +\infty)$, ϕ' is also analytic and we can take its series expansion around 1:

$$\phi'(x) = \sum_{n \geq 0} c_n (x - 1)^n \quad \text{for some } c_n \in \mathbb{R}, n \geq 0.$$

In consequence, if $\Sigma \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and \mathcal{L} satisfies (26) with $I_m \in \mathcal{L}$ then $(\Sigma - I_m)^n \in \mathcal{L}$ for all $n \geq 1$ and so

$$\nabla F(\Sigma) = \phi'(\Sigma) = c_0 I_m + \sum_{n \geq 1} c_n (\Sigma - I_m)^n \in \mathcal{L} \cap \mathbb{L}_+^m.$$

This shows the right implication. For the left implication we use the fact that $\phi''(x) > 0$ (strict convexity) and so ϕ' is strictly increasing. The inverse of ϕ' is also analytic by the Lagrange Inversion Theorem (e.g. Theorem 5.4.2 of [Stanley \(2023\)](#)). Now we can apply exactly the same argument as above to the inverse of ϕ' . \square

REMARK 8.6. If \mathcal{L} forms a Jordan algebra and $I_m \in \mathcal{L}$, then we also do not have to worry about the statistical interpretability of the linear restrictions on $L = \nabla F(\Sigma)$ because they are exactly equivalent to the same linear restrictions on Σ .

This is how Jordan algebra structure leads to trivial estimation procedures.

PROPOSITION 8.7. *Suppose that $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ and $\mathbb{L}_+^m = \nabla F(\mathbb{S}_+^m)$ is open. If \mathcal{L} is a Jordan algebra and $I_m \in \mathcal{L}$, then the optimum in (9) is given in a closed form: $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma})$, where $\hat{\Sigma}$ is the orthogonal projection of S_n on \mathcal{L} .*

PROOF. By Theorem 3.7, the optimum in (9), if it exists, is uniquely given by the pair $(\hat{\Sigma}, \hat{L}) \in \mathbb{S}_+^m \times \mathbb{L}_+^m$ with $\hat{L} = \nabla F(\hat{\Sigma})$ satisfying (11): $\hat{L} \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\hat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$. Since \mathcal{L} is a Jordan algebra and $I_m \in \mathcal{L}$, by Proposition 8.5, equivalently $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{L}$. But the condition $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\hat{\Sigma} - S_n \in \mathcal{L}^\perp$ says exactly that $\hat{\Sigma}$ is an orthogonal projection of S_n onto \mathcal{L} . \square

9. Discussion. In this paper we presented a flexible family of models for covariance matrices together with a canonical estimation procedure. We presented that this setting brings new insights into the geometry of covariance matrices, which can be applied to design new statistical procedures. To conclude the paper, we briefly outline some of the questions that immediately arise for future work.

Unrestricted parametrizations of covariance matrices. The main motivation for using the matrix logarithm transformation in Chiu, Leonard and Tsui (1996) was that it maps \mathbb{S}_+^m bijectively to \mathbb{S}^m . Using our geometric insights, we can easily provide a tractable alternative for this transformation; an algebraic map ∇F for which $\nabla F(\mathbb{S}_+^m) = \mathbb{S}^m$.

PROPOSITION 9.1. *Consider the map $F(\Sigma) = -\log \det(\Sigma) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2)$ for any $\lambda > 0$. Then $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth and $\nabla F(\Sigma) = \lambda\Sigma - \Sigma^{-1}$ maps bijectively \mathbb{S}_+^m to \mathbb{S}^m .*

PROOF. The underlying function ϕ is $-\log(x) + \frac{\lambda}{2}x^2$ when $x > 0$ and $+\infty$ for all other x . It is strictly convex and differentiable in $(0, +\infty)$. Moreover, $\phi'(x) = \lambda x - 1/x$ and so $|\phi'(x)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow 0^+$. This shows that $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth. As ϕ maps $(0, +\infty)$ to \mathbb{R} , the result follows. \square

Natural exponential families for $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$: As suggested by one of the referees, this set-up implicitly leads to definition of a natural exponential family; see Theorem 4 in Banerjee et al. (2005). If $F \in \mathcal{E}^m$ is essentially smooth then we could study the family of distributions over $S \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ with density $p_L(S) = h(S) \exp\{\langle S, L \rangle - F^*(L)\}$. This could be particularly interesting in the case when both h and F^* are spectral sums.

Gaussian Bayesian networks. Consider a directed acyclic graph (DAG) G whose nodes represent components of the random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_m)$. We say that the distribution of X lies in a Gaussian linear structural model over G if

$$X_i = \sum_{j \rightarrow i \in G} \lambda_{ij} X_j + \varepsilon_i,$$

where $\lambda_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ and ε_i is independent of X_j for each parent j of i in G , and the ε_i 's are mutually independent. Denote by $\Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ the matrix with entries λ_{ij} if $j \rightarrow i$ in G and zero otherwise. Then the covariance matrix Σ of X satisfies $\Sigma = (I - \Lambda)^{-1} \Omega (I - \Lambda)^{-\top}$, where Ω is the diagonal covariance matrix of ε . Taking the inverse $K = \Sigma^{-1}$, we get $K = L \Omega^{-1} L^\top$ (see e.g. Proposition 2.1 in Sullivant, Talaska and Draisma (2010)), where $L = (I - \Lambda)^\top$, and so $L_{ij} = 0$ unless $i = j$ or $i \rightarrow j$ in the underlying DAG.

Looking at the second power of Σ^{-1} we see that

$$(K^2)_{ij} = (L\Omega^{-1}L^\top L\Omega^{-1}L^\top)_{ij} = \sum_{u,v,w} \frac{L_{iu}L_{vu}L_{vw}L_{jw}}{\Omega_{uu}\Omega_{ww}}.$$

In particular, $(K^2)_{ij} = 0$ if the graph does not contain a structure $i \rightarrow u \leftarrow v \rightarrow w \leftarrow j$ in G or any simpler structure obtained from this by contracting some of the arrows. We get a similar interpretation for higher powers of Σ^{-1} .

Acknowledgments. Special thanks go to the anonymous referees and the associate editor for many insightful suggestions. I would also like to thank Daniel Bernstein, Christian Brownlees, Hengchao Chen, Sean Dewar, Mathias Drton, Steven Gortler, Gábor Lugosi, Geert Mesters, Frank Röttger, Alex Valencia, and Jierui Zhu for helpful remarks. This research was supported by a grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC, RGPIN-2023-03481).

APPENDIX A: SPECTRAL FUNCTIONS

A.1. Basic convex analysis on \mathbb{R}^m . In this section we briefly review some basic and very streamlined results in convex analysis. We refer to [Rockafellar \(1970\)](#); [Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal \(2012\)](#) as good references for convex analysis. Chapter 5 of [Barndorff-Nielsen \(1978\)](#) provides an exposition of the most statistically-relevant results from [Rockafellar \(1970\)](#). Our discussion of Bregman divergences is closely related to [Bauschke and Borwein \(1997\)](#)

By $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ denote the set of convex function $f \in \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ that are not identically equal to $+\infty$ (those are sometimes called proper convex functions). The domain of $f \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the non-empty set $\text{dom}(f) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : f(x) < +\infty\}$. By $\overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ denote the class of functions in $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ that are lower semicontinuous on \mathbb{R}^m - these are also known as closed convex functions. Recall that f is lower semicontinuous if the lower level-set $\{x : f(x) \leq t\}$ is closed for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be any function that is not identically equal to $+\infty$. Suppose, in addition, that there is an affine function minorizing f on \mathbb{R}^m . If $f \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, this is automatically satisfied; see Proposition B1.2.1 in [Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal \(2012\)](#). The conjugate function f^* is defined for $s \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as

$$f^*(s) := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{\langle s, x \rangle - f(x)\}.$$

If f is minorized by $\langle s_0, x \rangle - b$, for some $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $f^*(s_0) \leq b$ and $f^*(s) > -\infty$ for all s because $\text{dom}(f) \neq \emptyset$. Thus $f^* : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and it is not equal to $+\infty$ everywhere. Since it is a pointwise supremum of linear functions, f^* is convex. In fact, $f^* \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ irrespective of whether f is convex. We actually have the following fundamental result: $f \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ if and only if $f = (f^*)^*$; Corollary E.1.3.6 in [Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal \(2012\)](#).

Note that, by definition, $f(x) + f^*(s) - \langle s, x \rangle \geq 0$ for every s, x . The conjugate function can be used to conveniently define the subdifferential of f at x for any $f \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^m)$

$$\partial f(x) := \{s \in \mathbb{R}^m : f(x) + f^*(s) - \langle s, x \rangle = 0\};$$

see Theorem E1.4.1 in [Hiriart-Urruty and Lemaréchal \(2012\)](#). Moreover, f is differentiable at x with gradient $\nabla f(x)$ if and only if $\partial f(x) = \{\nabla f(x)\}$ and if $x \notin \text{dom}(f)$ then $\partial f(x) = \emptyset$.

A.2. General results on spectral functions on \mathbb{S}^m . Establishing convexity of a general function $F : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and computing its gradient may be complicated. We note however that our running examples are spectral functions [Lewis \(1996a\)](#); [Watkins \(1974\)](#). For reader's convenience we briefly mention relevant results and definitions.

DEFINITION A.1. A function $F : \mathbb{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a spectral function if $F(U^\top \Sigma U) = F(\Sigma)$ for all $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m$ and orthogonal U . In particular, $F(\Sigma)$ depends on the eigenvalues of Σ only.

Associated with any spectral function is a symmetric real-valued function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Specifically, we define $f(\lambda) = F(\text{diag}(\lambda))$, where $\text{diag}(\lambda)$ is the diagonal matrix with $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ on the diagonal. Denote by $\lambda(\Sigma) = (\lambda_1(\Sigma), \dots, \lambda_m(\Sigma))$ the spectrum of Σ in a decreasing order. The spectral functions are precisely those of the form $F(\Sigma) = F(\text{diag}(\lambda(\Sigma))) = f(\lambda(\Sigma))$. The following important result appears as Corollary 2.4 in [Lewis \(1996a\)](#); see also [Davis \(1957\)](#).

THEOREM A.2. A symmetric function f on \mathbb{R}^m satisfies $f \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ if and only if the associated spectral function F defined by $F(\Sigma) = f(\lambda(\Sigma))$ satisfies $F \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$.

SKETCH PROOF. The left implication follows easily by restricting to the linear subspace of diagonal matrices Σ . So suppose $f \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$. To show that $F \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ we show that $F = (F^*)^*$. For this we first show that if $F(\Sigma) = f(\lambda(\Sigma))$ for $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ symmetric then $F^*(L) = f^*(\lambda(L))$. For this, we use the von Neumann trace inequality which states that $\langle L, \Sigma \rangle \leq \lambda(L)^\top \lambda(\Sigma)$ with equality if and only if there exists an orthogonal matrix U such that $U^\top \Sigma U$ and $U^\top L U$ are simultaneously diagonal; see [Mirsky \(1959\)](#). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(L) &= \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m} \{ \langle L, \Sigma \rangle - F(\Sigma) \} \leq \sup_{\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}^m} \lambda(L)^\top \lambda(\Sigma) - f(\lambda(\Sigma)) \\ &= \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{ \lambda(L)^\top u - f(u) \} = f^*(\lambda(L)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since the von Neumann inequality can become equality as described above, the inequality above becomes equality proving that $F^*(L) = f^*(\lambda(L))$. Suppose now that $f \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ or, equivalently, $f = (f^*)^*$. By the argument above applied to F^*

$$(F^*)^*(\Sigma) = (f^*)^*(\lambda(\Sigma)) = f(\lambda(\Sigma)) = F(\Sigma).$$

□

Computing the gradient of a spectral function F also relies on computing the gradient of f . The following result will be useful; see Corollary 3.2 [Lewis \(1996a\)](#).

THEOREM A.3. Suppose that the function $f \in \overline{\text{Conv}}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is symmetric. If $F(\Sigma) = f(\lambda(\Sigma))$ is the associated spectral function and $\Sigma = U \text{diag}(\lambda(\Sigma)) U^\top$ for an orthogonal matrix U then for every Σ such that f is differentiable at $\lambda(\Sigma)$, F is differentiable at Σ and

$$\nabla F(\Sigma) = U \text{diag}(\nabla f(\lambda(\Sigma))) U^\top.$$

PROOF SKETCH. In the proof of Theorem [A.2](#) we showed that $F^*(L) = f^*(\lambda(L))$. By Section [A.1](#), we have $L \in \partial F(\Sigma)$ exactly when

$$\langle L, \Sigma \rangle = F(\Sigma) + F^*(L) = f(\lambda(\Sigma)) + f^*(\lambda(L)) \leq \lambda^\top(L) \lambda(\Sigma) \leq \langle L, \Sigma \rangle,$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of f^* and the second inequality follows again by the von Neumann trace inequality [Mirsky \(1959\)](#). The fact that the left most

expression is equal to the right most expression implies that both inequalities are equalities and so: (i) $\lambda(L) \in \partial f(\lambda(\Sigma))$, (ii) if $\Sigma = U \text{diag}(\lambda(\Sigma)) U^\top$ then $L = U \text{diag}(\lambda(L)) U^\top$. If f is differentiable at $\lambda(\Sigma)$ then $\nabla f(\lambda(\Sigma)) = \lambda(L)$ and $\nabla F(\Sigma) = L = U \text{diag}(\lambda(L)) U^\top$, which concludes the proof. \square

We note that this result is true more generally for spectral functions that are not convex; see Theorem 1.1 in [Lewis \(1996b\)](#). The computation of the second order derivatives is generally much more complicated [Lewis and Sendov \(2001\)](#).

It is worth noting that all our examples have a special form

$$(27) \quad f(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^m \phi(\lambda_i)$$

for some smooth function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. For example, $-\log \det(\Sigma) = -\sum_{i=1}^m \log \lambda_i(\Sigma)$ and $\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^2(\Sigma)$. Using the matrix function notation (e.g. [Higham \(2008\)](#)) we can write it more elegantly as $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$. Such functions are also sometimes called spectral sums. The following follows from [Theorem A.3](#).

PROPOSITION A.4. *Suppose that ϕ is differentiable in $(0, +\infty)$ and $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$. Then, for every $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, we get $\nabla \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma)) = \phi'(\Sigma)$.*

PROOF. If $f(\lambda) = \sum_i \phi(\lambda_i)$ then $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i}(\lambda) = \phi'(\lambda_i)$. By [Theorem A.3](#), if $\Sigma = U \text{diag}(\lambda(\Sigma)) U^\top$ then

$$\nabla \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma)) = U \phi'(\text{diag}(\lambda(\Sigma))) U^\top = \phi'(\Sigma).$$

\square

A.3. Running examples. Many results in this paper rely on the fact that the underlying function F lies in $\text{C}\overline{\text{ONV}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$. In this section we study specifically spectral sums.

LEMMA A.5. *Suppose $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ then $F^*(L) = \text{tr}(\phi^*(L))$. Moreover, $F \in \text{C}\overline{\text{ONV}}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ if and only if $\phi \in \text{C}\overline{\text{ONV}}(\mathbb{R})$.*

PROOF. First note that in the proof of [Theorem A.2](#) we showed $F^*(L)$ is induced by the conjugate of $f(\lambda) = \sum_i \phi(\lambda_i)$. We have

$$f^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \{ \langle x, y \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^m \phi(x_i) \} = \sum_{i=1}^m \phi^*(y_i),$$

which proves the first statement. This implies that $F^{**}(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi^{**}(\lambda))$ and in consequence also the second part of the lemma. \square

As we said earlier, we normally define F over \mathbb{S}_+^m and then we extend it to \mathbb{S}_+^m by taking the lower semicontinuous closure. We now explain how this works for our running examples.

Suppose that ϕ is a proper convex function. Taking $\text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma)) + \mathbf{i}_{\mathbb{S}_+^m}(\Sigma)$ in [Remark 2.1](#) corresponds to adding to ϕ the indicator of the closed interval $[0, +\infty)$. Here the semicontinuous closure is easy to calculate directly. Concretely, the functions $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ that we consider in this paper take the form

$$(i) \ \phi(x) = +\infty \text{ for } x < 0; \quad (ii) \ \phi(x) < +\infty \text{ for } x > 0; \quad (iii) \ \phi(0) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(x).$$

We have $\text{dom}(\phi) = (0, +\infty)$ or $\text{dom}(\phi) = [0, +\infty)$ depending on whether the limit in (iii) is finite or not.

Now we can present our running examples more formally. In example (A) our function was defined by $\phi_A(x) = -\log(x)$ for $x > 0$. We have $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \phi_A(x) = +\infty$ and so:

$$(28) \quad \phi_A(x) = \begin{cases} -\log(x) & x > 0 \\ +\infty & x \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad F_A(\Sigma) = \begin{cases} -\log \det(\Sigma) & \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m \\ +\infty & \Sigma \notin \mathbb{S}_+^m \end{cases}.$$

and so $\text{dom}(F_A) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$. In example (B):

$$(29) \quad \phi_B(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}x^2 & x \geq 0 \\ +\infty & x < 0 \end{cases}, \quad F_B(\Sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^2) & \Sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m \\ +\infty & \Sigma \notin \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m \end{cases}.$$

and so $\text{dom}(F_B) = \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$. Note that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \phi_B(x) = 0$ so $x = 0$ lies in the domain of ϕ_B . Here the extension was rather trivial because $\frac{1}{2}x^2$ is well defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Example (C) is slightly more subtle:

$$(30) \quad \phi_C(x) = \begin{cases} -x(1 - \log(x)) & x > 0 \\ 0 & x = 0 \\ +\infty & x < 0 \end{cases}, \quad F_C(\Sigma) = \begin{cases} -\text{tr}(\Sigma - \Sigma \log(\Sigma)) & \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m \\ +\infty & \Sigma \notin \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m \end{cases}$$

and so $\text{dom}(F_C) = \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$. Note that we did not write explicitly what is the value of the map F_C on the boundary of $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$. This function, similarly to the pseudoinverse, takes the spectral decomposition $\Sigma = U\Lambda U^\top$ and applies the transformation ϕ_C only to the non-zero eigenvalues in Λ leaving the zero eigenvalues unchanged. In particular it is well defined on $\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$. Finally, in example (D):

$$(31) \quad \phi_D(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x} & x > 0 \\ +\infty & x \leq 0 \end{cases}, \quad F_D(\Sigma) = \begin{cases} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1}) & \Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m \\ +\infty & \Sigma \notin \mathbb{S}_+^m \end{cases}$$

and so $\text{dom}(F_D) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$.

We now proceed to compute the convex conjugates of our running examples. In example (A), ϕ_A is given in (28) and

$$\phi_A^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \{xy - \phi(x)\} = \sup_{x > 0} \{xy + \log(x)\} = \begin{cases} -1 - \log(-y) & \text{if } y < 0, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This calculation shows that

$$F_A^*(L) = \begin{cases} -m - \log \det(-L) & \text{if } L \in -\mathbb{S}_+^m, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \text{dom}(F_A^*) = -\mathbb{S}_+^m = \nabla F_A(\mathbb{S}_+^m).$$

Similarly, ϕ_B is given in (29) and

$$\phi_B^*(y) = \sup_{x \geq 0} \{xy - \frac{1}{2}x^2\} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}y^2 & \text{if } y \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular,

$$(32) \quad F_B^*(L) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(L^2) & \text{if } L \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}, \quad \text{dom}(F_B^*) = \mathbb{S}^m \supset \nabla F_B(\mathbb{S}_+^m) = \mathbb{S}_+^m$$

In example (C), ϕ_C is given by (30) and

$$\phi_C^*(y) = \max\{0, \sup_{x > 0} \{xy + x - x \log(x)\}\} = e^y.$$

In particular, $F_C^*(L) = \exp(L)$ and $\text{dom}(F_C^*) = \mathbb{S}^m = \nabla F_C(\mathbb{S}_+^m)$. Finally, ϕ_D is given in (31) and its conjugate is

$$\phi_D^*(y) = \sup_{x>0} \{xy - \frac{1}{x}\} = \begin{cases} -2\sqrt{-y} & \text{if } y \leq 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and we have

$$F_D^*(L) = \begin{cases} -2\text{tr}(\sqrt{-L}) & \text{if } L \in -\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}, \quad \text{dom}(F_D^*) = -\overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m \supset \nabla F_D(\mathbb{S}_+^m).$$

APPENDIX B: PROOFS FROM SECTION 4

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3. By Theorem 4 in [Niemiro \(1992\)](#)

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) = -\mathcal{I}_0^{-1} \sqrt{n} \nabla M_n(\theta_0) + o_P(1).$$

It is then enough to show that $\sqrt{n} \nabla M_n(\theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} N_m(0, \Omega)$. Using (15), we get

$$\nabla M_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i h(\theta_0, X_i) = [\langle \Sigma_0 - S_n, A_i \rangle]_{i=1}^d.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}h(\theta_0, X) = [\langle \Sigma_0 - \mathbb{E}X X^\top, A_i \rangle]_{i=1}^d = 0.$$

Since the fourth moments exist, the central limit theorem gives that $\sqrt{n} \nabla M_n(\theta_0)$ converges in distribution to $N(0, \Omega)$, where

$$\Omega_{ij} = n \mathbb{E}(\langle \Sigma_0 - S_n, A_i \rangle \cdot \langle \Sigma_0 - S_n, A_j \rangle) = n \text{var}(S_n)[A_i, A_j] = \mathcal{S}[A_i, A_j].$$

□

PROOF OF LEMMA 4.5. Recall the definition of $M_n(\theta)$ in (13) as well as \overline{M} and \overline{M}_n . We have

$$M_n(\theta_0 + \omega) - M_n(\theta_0) = \overline{M}(\omega) - \text{tr}((S_n - \Sigma_0)L(\omega)).$$

and $\text{tr}((S_n - \Sigma_0)L(\omega)) = \langle \omega, \Delta^{(n)} \rangle$, which gives

$$\overline{M}_n(\omega) = \overline{M}(\omega) - \langle \omega, \Delta^{(n)} \rangle.$$

The optimum of $\overline{M}_n(\omega)$ is then obtained for $\hat{\omega} = \hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0$ satisfying the first order condition $\nabla \overline{M}(\hat{\omega}) = \Delta^{(n)}$. We get

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}(\Delta^{(n)} \in \nabla \overline{M}(\epsilon \mathbb{B}_2)),$$

where $\epsilon \mathbb{B}_2 = \{\omega : \|\omega\| \leq \epsilon\}$. By definition of μ -strong convexity, for all $\|\omega\| \leq \epsilon$

$$\overline{M}(0) \geq \overline{M}(\omega) + \langle \nabla \overline{M}(\omega), -\omega \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\omega\|^2.$$

Using the fact that, $\overline{M}(0) = 0$ and $\overline{M}(\omega) \geq 0$, we get that

$$(33) \quad \langle \nabla \overline{M}(\omega), \omega \rangle \geq \overline{M}(\omega) + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\omega\|^2 \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \|\omega\|^2.$$

By the Hölder's inequality $\langle \nabla \overline{M}(\omega), \frac{\omega}{\|\omega\|_1} \rangle \leq \|\nabla \overline{M}(\omega)\|_\infty$. Thus, dividing (33) by $\|\omega\|_1$ we get that

$$\|\nabla \overline{M}(\omega)\|_\infty \geq \frac{\mu \|\omega\|^2}{2 \|\omega\|_1} \geq \frac{\mu \|\omega\|}{2\sqrt{d}},$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\|\omega\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d}\|\omega\|$. Note that, for every $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\nabla \overline{M}(t\omega)$ is monotonely increasing in $t > 0$. It now directly follows that

$$(34) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Delta^{(n)} \in \nabla \overline{M}(\epsilon \mathbb{B}_2)) \geq \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty \leq \inf_{\|\omega\|=\epsilon} \|\nabla \overline{M}(\omega)\|_\infty) \geq \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\mu\epsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}).$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.6. By Lemma 4.5 and the union bound, we get

$$(35) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| > \epsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|\Delta^{(n)}\|_\infty > \frac{\mu\epsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_k^{(n)}| > \frac{\mu\epsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}).$$

We will bound each term on the right of (35). Given Σ_0 and $A_1, \dots, A_d \in \mathbb{S}^m$ denote the eigenvalues of $\sqrt{\Sigma_0} A_k \sqrt{\Sigma_0}$ by

$$\lambda_{jk} = \lambda_j(\sqrt{\Sigma_0} A_k \sqrt{\Sigma_0}) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

If $X \sim N(0, \Sigma_0)$ then $X^\top A_k X = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{jk} Z_j^2$, where $Z \sim N_m(0, I_m)$. Thus, for every k we have

$$\Delta_k^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i^\top A_k X_i - \text{tr}(\Sigma_0 A_k)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{jk} (Z_{ij}^2 - 1),$$

where $Z_{ij} \sim N(0, 1)$ are all independent of each other. Recall from Definition 2.7 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#) that a random variable Y with mean zero is sub-exponential with parameters (ν, α) , both positive, if $\mathbb{E}e^{\lambda Y} \leq e^{\nu^2 \lambda^2 / 2}$ for all $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{\alpha}$. By Example 2.8 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#), all $Z_{ij}^2 - 1$ are independent sub-exponential random variables with parameters $(\nu, \alpha) = (2, 4)$. We also use another standard result: if Y_1, \dots, Y_N are independent sub-exponential with parameters (ν_i, α_i) , then for any fixed vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the linear combination $\sum_i u_i Y_i$ is sub-exponential with parameters $(\sqrt{\sum_i u_i^2 \nu_i^2}, \max_i \alpha_i)$; see p. 29 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#). Since each $\Delta_k^{(n)}$ is a linear combination of independent sub-exponential variables, we conclude that it is sub-exponential with parameters (ν_k, α_k) with

$$\nu_k = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{4}{n^2} \lambda_{jk}^2} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_{jk}^2} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma_0 A_k\|_F.$$

and

$$\alpha_k = \frac{4}{n} \max_{j=1, \dots, m} |\lambda_{jk}| = \frac{4}{n} \|\Sigma_0 A_k\|.$$

Directly from the definition, if Y is sub-exponential with parameters (ν_k, α_k) , then it is sub-exponential with parameters (ν, α) whenever $\nu_k \leq \nu$ and $\alpha_k \leq \alpha$. Using the fact that A_1, \dots, A_d for an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{L} , we now show that, for each k ,

$$\nu_k \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \|\Sigma_0\|, \quad \alpha_k \leq \frac{4}{n} \|\Sigma_0\|.$$

Note that $\|\Sigma_0 A_k\| \leq \|\Sigma_0\| \|A_k\| \leq \|\Sigma_0\|$ simply because $\|A_k\| \leq \|A_k\|_F = 1$. Moreover, $\|\Sigma_0 A_k\|_F \leq \|\Sigma_0\| \|A_k\|_F \leq \|\Sigma_0\|$. The fact that $\|\Sigma_0 A_k\|_F$ can be upper bounded by $\|\Sigma_0\| \|A_k\|_F$ follows easily from the first inequality in [Fang, Loparo and Feng \(1994\)](#), which states that if $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ then $\text{tr}(AB) \leq \|A\| \text{tr}(B)$. From this, for each k ,

$$\|\Sigma_0 A_k\|_F^2 = \text{tr}(\Sigma_0^2 A_k^2) \leq \|\Sigma_0\|^2 \text{tr}(A_k^2) = \|\Sigma_0\|^2 \|A_k\|_F^2 \leq \|\Sigma_0\|^2.$$

We conclude that each $\Delta_k^{(n)}$ is a sub-exponential random variable with parameters $(\frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\|\Sigma_0\|, \frac{4}{n}\|\Sigma_0\|)$. Standard sub-exponential tail bound (Proposition 2.9 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)) imply then that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\Delta_k^{(n)}| \geq t) \leq \begin{cases} 2e^{-\frac{t^2 n}{8\|\Sigma_0\|^2}} & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \|\Sigma_0\|, \\ 2e^{-\frac{tn}{8\|\Sigma_0\|}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The final bound follows by taking $t = \frac{\mu\epsilon}{2\sqrt{d}}$ and using (35). For the last part of the theorem:

$$(36) \quad \delta = 2d \exp\left\{-\frac{\mu^2 \epsilon^2 n}{32d\|\Sigma_0\|^2}\right\} \iff \epsilon = \frac{4\|\Sigma_0\|}{\mu} \sqrt{\frac{2d}{n} \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)}.$$

If $n \geq 8 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right)$ then the parameter ϵ in (36) satisfies $\epsilon \leq \frac{2\|\Sigma_0\|\sqrt{d}}{\mu}$, which, by the first part, implies that $\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| > \epsilon) \leq \delta$ concluding the proof. \square

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.7. By Lemma 4.4, $\overline{M}(0) = 0$ and $\nabla \overline{M}(0) = 0$. Then by Taylor's theorem, for some $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\overline{M}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}\omega^\top \nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)\omega \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)) \cdot \|\omega\|^2,$$

where we will use the standard variational definition of the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)$

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)) = \min_{\|u\|=1} u^\top \nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)u = \min_{\|u\|=1} \nabla^2 F^*(L(\theta_0 + t\omega))[L(u), L(u)].$$

Note that if $\|u\| = 1$ then $\|L(u)\|_F = 1$ because

$$\langle L(u), L(u) \rangle = \sum_{i,j} u_i u_j \langle A_i, A_j \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m u_i^2 = 1.$$

In other words, the minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)$ corresponds to the restricted minimal eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 F^*(L(\theta_0 + t\omega))$, which we bound here by the minimal unrestricted eigenvalue

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)) = \min_{\|H\|_F=1, H \in \mathcal{L}} \nabla^2 F^*(L(\theta_0 + t\omega))[H, H] \geq \min_{\|H\|_F=1} \nabla^2 F^*(L(\theta_0 + t\omega))[H, H].$$

Since the gradient mappings ∇F and ∇F^* are inverses of each other on \mathbb{S}_+^m , by the inverse mapping theorem, at each point $L = \nabla F(\Sigma) \in \mathbb{L}_+^m$, the linear mapping $\nabla^2 F^*(L)$ is the inverse of the linear mapping $\nabla^2 F(\Sigma)$. Since these linear mappings are positive definite (by strict convexity of F and F^*) it follows that

$$\min_{\|H\|_F=1} \nabla^2 F^*(L(\theta_0 + t\omega))[H, H] = \frac{1}{\max_{\|H\|_F=1} \nabla^2 F(\Sigma(\theta_0 + t\omega))[H, H]}.$$

The proof of this result follows like in the standard matrix case by solving the corresponding Lagrange problems. By Proposition 3.1 in [Juditsky and Nemirovski \(2008\)](#), if $F(\Sigma) = \text{tr}(\phi(\Sigma))$ and the condition (19) holds, then, for every $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$

$$(37) \quad \nabla^2 F(\Sigma)[H, H] \leq \ell \text{tr}(H\phi''(\Sigma)H) = \ell \text{tr}(\phi''(\Sigma)H^2).$$

Since ϕ is strictly convex, $\phi''(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$ and so, if $\Sigma \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, then $\phi''(\Sigma) \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$. The first inequality in [Fang, Loparo and Feng \(1994\)](#) states that if $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_+^m$ then $\text{tr}(AB) \leq \|A\| \text{tr}(B)$. We use it with $A = \phi''(\Sigma)$ and $B = H^2$ to conclude

$$\text{tr}(\phi''(\Sigma)H^2) \leq \|\phi''(\Sigma)\| \text{tr}(H^2) = \|\phi''(\Sigma)\| \|H\|_F^2 = \|\phi''(\Sigma)\|$$

whenever $\|H\|_F = 1$. Putting this all together gives

$$\lambda_{\min}(\nabla^2 \overline{M}(t\omega)) \geq \frac{1}{\ell \|\phi''(\Sigma(\theta_0 + t\omega))\|} \geq \frac{1}{\ell \alpha},$$

which shows that $\overline{M}(\omega)$ is $\frac{1}{\ell \alpha}$ -strongly convex in the ϵ -ball. \square

REFERENCES

- AMÉNDOLA, C. and ZWIERNIK, P. (2021). Likelihood geometry of correlation models. *Le Matematiche* **76** 559–583.
- ANDERSEN, P. K. and GILL, R. D. (1982). Cox’s regression model for counting processes: a large sample study. *The annals of statistics* 1100–1120.
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1970). Estimation of covariance matrices which are linear combinations or whose inverses are linear combinations of given matrices. In *Essays in Probability and Statistics* 1–24. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C. [MR0277057 \(43 #2794\)](#)
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1973). Asymptotically efficient estimation of covariance matrices with linear structure. *Annals of Statistics* **1** 135–141. [MR0331612 \(48 #9944\)](#)
- ANDERSON, T. W. (1978). Maximum likelihood estimation for vector autoregressive moving average models Technical Report, STANFORD UNIV CA DEPT OF STATISTICS.
- ARCHAKOV, I. and HANSEN, P. R. (2021). A new parametrization of correlation matrices. *Econometrica* **89** 1699–1715.
- ASAI, M. and SO, M. K. (2015). Long memory and asymmetry for matrix-exponential dynamic correlation processes. *Journal of Time Series Econometrics* **7** 69–94.
- BANERJEE, A., MERUGU, S., DHILLON, I. S., GHOSH, J. and LAFFERTY, J. (2005). Clustering with Bregman divergences. *Journal of machine learning research* **6**.
- BARNDORFF-NIELSEN, O. E. (1978). *Information and Exponential Families in Statistical Theory*. Wiley, New York.
- BARRATT, S. and BOYD, S. (2022). Covariance prediction via convex optimization. *Optimization and Engineering* 1–34.
- BATTEY, H. (2017). Eigen structure of a new class of covariance and inverse covariance matrices. *Bernoulli* **23** 3166–3177. <https://doi.org/10.3150/16-BEJ840> [MR3654802](#)
- BATTEY, H. (2019). On sparsity scales and covariance matrix transformations. *Biometrika* **106** 605–617.
- BAUER, G. H. and VORKINK, K. (2011). Forecasting multivariate realized stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics* **160** 93–101.
- BAUSCHKE, H. H. and BORWEIN, J. M. (1997). Legendre functions and the method of random Bregman projections. *Journal of convex analysis* **4** 27–67.
- BECK, A. (2017). *First-order methods in optimization*. *MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization* **25**. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA; Mathematical Optimization Society, Philadelphia, PA. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974997.ch1> [MR3719240](#)
- BERNSTEIN, D. I., BLEKHERMAN, G. and SINN, R. (2020). Typical and generic ranks in matrix completion. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **585** 71–104.
- BERNSTEIN, D. I., DEWAR, S., GORTLER, S. J., NIXON, A., SITHARAM, M. and THERAN, L. (2021). Maximum likelihood thresholds via graph rigidity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.02185*.
- BLEKHERMAN, G. and SINN, R. (2019). Maximum likelihood threshold and generic completion rank of graphs. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* **61** 303–324.
- BOEGE, T., KAHLE, T., KRETSCHMER, A. and RÖTTGER, F. (2023). The geometry of Gaussian double Markovian distributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **50** 665–696.
- BOIK, R. J. (2002). Spectral models for covariance matrices. *Biometrika* **89** 159–182.
- BREGMAN, L. M. (1967). The relaxation method of finding the common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming. *USSR computational mathematics and mathematical physics* **7** 200–217.
- BROWNE, M. W. (1974). Generalized least squares estimators in the analysis of covariance structures. *South African Statistical Journal* **8** 1–24.
- BUHL, S. L. (1993). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimators for graphical Gaussian models. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 263–270.
- CAI, T. T. and ZHOU, H. H. (2012). Optimal rates of convergence for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 2389–2420.
- CHAUDHURI, S., DRTON, M. and RICHARDSON, T. S. (2007). Estimation of a covariance matrix with zeros. *Biometrika* **94** 199–216.
- CHIU, T. Y., LEONARD, T. and TSUI, K.-W. (1996). The matrix-logarithmic covariance model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **91** 198–210.
- CHRISTENSEN, E. S. (1989). Statistical Properties of I -projections Within Exponential Families. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **16** 307–318.
- DAVIS, C. (1957). All convex invariant functions of hermitian matrices. *Archiv der Mathematik* **8** 276–278.
- DEMPSTER, A. P. (1972). Covariance selection. *Biometrics* 157–175.

- DHILLON, I. S. and TROPP, J. A. (2008). Matrix nearness problems with Bregman divergences. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **29** 1120–1146.
- DJORDJILOVIĆ, V., CHIOGNA, M., ROMUALDI, C. and SALVIATO, E. (2018). Searching for the Source of Difference: A Graphical Model Approach. In *International Meeting on Computational Intelligence Methods for Bioinformatics and Biostatistics* 131–138. Springer.
- DRTON, M. and RICHARDSON, T. S. (2008). Graphical methods for efficient likelihood inference in Gaussian covariance models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **9** 893–914.
- FANG, Y., LOPARO, K. A. and FENG, X. (1994). Inequalities for the trace of matrix product. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **39** 2489–2490.
- GEYER, C. J. (1994). On the asymptotics of constrained M-estimation. *The Annals of statistics* 1993–2010.
- GROSS, E. and SULLIVAN, S. (2018). The maximum likelihood threshold of a graph. *Bernoulli* **24** 386–407.
- GRÜNWARD, P. D. and DAWID, A. P. (2004). Game theory, maximum entropy, minimum discrepancy and robust Bayesian decision theory. *Ann. Statist.* **32** 1367–1433. <https://doi.org/10.1214/00905360400000553MR2089128>
- HABERMAN, S. J. (1989). Concavity and estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 1631–1661.
- HAN, I., AVRON, H. and SHIN, J. (2018). Stochastic chebyshev gradient descent for spectral optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **31**.
- HASTIE, T., TIBSHIRANI, R. and WAINWRIGHT, M. (2015). *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*. CRC press.
- HIGHAM, N. J. (2008). *Functions of matrices*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA Theory and computation. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9780898717778MR2396439>
- HIRIART-URRUTY, J.-B. and LEMARÉCHAL, C. (2001). *Fundamentals of convex analysis. Grundlehren Text Editions*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Abridged version of it Convex analysis and minimization algorithms. I [Springer, Berlin, 1993; MR1261420 (95m:90001)] and it II [ibid.; MR1295240 (95m:90002)]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-56468-0MR1865628>
- HIRIART-URRUTY, J.-B. and LEMARÉCHAL, C. (2012). *Fundamentals of convex analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- HØJSGAARD, S. and LAURITZEN, S. L. (2008). Graphical Gaussian models with edge and vertex symmetries. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **70** 1005–1027.
- ISHIHARA, T., OMORI, Y. and ASAI, M. (2016). Matrix exponential stochastic volatility with cross leverage. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **100** 331–350.
- JENNRICH, R. I. and SCHLUCHTER, M. D. (1986). Unbalanced repeated-measures models with structured covariance matrices. *Biometrics* 805–820.
- JENSEN, S. T. (1988). Covariance hypotheses which are linear in both the covariance and the inverse covariance. *The Annals of Statistics* **16** 302–322.
- JUDITSKY, A. and NEMIROVSKI, A. S. (2008). Large deviations of vector-valued martingales in 2-smooth normed spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0809.0813*.
- KAUERMANN, G. (1996). On a dualization of graphical Gaussian models. *Scandinavian journal of statistics* 105–116.
- KAWAKATSU, H. (2006). Matrix exponential GARCH. *Journal of Econometrics* **134** 95–128.
- LAURITZEN, S. L. (1996). *Graphical Models*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- LAURITZEN, S. (2023). *Fundamentals of Mathematical Statistics*. CRC Press.
- LAURITZEN, S. and ZWIERNIK, P. (2022). Locally associated graphical models and mixed convex exponential families. *The Annals of Statistics* **50** 3009–3038.
- LEONARD, T. and HSU, J. S. (1992). Bayesian inference for a covariance matrix. *The Annals of Statistics* **20** 1669–1696.
- LESAGE, J. P. and PACE, R. K. (2007). A matrix exponential spatial specification. *Journal of Econometrics* **140** 190–214.
- LEWIS, A. S. (1996a). Convex analysis on the Hermitian matrices. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **6** 164–177.
- LEWIS, A. S. (1996b). Derivatives of spectral functions. *Mathematics of Operations Research* **21** 576–588.
- LEWIS, A. S. and SENDOV, H. S. (2001). Twice differentiable spectral functions. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **23** 368–386.
- LIN, L., DRTON, M. and SHOJAIE, A. (2016). Estimation of high-dimensional graphical models using regularized score matching. *Electronic journal of statistics* **10** 806.
- LIN, Z., MÜLLER, H.-G. and PARK, B. (2023). Additive models for symmetric positive-definite matrices and Lie groups. *Biometrika* **110** 361–379.
- LIU, H., HAN, F., YUAN, M., LAFFERTY, J. and WASSERMAN, L. (2012). High-dimensional semiparametric Gaussian copula graphical models. *Ann. Statist.* **40** 2293–2326. <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1037MR3059084>

- LLORENS-TERRAZAS, J. and BROWNLEES, C. (2022). Projected Dynamic Conditional Correlations. *International Journal of Forecasting*.
- MIRSKY, L. (1959). On the trace of matrix products. *Mathematische Nachrichten* **20** 171–174.
- NIEMIRO, W. (1992). Asymptotics for M-estimators defined by convex minimization. *The Annals of Statistics* 1514–1533.
- ORD, K. (1975). Estimation methods for models of spatial interaction. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **70** 120–126.
- PAVLOV, D. (2023). Logarithmically Sparse Symmetric Matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10042*.
- PAVLOV, D., STURMFELS, B. and TELEN, S. (2022). Gibbs Manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15490*.
- PEARL, J. and WERMUTH, N. (1994). When can association graphs admit a causal interpretation. *Selecting Models from Data: Artificial Intelligence and Statistics IV* **89** 205–214.
- POURAHMADI, M. (2000). Maximum likelihood estimation of generalised linear models for multivariate normal covariance matrix. *Biometrika* **87** 425–435.
- POURAHMADI, M. (2011). Covariance estimation: the GLM and regularization perspectives. *Statist. Sci.* **26** 369–387. <https://doi.org/10.1214/11-STS358> MR2917961
- POURAHMADI, M. (2013). *High-dimensional covariance estimation: with high-dimensional data* **882**. John Wiley & Sons.
- RAVIKUMAR, P., WAINWRIGHT, M. J. and LAFFERTY, J. D. (2010). High-dimensional Ising model selection using ℓ_1 -regularized logistic regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **38** 1287–1319.
- ROCKAFELLAR, R. T. (1970). *Convex analysis* **28**. Princeton University Press.
- ROSSELL, D. and ZWIERNIK, P. (2021). Dependence in elliptical partial correlation graphs. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15** 4236–4263.
- RUBIN, D. B. and SZATROWSKI, T. H. (1982). Finding maximum likelihood estimates of patterned covariance matrices by the EM algorithm. *Biometrika* **69** 657–660.
- RYBAK, J. and BATTEY, H. S. (2021). Sparsity induced by covariance transformation: some deterministic and probabilistic results. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **477** 20200756.
- STANLEY, R. (2023). *Enumerative Combinatorics, 2 ed. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press.
- STURMFELS, B., TIMME, S. and ZWIERNIK, P. (2019). Estimating linear covariance models with numerical nonlinear algebra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00566*.
- STURMFELS, B. and UHLER, C. (2010). Multivariate Gaussians, semidefinite matrix completion, and convex algebraic geometry. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **62** 603–638.
- SULLIVANT, S., TALASKA, K. and DRAISMA, J. (2010). Trek separation for Gaussian graphical models. *Ann. Statist.* **38** 1665–1685. <https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS760> MR2662356
- SUNDBERG, R. (2019). *Statistical modelling by exponential families. Institute of Mathematical Statistics Textbooks* **12**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108604574> MR3969949
- SZATROWSKI, T. H. (1978). Explicit solutions, one iteration convergence and averaging in the multivariate normal estimation problem for patterned means and covariance. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **30** p81–88.
- SZATROWSKI, T. H. (1980). Necessary and sufficient conditions for explicit solutions in the multivariate normal estimation problem for patterned means and covariances. *The Annals of Statistics* 802–810.
- SZATROWSKI, T. H. (2004). Patterned covariances. *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences* **9**.
- UHLER, C. (2012). Geometry of maximum likelihood estimation in Gaussian graphical models. *Ann. Statist.* **40** 238–261.
- WAINWRIGHT, M. J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint* **48**. Cambridge University Press.
- WATKINS, W. (1974). Convex matrix functions. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **44** 31–34.
- ZHU, H., CHEN, Y., IBRAHIM, J. G., LI, Y., HALL, C. and LIN, W. (2009). Intrinsic regression models for positive-definite matrices with applications to diffusion tensor imaging. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104** 1203–1212.
- ZOU, T., LAN, W., WANG, H. and TSAI, C.-L. (2017). Covariance regression analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **112** 266–281.
- ZWIERNIK, P., UHLER, C. and RICHARDS, D. (2017). Maximum likelihood estimation for linear Gaussian covariance models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology* **79**.