

Maximum information divergence from linear and toric models

Yulia Alexandr¹ and Serkan Hoşten²

¹University of California, Berkeley

²San Francisco State University

Abstract

We study the problem of maximizing information divergence from a new perspective using logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. We show that for linear models, the maximum is always achieved at the boundary of the probability simplex. For toric models, we present an algorithm that combines the combinatorics of the chamber complex with numerical algebraic geometry. We pay special attention to reducible models and models of maximum likelihood degree one.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ be a statistical model where

$$\Delta_{n-1} = \left\{ p = (p_1, \dots, p_n) : \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \text{ and } p_i \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, n \right\}$$

is the probability simplex of dimension $n-1$. Given two points $p, q \in \Delta_{n-1}$ with $\text{supp}(p) \subseteq \text{supp}(q)$, the information divergence or Kullback-Leibler divergence of p and q is defined as

$$D(p \parallel q) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{q_i} \right).$$

We use the convention that $0 \log 0 = 0 \log(0/0) = 0$ and $D(p \parallel q) = +\infty$ if $\text{supp}(p) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(q)$. For fixed q , the function $D(\cdot \parallel q)$ is strictly convex. The information divergence (or just divergence) from $p \in \Delta_{n-1}$ to \mathcal{M} is

$$D_{\mathcal{M}}(p) := \min_{q \in \mathcal{M}} D(p \parallel q).$$

In this paper, we study $D(\mathcal{M}) = \max_{p \in \Delta_{n-1}} D_{\mathcal{M}}(p)$ and the points which achieve $D(\mathcal{M})$ when \mathcal{M} is a linear or a discrete exponential (toric) model.

1.1 Related prior work

The problem of determining $D(\mathcal{E})$ and studying the maximizers of the divergence function from an exponential family $\mathcal{E} \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ was first posed by Ay [4] who computed the gradient of $D_{\mathcal{E}}(p)$. The exponential family \mathcal{M} of probability distributions of independent random variables $X_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ with state spaces $[d_i] := \{1, \dots, d_i\}$ is known as an independence model. In this case, $D_{\mathcal{M}}(p)$ is the

multi-information, and $D(\mathcal{M}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \log(d_i)$ where $2 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_m$ [5]. In the same work, the structure of the global maximizers of the multi-information when the above bound is achieved was also determined. Subsequently, Matúš has computed the optimality conditions for $D_{\mathcal{E}}(p)$ for any exponential model $\mathcal{E} \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ [20]. We will use these conditions heavily. Rauh's dissertation [26] as well as his work in [27] gave algorithms to compute $D(\mathcal{M})$ for a discrete exponential family \mathcal{M} . These algorithms have two components: a combinatorial step followed by an algebraic step, both of which can be challenging. Nevertheless, they were capable of computing the maximum multi-information to an independence model with $d_1 = 2$ and $d_2 = d_3 = 3$, the smallest case where the aforementioned bound is not attained. We will provide another algorithm in the same spirit with combinatorial and algebraic steps. Finally, the literature contains results on the maximum divergence from certain hierarchical models [21], partition models [28], naive Bayes models and restricted Boltzmann machines [24].

1.2 Preliminaries and summary of results

Let \mathfrak{X} be a finite set of cardinality n and let A be a $d \times n$ matrix with entries in \mathbb{R} . With respect to the reference measure $\omega(x)$, $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, the exponential family $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_{\omega, A}$ consists of the positive probability distributions in Δ_{n-1} of the form

$$P_{\theta}(x) = \frac{\omega(x)}{Z_{\theta}} \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i A_{i,x}\right),$$

where A_i is the i th row of A and Z_{θ} is the normalizing constant. Here $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, the Euclidean closure of \mathcal{E} in Δ_{n-1} , will be referred to as the extended exponential family. Usually we will identify \mathfrak{X} with $[n]$ and write p_i and ω_i instead of $P(x)$ and $\omega(x)$, respectively.

In this paper, we consider *discrete* exponential families because of the bridge to toric geometry and algebraic statistics [11, 30]. This means that A is a matrix with *integer* entries. Since without loss of generality we can assume that the row span of A

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_n \end{pmatrix}$$

contains $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$, we will take the columns $a_j \in \mathbb{N}^d$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ and fix the first row of A to be the row of all ones. The toric variety $X_{\omega, A}$ is the Zariski closure in \mathbb{C}^n of the image of the algebraic torus $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ under the monomial map $\Psi : (\mathbb{C}^*)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ given by

$$z = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \mapsto (\omega_1 z^{a_1}, \omega_2 z^{a_2}, \dots, \omega_n z^{a_n}).$$

Because of the assumption on the first row of A , we can also view $X_{\omega, A}$ as a toric variety in the projective space \mathbb{P}^{n-1} . The following theorem connects exponential families and toric varieties.

Theorem 1. [12, Theorem 3.2] The extended exponential family $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{\omega, A}$ is equal to $X_{\omega, A} \cap \Delta_{n-1}$.

Therefore, we will refer to discrete exponential families as toric models. We will denote them by $\mathcal{M}_{\omega, A}$ or just \mathcal{M}_A .

Given a toric model \mathcal{M}_A and a fixed $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$, the minimum $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}(u)$ is attained at a unique point $q \in \mathcal{M}_A$. It is known as the *maximum likelihood estimate* (MLE) of u . Birch's Theorem (see

[19, Theorem 4.8], [11, Proposition 2.1.5], [25, Theorem 1.10]) states that the maximum likelihood estimate of u is equal to the unique point in the intersection

$$\mathcal{M}_A \cap \{p \in \Delta_{n-1} : Au = Ap\}.$$

The second term in this intersection is the polytope $Q_u := \{p \in \Delta_{n-1} : Au = Ap\}$. If $q \in \mathcal{M}_A$ is the MLE of u , by Birch's Theorem $Q_q = Q_u$. We will call this polytope the *logarithmic Voronoi polytope* at q following [2]. For an arbitrary model $\mathcal{M} \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ and $q \in \mathcal{M}$, the logarithmic Voronoi cell at q consists of all points $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$ such that a maximum likelihood estimate of u is q . Logarithmic Voronoi cells are always convex sets [2, Proposition 4], and when the model is linear or toric, they are polytopes [2, Theorem 9-10].

Proposition 2. Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ be a linear or a toric model and let $q \in \mathcal{M}$. Then the maximum of $D_{\mathcal{M}}(u)$ restricted to the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_q is achieved at a vertex of Q_q . The maximizers are a subset of the vertices in Q_q .

Proof. As we observed above $D(u \parallel q)$ is strictly convex in u over Δ_{n-1} ; see for instance [26, Proposition 2.14 (iii)]. The result follows since Q_q is a convex polytope. \square

Corollary 3. [4, Proposition 3.2] Let $\mathcal{M}_A \subseteq \Delta_{n-1}$ be a toric model where $A \in \mathbb{N}^{d \times n}$ and $\text{rank}(A) = d$. If p is a maximizer of the information divergence then $|\text{supp}(p)| \leq d = \dim(\mathcal{M}_A) + 1$.

Proof. If $q \in \mathcal{M}_A$ is the MLE of p , then p is a vertex of $Q_q = \{u \in \Delta_{n-1} : Au = Aq\}$. Any vertex of Q_q is a basic feasible solution to the system $Au = Aq$. In other words, it is of the form $p = (p_B, p_N)$ where $p_N = 0$ and $Bp_B = Aq$ with B a $d \times d$ invertible submatrix of A . This shows $|\text{supp}(p)| \leq d$. \square

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we focus on the maximum divergence to linear models. Theorem 5 proves that the maximum divergence to a linear model will always be achieved at a vertex of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope at a vertex of the model itself. In Section 3, we focus on identifying the critical points of information divergence to toric models. Theorem 12 gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a vertex of a logarithmic Voronoi polytope to be a critical point. In Section 4, we define the chamber complex of a toric model and describe how it determines the combinatorial type of logarithmic Voronoi polytopes in Theorem 18. We then present an algorithm for maximizing information divergence from a toric model, which utilizes the combinatorics of the chamber complex and numerical algebraic geometry. We make our code for several parts of the algorithm available on Github.¹ Section 5 is devoted to reducible toric models and a decomposition theory of their logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. Theorem 36 provides a way to reconstruct logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of a reducible model \mathcal{M} from the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of the models induced by the the reduction of \mathcal{M} . Section 5.2 then explains how to use this decomposition to obtain and bound information divergence to reducible models. Finally, Section 6 studies divergence from toric models of ML degree one. After revisiting the multinomial model in Theorem 53, we generalize the results to the box model by establishing the maximum divergence and characterizing the set of maximizers in Theorem 54. Theorem 60 establishes an upper bound for divergence to the trapezoid model.

¹<https://github.com/yuliaalexandr/maximizing-divergence>

2 Maximum divergence from linear models

Let \mathcal{M} be a d -dimensional linear model in Δ_{n-1} given by an $n \times d$ matrix B with rows b_1, \dots, b_n which sum to the zero vector and a vector $c \in \Delta_{n-1}$. That is, \mathcal{M} is the image of the linear map

$$f : \Theta \rightarrow \Delta_{n-1} : (x_1, \dots, x_d) \mapsto (c_1 - \langle b_1, x \rangle, \dots, c_n - \langle b_n, x \rangle).$$

We wish to find $D(\mathcal{M})$ and the points $p \in \Delta_{n-1}$ at which the information divergence $D_{\mathcal{M}}(p)$ from the linear model is maximized. By Proposition 2,

$$D(\mathcal{M}) = \max_{q \in \mathcal{M}} \max_{p \in Q_q} D(p \parallel q).$$

Hence, the maximum is achieved at some of the vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi cell Q_q at q . The vertices of Q_q at $q = f(x)$ are given by the co-circuits of B and can be expressed as functions in q (or the parameters x) [1, Proposition 2]. Here, by a co-circuit of B we mean a nonzero $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of minimal support so that $z^T B = 0$. Each co-circuit z of B such that $\langle z, q \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i q_i = 1$ defines a vertex $V_z(q) = (z_1 q_1, \dots, z_n q_n)$ of Q_q . Note that the choice of the co-circuit representative does not depend on the point q , i.e. we may always choose the representative z such that $\langle z, q \rangle = 1$ for all $q \in \mathcal{M}$ simultaneously. Indeed, let y be some co-circuit of B . We wish to find $k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $z = ky$ has the property $\langle z, q \rangle = 1$ for all $q \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $q = c - Bx$ for some $x \in \Theta$, we have that

$$1 = \langle z, q \rangle = k \langle y, c - Bx \rangle = k \langle y, c \rangle.$$

Hence, $z = ky$ where $k = 1/\langle y, c \rangle$ is the desired co-circuit representative. For every such co-circuit we wish to maximize the information divergence over all $q \in \mathcal{M}$. We then compare the maximum divergences over all such co-circuits to find the global maximum.

Lemma 4. Let \mathcal{M} be a linear model defined by the matrix B and the vector c . For a fixed co-circuit z of B , the information divergence $D(V_z(q) \parallel q)$ is linear in $q \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof.

$$D(V_z(q) \parallel q) = \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i q_i) \log(z_i q_i / q_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i \log(z_i)) q_i.$$

□

Hence, for each co-circuit z , we are maximizing a linear function over the polytope \mathcal{M} . We summarize this in the following result.

Theorem 5. The maximum divergence of a linear model \mathcal{M} is always achieved at a vertex of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_q where q itself is a vertex of \mathcal{M} .

Remark 6. A particular kind of discrete exponential family that is also a linear model is a partition model. The information divergence from partition models have been studied in [22]. A result similar to Theorem 5 is Proposition 2 in this reference.

Theorem 5 can be used to obtain compact formulas for maximum divergence for special families of linear models, such as the one below.

Corollary 7. Let \mathcal{M} be a one-dimensional linear model in Δ_3 given by $B = [-a, -b, b, a]^T$, $a, b > 0$ and $c = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$. Then $D(\mathcal{M}) = \log\left(\frac{4\max\{a,b\}}{a+b}\right)$, maximized at two vertices of Δ_3 .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $a > b$. Then the model is parametrized as $f : x \mapsto (ax + 1/4, bx + 1/4, -bx + 1/4, -ax + 1/4)$. The two vertices of the model are $v_1 = f(-\frac{1}{4a})$ and $v_2 = f(\frac{1}{4a})$. Each logarithmic Voronoi polytope is a quadrangle, so the matrix B has four co-circuits which parameterize the four vertices of this polytope at a general point $q = f(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1(x) &= (0, 2bx + 1/2, -2bx + 1/2, 0) \\ V_2(x) &= (0, (4abx + a)/(a + b), 0, (b - 4abx)/(a + b)) \\ V_3(x) &= (2ax + 1/2, 0, 0, -2ax + 1/2) \\ V_4(x) &= ((4abx + b)/(a + b), 0, (a - 4abx)/(a + b), 0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $D(V_1(x)||f(x)) = D(V_3(x)||f(x)) = \log(2)$ for all $x \in [-\frac{1}{4a}, \frac{1}{4a}]$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(V_2\left(-\frac{1}{4a}\right) \parallel v_1\right) &= \frac{(a-b)\log\left(\frac{4a}{a+b}\right) + 2b\log\left(\frac{4b}{a+b}\right)}{a+b} < \log\left(\frac{4a}{a+b}\right) = D\left(V_2\left(\frac{1}{4a}\right) \parallel v_2\right) \\ D\left(V_4\left(-\frac{1}{4a}\right) \parallel v_1\right) &= \log\left(\frac{4a}{a+b}\right) > \frac{(a-b)\log\left(\frac{4a}{a+b}\right) + 2b\log\left(\frac{4b}{a+b}\right)}{a+b} = D\left(V_4\left(\frac{1}{4a}\right) \parallel v_2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the maximum divergence $\log\left(\frac{4a}{a+b}\right)$ is achieved at the two vertices $V_2\left(\frac{1}{4a}\right) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$ and $V_4\left(-\frac{1}{4a}\right) = (0, 0, 1, 0)$. The proof for $b > a$ is identical. \square

Example 8. Consider the 1-dimensional linear model \mathcal{M} inside Δ_3 given by $B = [-2, -1, 1, 2]^T$ and $c = (1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4)$. It is a line segment in Δ_3 with the vertices $v_1 = f(-1/8) = (0, 1/8, 3/8, 1/2)$ and $v_2 = f(1/8) = (1/2, 3/8, 1/8, 0)$. The global maximum divergence $\log(8/3)$ is achieved at $V_4(-1/8) = (0, 0, 1, 0)$ and $V_2(1/8) = (0, 1, 0, 0)$. This is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Linear model given by $B = [-2, -1, 1, 2]^T$.

As we close this section we wish to emphasize two relevant facts about logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of linear models. First, for all points q that are in the relative interior of \mathcal{M} the combinatorial type

of Q_q is the same [1, Corollary 4]. Moreover, if \mathcal{M} is the transversal intersection of an affine subspace with Δ_{n-1} , all Q_q , including the ones at boundary points of \mathcal{M} , have the same combinatorial type [1, Theorem 9]. The results in this section help us identify those logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of just one combinatorial type (at least for generic \mathcal{M}) potentially containing a vertex attaining $D(\mathcal{M})$. This phenomenon carries over to the toric case where we need to account for the fact that the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes have more than one (but finitely many) combinatorial types. In the next section, we will review results that will be useful in locating vertices of logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of the same combinatorial type that potentially maximize the information divergence. Then in Section 4 we will see how to parameterize the different combinatorial types and how this helps develop an algorithm to compute $D(\mathcal{M})$.

3 Critical points of information divergence to toric models

In the rest of the paper, we will work only with toric models \mathcal{M}_A introduced in Section 1. For a face F of a given polytope Q , we define the support of F as the union of the supports of the vertices on F and denote it by $\text{supp}(F)$. We start with a definition that will pave the path for characterizing the critical points of the function $D_{\mathcal{M}}(\cdot)$.

Definition 9. Let Q_q be a logarithmic Voronoi polytope at a point on a toric model $\mathcal{M}_A \subset \Delta_{n-1}$. A vertex v of Q_q is *complementary* if there exists a face F of Q_q such that $\text{supp}(F) = [n] \setminus \text{supp}(v)$. We call F the complementary face of v .

Definition 10. Let $\mathcal{M}_A \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ be a toric model and let p be a point in Δ_{n-1} whose MLE is q with $\text{supp}(q) = [n]$. We say that p is a projection point if

$$p_i = \begin{cases} \frac{q_i}{\sum_{j \in \text{supp}(p)} q_j} & \text{if } i \in \text{supp}(p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 11. We can relax the condition for the full support of the MLE in the above definition. In this case, we need to consider MLEs that are in the extended exponential family, namely, those that are on \mathcal{M}_A and on a proper face Γ of Δ_{n-1} . However, these can be separately treated by focusing on the toric model $\mathcal{M}_{A_\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ where A_Γ consists of the columns a_i of A with $i \in \text{supp}(\Gamma)$.

Theorem 12. If p is a local maximizer of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ then p is a projection point. Moreover, every such projection point is a complementary vertex of Q_q where q is the MLE of p . A complementary vertex v of Q_q with the complementary face F is a projection point if and only if the line passing through v and q intersects the relative interior of F .

Proof. The first statement is proved in [20, Theorem 5.1]. Since p is a local maximizer it needs to be a vertex of Q_q . The point \tilde{p} defined by

$$\tilde{p}_i = \begin{cases} \frac{q_i}{\sum_{j \notin \text{supp}(p)} q_j} & \text{if } i \notin \text{supp}(p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is obtained by $\tilde{p} = p + \frac{1}{\sum_{j \notin \text{supp}(p)} q_j} [q - p]$ where $[q - p]$ is a vector parallel to the line through p and q . The support of \tilde{p} is precisely $[n] \setminus \text{supp}(p)$ and therefore it is contained in the interior of a face F with identical support. Hence p is a complementary vertex and the last statement follows. \square

Example 13. The binomial model of size 3 is the set of probability distributions on $\mathfrak{X} = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ parametrized as

$$q_j = \binom{3}{j} \theta^j (1 - \theta)^{3-j}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

This is a one-dimensional toric model that describes the experiment of flipping a coin with the bias θ three times. The matrix A can be taken to be

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $p = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \Delta_3$ the MLE is given by

$$\begin{aligned} q_0 &= \frac{1}{27}(3p_0 + 2p_1 + p_2)^3, \\ q_1 &= \frac{1}{9}(p_1 + 2p_2 + 3p_3)(3p_0 + 2p_1 + p_2)^2, \\ q_2 &= \frac{1}{9}(p_1 + 2p_2 + 3p_3)^2(3p_0 + 2p_1 + p_2), \\ q_3 &= \frac{1}{27}(p_1 + 2p_2 + 3p_3)^3. \end{aligned}$$

The logarithmic Voronoi polytopes are of the form $Q_b = \{u \in \Delta_3 : u_1 + 2u_2 + 3u_3 = b\}$ where $0 < b < 3$. For $0 < b < 1$ and $2 < b < 3$ these polytopes are triangles. The first kind has vertices with supports $\{0, 1\}$, $\{0, 2\}$, and $\{0, 3\}$. The vertices of the second kind have supports $\{0, 3\}$, $\{1, 3\}$, and $\{2, 3\}$. None of these triangles have a complementary vertex. When $b = 1$ and $b = 2$, Q_b is still a triangle: the supports of the vertices of Q_1 are $\{1\}$, $\{0, 2\}$, and $\{0, 3\}$. Those of Q_2 are $\{0, 3\}$, $\{1, 3\}$, and $\{2\}$. In Q_1 , the vertex $(0, 1, 0, 0)$ is a projection point with divergence $\log \frac{3}{4}$. In Q_2 , the vertex $(0, 0, 1, 0)$ is a projection point with the same divergence. The logarithmic Voronoi polytopes for $1 < b < 2$ are quadrangles with vertex supports $\{0, 2\}$, $\{0, 3\}$, $\{1, 2\}$, and $\{1, 3\}$. Therefore each vertex is a complementary vertex where the corresponding complementary face F is a vertex itself. Among all these, we find projection points only when $b = 3/2$. The vertices of $Q_{\frac{3}{2}}$ are $(\frac{1}{4}, 0, \frac{3}{4}, 0)$, $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$, $(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$, and $(0, \frac{3}{4}, 0, \frac{1}{4})$. All are projection points with the MLE $q = (\frac{1}{8}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{8})$ which is the intersection of the diagonals of the quadrangle. The divergences from each vertex to this binomial model are $\log(2)$, $2 \log(2)$, $2 \log(2) - \log(3)$, and $\log(2)$, respectively. Therefore $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ is the unique global maximizer attaining $D(\mathcal{M}) = 2 \log(2)$.

Corollary 14. [27, Section VI] Let \mathcal{M}_A be a codimension one toric model in Δ_{n-1} , i.e., let $\text{rank}(A) = d = n - 1$. Then there are exactly two projection points and at most two global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$.

Proof. The toric variety X_A is defined by a single equation which we can assume is of the form $x_1^{u_1} x_2^{u_2} \cdots x_r^{u_r} - x_{r+1}^{u_{r+1}} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ where $\sum_{i=1}^r u_i = \sum_{j=r+1}^n u_j$. The one-dimensional $\ker(A)$ is spanned by $(u_1, \dots, u_r, -u_{r+1}, \dots, -u_n)$, and all logarithmic Voronoi polytopes are one-dimensional whose affine span is parallel to $\ker(A)$. Since each such polytope has exactly two vertices, the line through these vertices always intersects \mathcal{M}_A . Hence, for these vertices to be projection points, we only need to make sure that they have complementary support. This can only happen if the vertices are $p = (p_1, \dots, p_r, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\tilde{p} = (0, \dots, 0, \tilde{p}_{r+1}, \dots, \tilde{p}_n)$ where $p_i = \frac{u_i}{\sum_{i=1}^r u_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $\tilde{p}_j = \frac{u_j}{\sum_{j=r+1}^n u_j}$ for $j = r + 1, \dots, n$. Both points are projection points and either one or both of them are global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$. \square

Example 15. Let X and Y be two independent binary random variables. The set of joint probability distributions $q_{ij} = \text{Prob}(X = i, Y = j)$ with $i, j \in \{0, 1\}^2$ is parametrized by $q_{ij} = a_i b_j$. This toric model $\mathcal{M}_A \subset \Delta_3$ has codimension one and can be given by the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The kernel of A is generated by $(1, -1, -1, 1)$, and the only two projection points are $(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $(0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0)$ with the MLE $q = (\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4})$. Since the information divergence from both projection points is $\log(2)$ they are both global maximizers.

We finish this section with a result that will be useful later.

Theorem 16. [23, Lemma 3.2] Let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k be $d_i \times n_i$ matrices, $i = 1, \dots, k$ with nonnegative entries and with the corresponding all ones vector as their first row. Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & A_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $D(\mathcal{M}_A) = \max\{D(\mathcal{M}_{A_1}), \dots, D(\mathcal{M}_{A_k})\}$.

Proof. Let $n = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$ and $d = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i$. The toric variety X_A as an affine variety is $X_{A_1} \times \cdots \times X_{A_k}$ and the defining toric ideal is $I_A = I_{A_1} + \cdots + I_{A_k}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $D(\mathcal{M}_{A_1})$ attains the maximum among the maximum information divergences for $\mathcal{M}_{A_1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{A_k}$. Let $p^{(1)} \in \Delta_{n_1-1}$ be a global maximizer with the associated MLE $q^{(1)}$. Setting $p = (p^{(1)}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $q = (q^{(1)}, 0, \dots, 0)$, we get $p \in \Delta_{n-1}$ and $q \in \mathcal{M}_A = \Delta_{n-1} \cap X_A$. Since $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}(p \parallel q) = D_{\mathcal{M}_{A_1}}(p^{(1)} \parallel q^{(1)})$ we conclude that $D_{\mathcal{M}_A} \geq D_{\mathcal{M}_{A_1}}$. Conversely, let $p = (p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(k)})$ be a global maximizer of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ with the MLE $q = (q^{(1)}, \dots, q^{(k)})$. Set $p_+^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} p_j^{(i)}$ and $q_+^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} q_j^{(i)}$. Note that $A_i p^{(i)} = A_i q^{(i)}$, so $p_+^{(i)} = q_+^{(i)}$, and $q^{(i)} \in X_{A_i}$. Moreover $\sum_{i=1}^k p_+^{(i)} = 1$. Now let $\tilde{p}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{p_+^{(i)}} p^{(i)}$ and $\tilde{q}^{(i)} = \frac{1}{q_+^{(i)}} q^{(i)}$. We see that $\tilde{p}^{(i)} \in \Delta_{n_i-1}$, and $\tilde{q}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{M}_{A_i}$ is the MLE of $\tilde{p}^{(i)}$. Since $D(\tilde{p}^{(i)} \parallel \tilde{q}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{p_+^{(i)}} D(p^{(i)} \parallel q^{(i)})$ we conclude that

$$D(\mathcal{M}_A) = D(p \parallel q) = \sum_{i=1}^k D(p^{(i)} \parallel q^{(i)}) = \sum_{i=1}^k p_+^{(i)} D(\tilde{p}^{(i)} \parallel \tilde{q}^{(i)}) \leq \max\{D(\mathcal{M}_{A_1}), \dots, D(\mathcal{M}_{A_k})\},$$

as desired. □

4 The chamber complex and the algorithm

We devote this section to describing an algorithm to compute $D(\mathcal{M}_A)$ and the corresponding global maximizers for a toric model \mathcal{M}_A . We first introduce the chamber complex of A : a polytopal

complex \mathcal{C}_A that is supported on the convex hull of (the columns of) A . This combinatorial object parametrizes all logarithmic Voronoi polytopes for the model \mathcal{M}_A . In particular, the finitely many faces (chambers) of \mathcal{C}_A correspond to all possible combinatorial types of these logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. It appears that, in order to locate all global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$, one needs to examine the vertices of all logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. With the help of \mathcal{C}_A we will reduce this task to examining vertices of each combinatorial type where we essentially do an algebraic computation for each chamber in \mathcal{C}_A . For any omitted details in the definition and computation of \mathcal{C}_A as well as its properties we refer to [10, Chapter 5].

Recall that A is a $d \times n$ matrix with nonnegative integer entries and $\text{rank}(A) = d$. We also assume that the first row of A is the vector of all ones. This means that the convex hull of the columns of A , $\text{conv}(A)$, is a polytope of dimension $d - 1$ whose set of vertices is a subset of the columns of A . For a nonempty $\sigma \subset [n]$ we let $A_\sigma = \{a_i : i \in \sigma\}$. When $|\sigma| = d$ and A_σ is invertible, $\text{conv}(A_\sigma)$ is a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional simplex. We will also use σ to denote $\text{conv}(A_\sigma)$. By Carathéodory's theorem [31, Proposition 1.15], $\text{conv}(A)$ is the union of all such simplices.

Definition 17. For $b \in \text{conv}(A)$ let $C_b := \bigcap_{\sigma \ni b} \sigma$. The chamber complex of A is

$$\mathcal{C}_A := \{C_b : b \in \text{conv}(A)\}.$$

We note that \mathcal{C}_A is a polytopal complex supported on $\text{conv}(A)$, and each C_b is a face of \mathcal{C}_A . Each such face of \mathcal{C}_A is called a chamber. For every $b \in \text{conv}(A)$ the set $Q_b = \{p \in \Delta_{n-1} : Ap = b\}$ is a logarithmic Voronoi polytope. The polytope Q_b has the maximum dimension $n - d - 1$ if and only if b is in the relative interior of $\text{conv}(A)$.

Theorem 18. Let C be a chamber of the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A . Then for each b in the relative interior of C , the vertices of Q_b are in bijection with $\sigma \subset [n]$ such that C is contained in the relative interior of $\text{conv}(A_\sigma)$ where the columns of A_σ are linearly independent. The support of the vertex corresponding to such σ is precisely σ . More generally, each face F of Q_b is of the form $F = Q_b \cap \bigcap_{i \notin \text{supp}(F)} \{p_i = 0\}$. As b varies in the relative interior of C , the support of each face of Q_b as well as the combinatorial type of Q_b does not change.

Proof. The polytope Q_b is a polyhedron in standard form. Hence, $v \in \Delta_{n-1}$ is a vertex of Q_b if and only if $Av = b$ where there exists $\sigma \subset [n]$ such that the columns of A_σ are linearly independent, and $i \notin \sigma$ implies $v_i = 0$; see [7, Theorem 2.4]. This is equivalent to $C \subset \text{conv}(A_\sigma)$. The extra condition that C is contained in the relative interior of $\text{conv}(A_\sigma)$ is equivalent to $\text{supp}(v) = \sigma$. More generally, each face F of Q_b is defined by some subset of coordinate hyperplanes $p_i = 0$. Since $\text{supp}(F)$ is the union of the supports of all the vertices on F we conclude that $F = Q_b \cap \bigcap_{i \notin \text{supp}(F)} \{p_i = 0\}$. By

the first part of this theorem, as b varies in the relative interior of C , the support of each vertex does not change, and hence the support of each face does not change. Since each face is determined by the set of vertices contained in that face this implies that the face lattice of Q_b is constant, i.e. every Q_b has the same combinatorial type. \square

Example 19. Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we denote the columns of A by a, b, c, d , and e . Here $\text{conv}(A)$ is a pentagon which, together with its chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A , can be seen in Figure 2. This chamber complex consists of 10 vertices, 20 edges, and 11 two-dimensional chambers. For some chambers C we have depicted the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes Q_b where b is in the relative interior of C . For instance, the horizontal (red) edge of the pentagonal chamber supports logarithmic Voronoi polytopes that are quadrangles. The supports of their vertices are $\{a, d\}$, $\{a, c, e\}$, $\{b, c, e\}$, and $\{b, d, e\}$ because C is contained in the relative interiors of $\text{conv}(A_{a,d})$, $\text{conv}(A_{a,c,e})$, $\text{conv}(A_{b,c,e})$, and $\text{conv}(A_{b,d,e})$.




Figure 2: The chamber complex of a pentagon.

Remark 20. Although each chamber of \mathcal{C}_A gives rise to logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of \mathcal{M}_A that have the same combinatorial type, different chambers might yield identical combinatorial types. For instance, in Example 19 we see that there are multiple chambers that support logarithmic Voronoi polytopes that are triangles or quadrangles. In fact, \mathcal{C}_A parametrizes these polytopes according to a finer invariant, namely, the normal fan of each polytope. We will not directly need this finer differentiation, though we will use the fact from Theorem 18 that the supports of the faces of Q_b given by b in a fixed chamber are constant.

Remark 21. In the algorithm we present, first we have to compute the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A . Using Definition 17 for this computation is highly inefficient. Here is an outline for a more efficient way.

First, one computes a Gale transform B of A where B is a $(n - d) \times n$ matrix whose rows form a basis for the kernel of A . Then the secondary fan Π_B of B is computed. This is a complete fan in \mathbb{R}^n in which each cone consists of weight vectors that induce the same regular subdivision of the vector configuration given by the n columns of B . The cones of the secondary fan Π_B are in bijection with the chambers of \mathcal{C}_A . More precisely, if u_1, \dots, u_k are the generators of a cone in Π_B the corresponding chamber in \mathcal{C}_A is the convex hull of Au_1, \dots, Au_k . The details can be found in [10, Section 5.4]; in particular, for the claimed bijection see Theorem 5.4.5 in the same reference. We used *Gfan* [17] to compute Π_B which can also be accessed via *Macaulay 2* [13].

Example 22. As the matrix A gets larger, all of these computations become challenging. To give an idea, we consider the toric model \mathcal{M}_A that is the independence model of a binary and two ternary random variables. It is a 5-dimensional model in Δ_{17} . The f -vector of the 5-dimensional polytope $\text{conv}(A)$ is $(18, 45, 48, 27, 8)$, i.e., this polytope has 18 vertices, 45 edges, etc. The chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A that was computed via the methods outlined in Remark 21 has the f -vector

$$(3503407, 33084756, 105341820, 151227738, 100828884, 25361616).$$

The computation took about two days on a standard laptop, and it could only be done after taking into account the symmetries of $\text{conv}(A)$. We note that, luckily, this computation needs to be done only once, and once \mathcal{C}_A is computed, its chambers have to be processed as we will explain in our algorithm. This processing can be shortened by considering the symmetries of the chamber complex (if there are any) as well as by using a few simple observations on the structure of the supports of the vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. We will outline these ideas below.

According to Theorem 12, given a logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b where $b \in \text{conv}(A)$, we need to identify complementary vertices of Q_b and decide whether any of these vertices are projection points. These, in turn, are potential local and global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$. The following proposition gives a way to decide whether a complementary vertex is a projection point.

Proposition 23. Let v be a complementary vertex of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b of a toric model \mathcal{M}_A with the complementary face F . Let $\mathcal{L}_{v,F}$ be the collection of the lines passing through v and each point on F . Then v is a projection point if and only if $\mathcal{L}_{v,F}$ intersects \mathcal{M}_A .

Proof. By Birch's theorem, Q_b intersects \mathcal{M}_A in a single point, namely, the MLE q of any point p in Q_b . The vertex v is a projection point if and only if one of the lines in $\mathcal{L}_{v,F}$ passes through q . This happens if and only if $\mathcal{L}_{v,F}$ intersects \mathcal{M}_A in the only possible point q . \square

In light of Proposition 23, to check whether a complementary vertex v of Q_b is a projection point reduces to an algebraic computation. Let F be the complementary face of dimension k . Then $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$, the Zariski closure of $\mathcal{L}_{v,F}$, is an affine subspace of dimension $k + 1$ whose defining equations can easily be computed. For instance, if v_1, \dots, v_{k+1} are vertices of F that are affinely independent, then $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$ is the image of the map

$$(s, t_1, \dots, t_{k+1}) \mapsto sv + (1 - s)(t_1v_1 + \dots + t_{k+1}v_{k+1})$$

where $t_1 + \dots + t_{k+1} = 1$. To intersect $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$ with \mathcal{M}_A we use the equations of $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$ and the binomial equations defining the toric variety X_A . Since $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$ is contained in the affine span of Q_b , and since the latter affine subspace intersects X_A in finitely many complex points (see Definition 50), $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v,F}}$ intersects X_A also in finitely many points. They can be computed using a numerical algebraic

geometry software such as *Bertini* [6] or *HomotopyContinuation.jl* [8]. Finally, one checks whether this finite set contains a point with positive coordinates.

Example 24. We use Example 19. The point $b = (1, 7/4, 1)$ is the midpoint of the horizontal (red) edge of the pentagonal chamber. The vertex $v = (5/12, 0, 0, 7/12, 0)$ of Q_b is complementary to another vertex $v_1 = (0, 1/4, 1/4, 0, 1/2)$. The toric variety X_A is defined by the equations

$$p_2^2 p_4^2 - p_3^3 p_5 = p_1 p_3^3 - p_2^3 p_4 = p_1 p_4 - p_2 p_5 = 0.$$

The affine subspace spanned by v and v_1 is just a line defined by

$$12p_4 + 14p_5 - 7 = 2p_3 - p_5 = 2p_2 - p_5 = 12p_1 + 10p_5 - 5 = 0.$$

The intersection of X_A with $\overline{\mathcal{L}_{v, \{v_1\}}}$ is empty. Hence, we conclude that v is not a projection point.

The above discussion describes a way of checking whether a complementary vertex of a *fixed* logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b is a projection point. Next, we describe how to accomplish the same task for a complementary vertex of Q_b as b varies in the interior of a fixed chamber C in the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A . By Theorem 18 each such Q_b has the same combinatorial type and the support of any face of Q_b stays constant. Now let $(v(b), F(b))$ be a pair of a complementary vertex and its corresponding complementary face in Q_b where b is in the relative interior of a chamber C . Let w_1, \dots, w_m be the vertices of C . Then $b = \sum_{i=1}^m r_i w_i$ where $\sum_{i=1}^m r_i = 1$ and $r_i \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. This means that the coordinates of $v(b)$ and those of the vertices $v_1(b), \dots, v_z(b)$ of $F(b)$ are linear functions of r_1, \dots, r_m . Next, we parametrize a general point $w(b)$ on $F(b)$ via $w(b) = \sum_{i=1}^z t_i v_i(b)$ where $\sum_{i=1}^z t_i = 1$ and $t_i \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, z$. Finally, the line segment between $v(b)$ and $w(b)$ is parametrized by $sv(b) + (1-s)w(b)$ where $0 \leq s \leq 1$. The last expression gives points in Δ_{n-1} where each coordinate is a polynomial in the parameters $r_1, \dots, r_m, t_1, \dots, t_z$, and s , and it defines the map

$$\Psi_{v,F} : \Delta_{m-1} \times \Delta_{z-1} \times \Delta_1 \longrightarrow \Delta_{n-1}.$$

Proposition 23 implies that $v(b)$ is a projection point for some $b \in C$ if and only if the image of $\Psi_{v,F}$ intersects \mathcal{M}_A . Again, this boils down to an algebraic computation. We substitute the coordinates of $sv(b) + (1-s)w(b)$ into the equations defining X_A , check whether this system of equations has solutions in \mathbb{C}^{m+z+1} , and if there are any, compute $\text{im}\Psi_{v,F} \cap \mathcal{M}_A$ by imposing the positivity constraints on the solution set. The resulting semi-algebraic set is then the feasible region over which $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ can be maximized to identify local maximizers with support equal to the support of $v(b)$. Finally, we locate the global maximizer(s) among these local maximizers contributed by each chamber C of the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A that supports projection points. We summarize this in a high-level algorithm.

Algorithm:

Input: $A \in \mathbb{N}^{d \times n}$ that defines a toric model $\mathcal{M}_A \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ of dimension $d - 1$.

Output: All maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$.

1. Compute the equations of the toric variety X_A .
2. Compute the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A .
3. For each chamber C in \mathcal{C}_A do:

- a) for any fixed \hat{b} in the relative interior of C compute the face lattice of $Q_{\hat{b}}$ and identify complementary vertex/face pairs (v, F) ;
- b) for each (v, F) do:
 - i. compute the parametrization $\Psi_{v,F}$ and substitute it into the equations of X_A ;
 - ii. if the resulting algebraic set in \mathbb{C}^{m+z+1} is nonempty then
 - * compute the semi-algebraic set $\text{im}\Psi_{v,F} \cap \mathcal{M}_A$ by imposing positivity constraints on the parameters in $\Psi_{v,F}$;
 - * find the maximizers $D_{C,v,F}$ of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ over $\text{im}\Psi_{v,F} \cap \mathcal{M}_A$.

4. Identify global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ by comparing all $D_{C,v,F}$.

Example 25. We illustrate this algorithm using the toric model of Example 19. The equations of X_A are the three polynomials computed in Example 24. The chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A is the polytopal complex in Figure 2. The chambers which support complementary vertices are the (relative interior of) the boundary edges of the pentagonal chamber. Step 3 is executed only for these chambers. For instance, the horizontal edge is the convex hull of its vertices $(3/2, 1)$ and $(2, 1)$, and the unique complementary vertex/face pair (v, F) is given by vertex v with support $\{a, d\}$ and the vertex F with support $\{b, c, e\}$. We note that for such pair of complementary *vertices* $(v, \{w\})$ we do not need to consider the pair $(w, \{v\})$ in the next computation. The parametrization $\Psi_{v,F}$ is given by

$$(r_1, s) \mapsto \left(s\left(\frac{1}{6}r_1 + \frac{1}{3}\right), (1-s)\frac{r_1}{2}, (1-s)\frac{1-r_1}{2}, s\left(-\frac{1}{6}r_1 + \frac{2}{3}\right), \frac{1-s}{2} \right),$$

where we are parametrizing b on this edge by $r_1(3/2, 1) + (1-r_1)(2, 1)$. Substituting $\Psi_{v,F}$ into the equations of X_A results in

$$\begin{aligned} s^2r_1^2 + 7s^2r_1 - 8s^2 - 18sr_1 + 9r_1 &= 0 \\ 197s^4r_1 - 194s^4 - 1401s^3r_1 - 3sr_1^3 + 1014s^3 + 4398s^2r_1 + 246sr_1^2 - 2094s^2 - 5837sr_1 - 81r_1^2 + 2s + 2349r_1 &= 0 \\ 885s^4 - 31312s^3r_1 - 294sr_1^3 + 32392s^3 + 179435s^2r_1 + 17016sr_1^2 - 117350s^2 - 295438sr_1 - 6165r_1^2 + 2560s & \\ + 129141r_1 - 591 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This is a zero-dimensional system that has 11 solutions which we have computed using *Bertini*. Four of these are complex and seven are real. There is a unique real solution where $0 < r_1, s < 1$, namely

$$r_1 = 0.4702953126494577 \text{ and } s = 0.4106301713351522.$$

The corresponding KL-divergence at the vertex v is 0.890062259952966. At the vertex w , the divergence is 0.528701425022976. For each of the remaining four edges of this pentagonal chamber we also get a pair of projection vertices with corresponding KL-divergences equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &0.729916767214609 \text{ and } 0.657681783609608 \\ &0.736523721240758 \text{ and } 0.651574202843057 \\ &0.927851227501820 \text{ and } 0.503192212618303 \\ &0.856820834934792 \text{ and } 0.552532602066626. \end{aligned}$$

The global maximizer is the vertex

$$v = (0, 0.6722451790633609, 0, 0, 0.3277548209366391)$$

corresponding to the divergence value 0.927851227501820. It is a vertex of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b where $b = (1.3277548209366392, 0.6555096418732783)$ lies on the edge of the pentagonal chamber contained in the line segment between $(1, 0)$ and $(2, 2)$.

The basic algorithm above can be improved on many fronts. We will now present some ideas for such improvements.

For Step 1, one could replace the equations of X_A , which could be challenging to compute for large models, with $n - d$ equations corresponding to a basis of $\ker_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$. Let B be an $(n - d) \times n$ matrix whose rows b_i , $i = 1, \dots, n - d$ form such a basis. The lattice basis ideal

$$I_B = \left\langle \prod_{j=1}^n p_j^{b_i^+} - \prod_{j=1}^n p_j^{b_i^-}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - d \right\rangle$$

where $b_i = b_i^+ - b_i^-$ with $b_i^+, b_i^- \geq 0$ and $\text{supp}(b_i^+) \cap \text{supp}(b_i^-) = \emptyset$ defines a variety Y_B containing X_A . In fact, Y_B is the union of X_A together with varieties contained in various coordinate subspaces defined by setting a subset of coordinates equal to zero (see [29, Section 8.3] and [14]). This means that $\mathcal{M}_A^{>0} = X_A \cap \Delta_{n-1}^\circ$ is equal to $Y_B \cap \Delta_{n-1}^\circ$. This is what is ultimately needed in Step 3.b.ii.

For Step 2, Example 22 illustrated that computing \mathcal{C}_A might be out of reach due to the combinatorial explosion in the number of chambers. However, one does not need to compute \mathcal{C}_A all at once. It can be computed one chamber at a time. This is how a software like *Gfan* [17] internally computes \mathcal{C}_A based on reverse search enumeration [3]. In this case, Step 3 can be executed as chambers get computed.

In Step 3, not all chambers need to be considered. For instance, any chamber that is contained in the boundary of $\text{conv}(A)$ can be skipped: if b is in such a chamber, the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b is contained in the boundary of Δ_{n-1} . Such Q_b does not contribute global maximizers of $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$. There are also ways to eliminate chambers since they cannot contain complementary vertices. We present a few ways this can be done.

Proposition 26. Suppose $\text{conv}(A)$ is a simplicial polytope where each column of A is a vertex. Let C be a chamber that intersects the boundary as well as the interior of $\text{conv}(A)$. Then for any b that is in the relative interior of C , the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b does not contain complementary vertices.

Proof. The intersection of C with the boundary of $\text{conv}(A)$ is a simplex spanned by a subset of columns of A , say A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_k} . Then the support of every vertex of Q_b contains $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. This disallows the existence of complementary vertices. \square

Note, for instance, in our running Example 19, it is enough to consider the pentagonal chamber and its faces by the above proposition. In fact, the interior of this chamber does not have to be considered either for the following reason.

Proposition 27. Let C be a chamber of dimension k where $k + 1 > n/2$. Then for any b that is in the relative interior of C , the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b does not contain complementary vertices.

Proof. By Theorem 18, each of the vertices of Q_b has support of size at least $k + 1$. If a vertex v of Q_b is complementary there must exist a vertex w such that $\text{supp}(v) \cap \text{supp}(w) = \emptyset$. Such two vertices can only exist when $2(k + 1) \leq n$. \square

Proposition 28. If (v, F) is a pair of a complementary vertex and its complementary face F where both v and F are contained in the same facet F' of Q_b , then v cannot be a projection point.

Proof. The line segments from v to the points in F are entirely contained in F' which is in the boundary of Δ_{n-1} . Then v cannot be a projection point since no such line segment can intersect the toric model \mathcal{M}_A in the interior of Δ_{n-1} . \square

Again, we note that, Proposition 28 rules out the zero-dimensional chambers that are the vertices of the pentagonal chamber in Example 19 since they give rise to complementary pairs (v, F) lying in the same facet of their logarithmic Voronoi polytope.

Proposition 29. Let C be a chamber in the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A . If no two vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b corresponding to points b in the relative interior of C have disjoint supports, then the same is true for any chamber C' containing C .

Proof. The supports of vertices of $Q_{b'}$ where b' is in the relative interior of C' are in bijection with σ' where columns of $A_{\sigma'}$ are affinely independent and the relative interior of $\text{conv}(A_{\sigma'})$ contains the relative interior of C' . Since C is a face of C' , for any σ such that the columns of A_{σ} are affinely independent and the relative interior of $\text{conv}(A_{\sigma})$ contains the relative interior of C , there is (possibly multiple) $\sigma' \supset \sigma$ as above. Hence if no two vertices of Q_b have disjoint supports, the same is true for $Q_{b'}$. \square

Corollary 30. Let $A \in \mathbb{N}^{3 \times 5}$ such that $\text{conv}(A)$ is a planar pentagon. If a logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b contains a projection point then b is in the interior of an edge of the pentagonal chamber. Moreover, each such edge contributes either finitely many projection points or for every b on the edge, Q_b has a projection point.

Proof. Propositions 26, 27, and 28 imply the first statement. Any logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b where b is on an edge of the pentagonal chamber has a pair of complementary vertices (v, w) . The Zariski closure of the image of $\Psi_{v,w} : \Delta_1 \times \Delta_1 \rightarrow \Delta_4$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^4$ is a two-dimensional irreducible surface. Since X_A is also two-dimensional and irreducible, and it is never equal to the former Zariski closure, their intersection has either finitely many points (this is the generic case) or it is an algebraic curve. This means that $\text{im}\Psi_{v,w} \cap \mathcal{M}_A$ has either finitely many points or contains the positive real part of an algebraic curve. In the second case, the projection of the preimage of this positive real part under $\Psi_{v,w}$ to the first Δ_1 in the domain of $\Psi_{v,w}$ must be all of Δ_1 . Hence, for every b on this edge, Q_b has a projection point. \square

Our final remark about the algorithm concerns the step where $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ needs to be maximized over the semi-algebraic set $\text{im}\Psi_{v,F} \cap \mathcal{M}_A$. Of course, this is a challenging step. However, generically one expects this set to be finite. In that case, numerical algebraic geometry tools perform well to compute each point in this finite intersection. Another relatively easier case is when the maximum likelihood degree of X_A is one; see Definition 50. There are two advantages in this case. First, the intersection of $\text{im}\Psi_{v,F}$ with X_A is guaranteed to be in Δ_{n-1} since the affine span of each logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b intersects X_A in exactly one point, namely the unique maximum likelihood estimator $q(b)$ in Q_b . Second, $q(b)$ is a rational function of $v(b)$ – an equivalent condition for an algebraic statistical model to have maximum likelihood degree equal to one. In other words, both $v(b)$ and $q(b)$ are rational functions of the parameters $(r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \Delta_{m-1}$. In turn, $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}$ restricted to the potential projection points $v(b)$ is a greatly simplified function of the same parameters. Now, one needs to optimize $D_{\mathcal{M}_A}(r_1, \dots, r_m)$ over Δ_{m-1} .

Example 31 (Independence model 2×3). Consider the independence model of two random variables, binary X and ternary Y . Similar to Example 15, this is a 3-dimensional toric model inside Δ_5 given by the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The polytope $\text{conv}(A)$ is a 3-dimensional polytope with six vertices that is highly symmetrical due to the action of the group $S_2 \times S_3$ on the states of X and Y . This, in turn, induces a partition of the elements in the chamber complex \mathcal{C}_A into symmetry classes. This way, 18 full-dimensional chambers are split into 5 classes, 44 ridges are split into 7 classes, 36 edges are split into 6 classes, and 11 vertices are split into 3 classes. Figure 3 demonstrates this division of full-dimensional chambers: any chambers that share a color are in the same symmetry class. The red middle chamber is a bipyramid with a triangular base and is the only one in its class.




Figure 3: Chamber complex of the 2×3 independence model (left and middle) and the middle chamber (right).

To run the algorithm, note that 9 out of the 11 vertices are on the boundary of $\text{conv}(A)$, and hence do not contribute any projection vertices by Proposition 28. Call the two interior vertices b_1 and b_2 . They are both in the same symmetry class and lie on the middle red full-dimensional chamber. The logarithmic Voronoi polytope at a point corresponding to b_1 is a triangle with no complementary vertices, and the same is true of b_2 by symmetry. Hence, no vertices of the chamber complex will contribute any projection points. Next, out of 36 edges 21 are on the boundary. Moreover, 6 of the remaining edges contain the vertex b_1 and by symmetry another 6 contain the vertex b_2 , so we do not need to check these edges by Proposition 29. This leaves us with three edges e_1 , e_2 , and e_3 on the base of the red bipyramid. We will treat them in the next paragraph. Out of 44 ridges, 14 are on the boundary, 12 contain vertex b_1 , and another 12 contain vertex b_2 . The remaining 6 are in the same symmetry class. Logarithmic Voronoi polytopes corresponding to these are quadrilaterals with supports like $\{1234, 1345, 1246, 156\}$ that contain no complementary vertices. Hence, none of the ridges will contribute projection points. Finally, none of the three-dimensional chambers will contribute any projection points by Proposition 27.

Hence, we only need to run step 3 of our algorithm on the edges e_1, e_2 , and e_3 . By symmetry, it suffices to run it on e_1 only. A point b on this edge can be parametrized as $r_1(1/2, 1/2, 0) + (1 - r_1)(1/2, 0, 1/2)$. The only vertex-face pair we need to consider is the pair of complementary vertices

$(v, \{w\})$, where $v = 1/2(1, 0, 0, 0, r_1, 1 - r_1)$ and $w = 1/2(0, r_1, 1 - r_1, 1, 0, 0)$. The parametrization $\Psi_{v, \{w\}}$ of the line between them gives rise to the single equation $(s - 1)^2 - s^2 = 0$. Therefore $s = 1/2$, while r_1 is a free variable between 0 and 1. Upon substituting $s = 1/2$ into $D(v, \text{im}(\Psi_{v, \{w\}}))$, we get the constant value $\log 2$. Therefore, the divergence at *every* point b of the edge e_1 is $\log 2$, attained at the two vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope v and w . By symmetry, the same is true of e_2 and e_3 . We conclude that the maximum divergence from this model is $\log 2$ and there are infinitely many maximizers which we completely characterized above. These maximizers were also studied and visualized in [5].

5 Logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of reducible hierarchical log-linear models

This section is devoted to logarithmic Voronoi polytopes of toric models that are known as reducible hierarchical log-linear models [11, 15, 19]. Besides giving one structural result about these polytopes, we will also prove results relating the maximum information divergence to such models with those that are obtained by certain marginalizations. For similar work we refer the reader to [21].

A *simplicial complex* is a set $\Gamma \subseteq 2^{[m]}$ such that if $F \in \Gamma$ and $S \subseteq F$, then $S \in \Gamma$. The elements of Γ are called *faces*. We refer to inclusion-maximal faces of Γ as *facets*. It is sufficient to list the facets to describe a simplicial complex. For example, $\Gamma = [12][13][23]$ will denote the simplicial complex $\Gamma = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}\}$.

Let X_1, \dots, X_m be discrete random variables. For each $i \in [m]$, assume that X_i has the state space $[d_i]$ for some $d_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathcal{R} = \prod_{i=1}^m [d_i]$ be the state space of the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_m) . For each $i = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathcal{R}$ and $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots\} \subseteq [m]$, we will denote $i_F = (i_{f_1}, i_{f_2}, \dots)$. Moreover, each such subset $F \subseteq [m]$ gives rise to the random vector $X_F = (X_f)_{f \in F}$ with the state space $\mathcal{R}_F = \prod_{f \in F} [d_f]$.

Definition 32. Let $\Gamma \subseteq 2^{[m]}$ be a simplicial complex and let $d_1, \dots, d_m \in \mathbb{N}$. For each facet $F \in \Gamma$, introduce $|\mathcal{R}_F|$ parameters $\theta_{i_F}^{(F)}$, one for each $i_F \in \mathcal{R}_F$. The *hierarchical log-linear model* associated with Γ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} = \left\{ p \in \Delta_{|\mathcal{R}|-1} : p_i = \frac{1}{Z(\theta)} \prod_{F \in \text{facets}(\Gamma)} \theta_{i_F}^{(F)} \text{ for all } i \in \mathcal{R} \right\}$$

where $Z(\theta)$ is the normalizing constant defined as

$$Z(\theta) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} \prod_{F \in \text{facets}(\Gamma)} \theta_{i_F}^{(F)}.$$

If $u \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$ is a $d_1 \times \dots \times d_m$ contingency table containing data for the random vector (X_1, \dots, X_m) and $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots\} \subseteq [m]$, let u_F denote the $d_{f_1} \times d_{f_2} \times \dots$ table with $(u_F)_{i_F} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_{[m] \setminus F}} u_{i_F, j}$. Such table u_F is called the *F-marginal* of u . For simplicity, we will denote the simplex in which $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ lives by $\Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$.

Proposition 33. [11, Prop. 1.2.9] Hierarchical log-linear models are toric models. For any simplicial complex $\Gamma \subseteq 2^{[m]}$ and positive integers $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m)$, the model $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ is realized by the $0/1$

matrix $A_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ representing the marginalization map

$$\varphi(u) = (u_{F_1}, u_{F_2}, \dots)$$

where F_1, F_2, \dots are the facets of Γ . In other words, $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} = \mathcal{M}_{A_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}$.

Here we wish to point out that for any point $q \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ (in particular, for $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$) the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_q^Γ consists of all $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ such that $\varphi(p) = \varphi(q)$.

Definition 34. A simplicial complex Γ on $[m]$ is called *reducible* with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) if there exist sub-complexes Γ_1, Γ_2 of Γ and a subset $S \subseteq [m]$ such that $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = 2^S$. We say Γ is *decomposable* if it is reducible and each of the Γ_1, Γ_2 is either decomposable or a simplex. A hierarchical log-linear model associated to a reducible (decomposable) simplicial complex is called reducible (decomposable).

5.1 Decomposition theory of logarithmic Voronoi polytopes

Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Suppose Γ_1 has the vertex set $\alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ and Γ_2 has the vertex set $\beta = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s\}$. Then $S = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\} \cap \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s\}$. We also let $\mathbf{d}_\alpha = (d_{\alpha_1}, \dots, d_{\alpha_k})$, with analogous definitions for \mathbf{d}_β and \mathbf{d}_S . Let p be a point in $\Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ and consider the maps

$$\pi_1 : \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} \rightarrow \Delta_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha} \quad p \mapsto p_1 = p_{\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\}}.$$

$$\pi_2 : \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} \rightarrow \Delta_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta} \quad p \mapsto p_2 = p_{\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s\}}.$$

More precisely,

$$(\pi_1(p))_{i_\alpha} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\alpha = i_\alpha} p_j \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi_2(p))_{i_\beta} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\beta = i_\beta} p_j.$$

Lemma 35. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ so that $q_1 = \pi_1(q)$ and $q_2 = \pi_2(q)$. Furthermore, consider the maps

$$\pi'_1 : \Delta_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha} \rightarrow \Delta_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S} \quad p \mapsto p_S$$

$$\pi'_2 : \Delta_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta} \rightarrow \Delta_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S} \quad p \mapsto p_S$$

defined by

$$(\pi'_1(p))_{i_S} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_\alpha: j_S = i_S} p_j \quad \text{and} \quad (\pi'_2(p))_{i_S} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}_\beta: j_S = i_S} p_j.$$

Then $q_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ and $q_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$, and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} & \\
 \pi_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \pi_2 \\
 q_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha} & & q_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta} \\
 \pi'_1 \searrow & & \swarrow \pi'_2 \\
 & q_3 \in \mathcal{M}_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S} &
 \end{array}$$

Proof. By the definitions of the maps, $\pi'_1 \circ \pi_1 = \pi'_2 \circ \pi_2$. Also, since $\mathcal{M}_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S} = \Delta_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S}$ it is clear that $q_3 \in \mathcal{M}_{2^S, \mathbf{d}_S}$. We just need to show $q_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ and $q_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$. We prove the first claim since the second one requires the same argument. Let $t \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ be the MLE of q_1 and $r \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$ be the MLE of q_2 . We will show that $q_1 = t$. Note that $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$, so it is its own MLE in the model. Since t is in the same logarithmic Voronoi polytope as q_1 and r is in the same logarithmic Voronoi polytope as q_2 , we see that $\pi'_1(t) = t_S = q_3$ and $\pi'_2(r) = r_S = q_3$. Then by [19, Prop 4.1.4]

$$q_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = \frac{(t_{i_\alpha}) \cdot (r_{i_\beta})}{(r_S)_{i_S}},$$

where $i_\alpha = (i_{\alpha_1}, \dots, i_{\alpha_k})$ and $i_\beta = (i_{\beta_1}, \dots, i_{\beta_s})$. Then observe that for any i_α , we get

$$(q_1)_{i_\alpha} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\alpha = i_\alpha} \frac{(t_{j_\alpha}) \cdot (r_{j_\beta})}{(r_S)_{j_S}} = \frac{t_{i_\alpha}}{(r_S)_{i_S}} \sum_{j_\beta: j_S = i_S} r_{j_\beta} = \frac{t_{i_\alpha} \cdot (r_S)_{i_S}}{(r_S)_{i_S}} = t_{i_\alpha}.$$

Since i_α was arbitrary, we get that $q_1 = t$. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section. From the discussion so far we see that π_1 and π_2 restrict to logarithmic Voronoi polytopes, i.e., $\pi_1 : Q_p^\Gamma \rightarrow Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $\pi_2 : Q_p^\Gamma \rightarrow Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ where $p_1 = \pi_1(p)$ and $p_2 = \pi_2(p)$ for $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$. In fact, we can take $q = p \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ so that q_1 and q_2 are in $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$, respectively, by the above lemma. The next theorem reconstructs Q_p^Γ from the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$.

Theorem 36. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $\psi : \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} \rightarrow \Delta_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha} \times \Delta_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$ be the map $\psi(u) = (\pi_1(u), \pi_2(u))$. Then for any $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$, we have

$$Q_q^\Gamma = \left[\left\{ u \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} : u_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = \frac{v_{i_\alpha} \cdot w_{i_\beta}}{(q_S)_{i_S}} \text{ for } v \in Q_{q_1}^{\Gamma_1} \text{ and } w \in Q_{q_2}^{\Gamma_2} \right\} + \ker(\psi) \right] \cap \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$$

Proof. We proceed by double containment. To show that the right-hand side is contained in Q_q^Γ , let $u = u^{(1)} + u^{(2)} \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ where $u_{i_1, \dots, i_m}^{(1)} = \frac{v_{i_\alpha} \cdot w_{i_\beta}}{(q_S)_{i_S}}$ for $v \in Q_{q_1}^{\Gamma_1}$, $w \in Q_{q_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ and $u^{(2)} \in \ker(\psi)$. Let $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$ be any facet of Γ . Then F is either in Γ_1 or in Γ_2 . Without loss of generality, assume F is in Γ_1 . Then for any $i_F = (i_{f_1}, \dots, i_{f_k})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((u^{(1)})_F)_{i_F} &= \sum_{\{j_\alpha: j_F = i_F\}} \left(\sum_{\{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\alpha = i_\alpha, j_F = i_F\}} \frac{v_{j_\alpha} \cdot w_{j_\beta}}{(q_S)_{j_S}} \right) = \sum_{\{j_\alpha: j_F = i_F\}} \frac{v_{j_\alpha} \cdot (w_S)_{j_S}}{(q_S)_{j_S}} \\ &= \sum_{\{j_\alpha: j_F = i_F\}} v_{j_\alpha} = (v_F)_{i_F} = (q_F)_{i_F}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $u^{(1)} \in Q_q^\Gamma$. But since $u^{(2)} \in \ker(\psi)$, it has a zero F -marginal for every facet of Γ . Thus, $u = u^{(1)} + u^{(2)} \in Q_q^\Gamma$, as desired.

To show the reverse containment, let $u \in Q_q^\Gamma$ and let $v \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ be the point defined by

$$v_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = \frac{(u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} \cdot (u_\beta)_{i_\beta}}{(q_S)_{i_S}}$$

for all (i_1, \dots, i_m) . We write $u = v + (u - v)$. Since $u_\alpha = \pi_1(u) \in Q_{q_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $u_\beta = \pi_2(u) \in Q_{q_2}^{\Gamma_2}$, it suffices to show that $u - v \in \ker \psi$. That is, we must show that $[(u - v)_\alpha]_{i_\alpha} = 0$ and $[(u - v)_\beta]_{i_\beta} = 0$. For any i_α , $[(u - v)_\alpha]_{i_\alpha}$ is equal to

$$(u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} - \sum_{\{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\alpha = i_\alpha\}} \frac{(u_\alpha)_{j_\alpha} \cdot (u_\beta)_{j_\beta}}{(qS)_{j_S}} = (u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} - \frac{(u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha}}{(qS)_{i_S}} \sum_{\{j_\beta: j_S = i_S\}} (u_\beta)_{j_\beta} = (u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} - \frac{(u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} \cdot (u_S)_{i_S}}{(qS)_{i_S}} = 0.$$

Similarly, one shows that $(u - v)_{i_\beta} = 0$ as well. Thus, $u - v \in \ker \psi$, and this concludes the proof. \square

In this theorem, the first summand in the Minkowski sum that appears in the decomposition of Q_q^Γ is an interesting object. It is nonlinear and captures a portion of Q_q^Γ .

Definition 37. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ and $p_i = \pi_i(p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then the product of $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ is defined as

$$Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1} \otimes_p Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2} = \left\{ u \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} : u_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = \frac{v_{i_\alpha} \cdot w_{i_\beta}}{(pS)_{i_S}} \text{ for } v \in Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1} \text{ and } w \in Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2} \right\}.$$

Remark 38. If $p' \in Q_p^\Gamma$ we get the equality of the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes $Q_{p'}^\Gamma = Q_p^\Gamma$. Moreover, since $p'_i = \pi_i(p') \in Q_{p'_i}^{\Gamma_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$, we see that $Q_{p'_i}^{\Gamma_i} = Q_{p_i}^{\Gamma_i}$. Therefore, $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1} \otimes_p Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2} = Q_{p'_1}^{\Gamma_1} \otimes_{p'} Q_{p'_2}^{\Gamma_2}$. In other words, the product depends only on the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_p^Γ and not on the individual points in the polytope.

Example 39. Consider the complex $\Gamma = [12][13][23][24][34]$ for $m = 4$. Suppose both X_1, X_2, X_3 , and X_4 are binary random variables, i.e., $d_i = 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Let $\Gamma_1 = [12][13][23]$ and $\Gamma_2 = [23][24][34]$, so $S = \{2, 3\}$. The logarithmic Voronoi polytopes $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ have dimension one whereas the dimension of Q_p^Γ is six. This is consistent with Theorem 36 since $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1} \otimes_p Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ is a two-dimensional surface in Δ_{15} and $\ker(\psi)$ has dimension four. More explicitly, if $v = (v_{ijk})$ and $w = (w_{jkl})$ are points in $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$, respectively, where in particular $v_{+jk} = v_{1jk} + v_{2jk}$ and $w_{jk+} = w_{jk1} + w_{jk2}$ are equal to each other for all $j, k = 1, 2$, then $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1} \otimes_p Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ consists of points $u = (u_{ijkl})$ where

$$u_{ijkl} = \frac{v_{ijk} \cdot w_{jkl}}{v_{+jk}}.$$

5.2 Comparing divergences

Since a reducible model $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ associated to a simplicial complex Γ on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) has the two associated models $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$ it is natural to ask how the divergences from these three models are related. Before we present our contributions we wish to cite two results of Matúš that are relevant.

Proposition 40. [21, Lemma 3] For any $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ and a reducible model $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$,

$$D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(p) = D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}}(\pi_1(p)) + D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}}(\pi_2(p)) + H(\pi_1(p)) + H(\pi_2(p)) - H(p) - H((\pi'_1 \circ \pi_1)(p))$$

where $H(\cdot)$ is the entropy.

Proposition 41. [21, Corollary 3] For a hierarchical log-linear model $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ we have

$$D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}) \leq \min_{F \text{ facet of } \Gamma} \left\{ \sum_{i \notin F} \log d_i \right\}.$$

With regards to Proposition 40 we point out that the four entropy terms together give a nonnegative quantity because of the strong subadditivity property of entropy. Therefore, for a reducible model we get the inequality $D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(p) \geq D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}}(\pi_1(p)) + D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}}(\pi_2(p))$. We state and prove a similar inequality in Corollary 44. In the case when the point p lives in the product portion of its logarithmic Voronoi polytope (as in Theorem 36), we recover the equality below.

Proposition 42. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ and $p_i = \pi_i(p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $u = v \otimes_p w$ where $v \in Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $w \in Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$, then $D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(u) = D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}}(v) + D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}}(w)$.

Proof. Let $t \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ and $r \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}$ be the respective maximum likelihood estimators of v and w . Similarly, let $q \in \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ be the maximum likelihood estimator of u . By [19, Prop 4.1.4], $q = t \otimes_p r$ and

$$D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(u) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} u_i \log(u_i/q_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} u_i \log(v_{i_\alpha}/t_{i_\alpha}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{R}} u_i \log(w_{i_\beta}/r_{i_\beta}).$$

Since $(u_\alpha)_{i_\alpha} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\alpha = i_\alpha} u_j = v_{i_\alpha}$ and $(u_\beta)_{i_\beta} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{R}: j_\beta = i_\beta} u_j = w_{i_\beta}$ (see the proof of Lemma 35) we conclude that

$$D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(u) = \sum_{i_\alpha} v_{i_\alpha} \log(v_{i_\alpha}/t_{i_\alpha}) + \sum_{i_\beta} w_{i_\beta} \log(w_{i_\beta}/r_{i_\beta}) = D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}}(v) + D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}}(w).$$

□

Corollary 43. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ and $p_i = \pi_i(p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose $v \in Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ maximizes the divergence to $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}$ over all points in $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$. Similarly, suppose $w \in Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ and $p' \in Q_p^\Gamma$ be such maximizers. Then $D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(p') \geq D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}}(v) + D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta}}(w)$.

Proof. Use Proposition 42 with $D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(p') \geq D_{\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}}(u)$ where $u = v \otimes_p w$. □

The corollary has the following implication for the maximum divergence to a reducible model.

Corollary 44. Let Γ be a reducible simplicial complex on $[m]$ with decomposition (Γ_1, S, Γ_2) and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$. Let $p \in \Delta_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ be a point that attains the maximum divergence $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}})$ and $p_i = \pi_i(p)$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $Q_{p_1}^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{p_2}^{\Gamma_2}$ contain points which attain the maximum divergence $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha})$ and $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta})$, respectively, then $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}) \geq D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1, \mathbf{d}_\alpha}) + D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2, \mathbf{d}_\beta})$.

5.3 Independence and related models

We have already encountered an independence model in Example 31. More generally, for discrete random variables X_1, \dots, X_m with respective state spaces $[d_i]$, the independence model is the hierarchical log-linear model on $[m]$ associated to the simplicial complex Γ consisting of just the m vertices $\Gamma = [1][2] \cdots [m]$. This is a reducible (in fact decomposable) model. Proposition 41 immediately implies the following (see also [5]).

Corollary 45. Let \mathcal{M} be the independence model of m discrete random variables X_1, \dots, X_m with state spaces $[d_i]$, respectively, where $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_m$. Then

$$D(\mathcal{M}) \leq \log d_1 + \dots + \log d_{m-1}.$$

Those independence models which achieve the upper bound in this result have been characterized [5, Theorem 4.4]. For instance, when $m = 2$ as well as in the case of $d_1 = \dots = d_m$, the upper bound is achieved. Since we will use it later we record a precise result regarding the latter case. For this, let S_{d+1} denote the group of permutations on $\{0, 1, \dots, d\}$ and let δ denote the Dirac delta (indicator) function.

Theorem 46. [5] Let \mathcal{M} be the independence model of m $(d+1)$ -ary random variables. Then the maximum divergence from \mathcal{M} is $D(\mathcal{M}) = (m-1) \log(d+1)$. This maximum value is achieved at vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope at the unique point $q = \left(\frac{1}{(d+1)^m}, \dots, \frac{1}{(d+1)^m}\right)$. Each maximizer has the form $\frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^d \delta_{j, \sigma_2(j), \dots, \sigma_m(j)}$ where $\sigma_i \in S_{d+1}$ for all $i = 2, \dots, m$.

Now we wish to illustrate the utility of Corollary 44 for independence models in two examples.

Example 47. The independence model \mathcal{M}_{222} of three binary variables is a 3-dimensional model in Δ_7 . We denote the coordinates of the points in Δ_7 by p_{ijk} where $i, j, k = 1, 2$. By using Corollary 44 we can show that $D(\mathcal{M}_{222}) = 2 \log 2$. Note that this model is reducible with $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, S, \Gamma_2)$ where $\Gamma_1 = [1][2]$, $\Gamma_2 = [2][3]$, and $S = \{2\}$. The models \mathcal{M}_{Γ_1} and \mathcal{M}_{Γ_2} are themselves independence models of two binary variables. In Example 15 we saw that $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1}) = D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2}) = \log 2$ where there are exactly two maximizers

$$v = (v_{11}, v_{12}, v_{21}, v_{22}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \text{ and } w = (w_{11}, w_{12}, w_{21}, w_{22}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

We will view v and w as elements of the logarithmic Voronoi polytopes $Q_v^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_w^{\Gamma_2}$, respectively. These two polytopes are *compatible* in the sense that $\pi'_1(v) = (v_{+1}, v_{+2}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$ is equal to $\pi'_2(w) = (w_{1+}, w_{2+}) = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. In other words, there exists a logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_p^{Γ} such that $Q_v^{\Gamma_1} \otimes Q_w^{\Gamma_2} \subset Q_p^{\Gamma}$. Here $p = v \otimes w$ where $p_{ijk} = \frac{v_{ij}w_{jk}}{v_{+j}}$, and we see that $p_{112} = p_{221} = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $D_{\mathcal{M}_{222}}(p) = D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_1}) + D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2}) = \log 2 + \log 2$ we conclude that $D(\mathcal{M}_{222}) = 2 \log 2$.

Example 48. Now we consider the independence model \mathcal{M}_{233} . Corollary 45 states that $D(\mathcal{M}_{233}) \leq \log 2 + \log 3$, but this bound cannot be attained by [5, Theorem 4.4]. We wish to provide a rationale based on Corollary 44. The model \mathcal{M}_{Γ_1} is the independence model of a binary and a ternary random variables, and the model \mathcal{M}_{Γ_2} is the independence model of two ternary random variables. By Example 31, there are six types of divergence maximizers for \mathcal{M}_{Γ_1} . If we denote the points in Δ_5 in which \mathcal{M}_{Γ_1} is contained by $v = (v_{11}, v_{12}, v_{13}; v_{21}, v_{22}, v_{23})$ these maximizers are

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0; 0, \frac{r}{2}, \frac{1-r}{2}\right) & \quad \left(0, \frac{r}{2}, \frac{1-r}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0\right) \\ \left(0, \frac{1}{2}, 0; \frac{r}{2}, 0, \frac{1-r}{2}\right) & \quad \left(\frac{r}{2}, 0, \frac{1-r}{2}; 0, \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \\ \left(0, 0, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{r}{2}, \frac{1-r}{2}, 0\right) & \quad \left(\frac{r}{2}, \frac{1-r}{2}, 0; 0, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where $0 < r < 1$. According to Theorem 46, there are six divergence maximizers of $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_2} \subset \Delta_8$. If we denote the points in Δ_8 by $w = (w_{jk} : j, k = 1, 2, 3)$ these maximizers are w^σ for each $\sigma \in S_3$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{11}^{id} = w_{22}^{id} = w_{33}^{id} &= \frac{1}{3} & w_{12}^{(12)} = w_{21}^{(12)} = w_{33}^{(12)} &= \frac{1}{3} \\
w_{13}^{(13)} = w_{22}^{(13)} = w_{31}^{(13)} &= \frac{1}{3} & w_{11}^{(23)} = w_{23}^{(23)} = w_{32}^{(23)} &= \frac{1}{3} \\
w_{12}^{(123)} = w_{23}^{(123)} = w_{31}^{(123)} &= \frac{1}{3} & w_{13}^{(132)} = w_{21}^{(132)} = w_{32}^{(132)} &= \frac{1}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we see that $\pi'_1(v) = (v_{+1}, v_{+2}, v_{+3})$ and $\pi'_2(w^\sigma) = (w_{1+}^\sigma, w_{2+}^\sigma, w_{3+}^\sigma) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ are not equal to each other for any choice of the maximizer v of \mathcal{M}_{Γ_1} and w^σ of \mathcal{M}_{Γ_2} . This means that $Q_v^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_{w^\sigma}^{\Gamma_2}$ are not compatible. In other words, it is impossible to apply Corollary 44. Indeed, the bound cannot be attained as it was explicitly shown in [27, Example 20]. The maximum divergence is equal to $\log(3 + 2\sqrt{2}) < \log 6 = \log 2 + \log 3$. Up to symmetry there is a unique global maximizer given by

$$p_{111} = \sqrt{2} - 1, \quad p_{222} = p_{233} = 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}.$$

We believe that for reducible models induced by $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1, S, \Gamma_2)$ finding *compatible* logarithmic Voronoi polytopes $Q_v^{\Gamma_1}$ and $Q_w^{\Gamma_2}$ that will give meaningful bounds for $D(\mathcal{M}_\Gamma)$ is worth exploring.

We close our discussion of reducible hierarchical log-linear models with a result involving conditional independence. For this we consider three random variables X_1 , X_2 , and X_3 with state spaces $[d_1]$, $[d_2]$, and $[d_3]$, respectively. We let $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, d_3)$. The simplicial complex we will use is $\Gamma = [12][23]$ with the decomposition $([12], \{2\}, [23])$. The toric model $\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ consists of the joint probability distributions where $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3 \mid X_2$.

Proposition 49. Let Γ be the reducible simplicial complex on $[3]$ with decomposition $([12], \{2\}, [23])$ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, d_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3$. Then $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}) = \min(\log d_1, \log d_3)$.

Proof. Proposition 41 implies that $D(\mathcal{M}_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}) \leq \min(\log d_1, \log d_3)$. The 0/1 matrix $A_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ defining the model can be organized as follows. Recall that this model is defined by the parametrization $p_{ijk} = a_{ij}b_{jk}$ with $i \in [d_1]$, $j \in [d_2]$, and $k \in [d_3]$. We order the indices (i, j, k) lexicographically as follows: $(i, j, k) < (i', j', k')$ if $j < j'$, or if $j = j'$ and $i < i'$, or if $j = j'$ and $i = i'$ and $k < k'$. We sort the columns of $A_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}}$ with respect to this ordering. We will also sort the rows of the matrix into d_2 blocks where in block j we list first the rows corresponding to the parameters a_{ij} with $i = 1, \dots, d_1$ and then the parameters b_{jk} with $k = 1, \dots, d_3$. Then

$$A_{\Gamma, \mathbf{d}} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{d_1, d_3} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & A_{d_1, d_3} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & A_{d_1, d_3} \end{pmatrix}$$

where A_{d_1, d_3} is the matrix defining an independence model of two random variables with state spaces $[d_1]$ and $[d_3]$. Since the maximum divergence from such a model is $\min(\log d_1, \log d_3)$, and each block gives the same maximum divergence, Theorem 16 implies the result. \square

6 Models of ML degree one

Definition 50. The maximum likelihood degree (*ML degree*) of a toric model $\mathcal{M}_A \subset \Delta_{n-1}$ is the number of points in \mathbb{C}^n that are in the intersection of the toric variety X_A and the affine span of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b , where $b = Au$ for a generic $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$.

The definition above is equivalent to the standard definition in [30, p. 140]. Moreover, a model has ML degree one if and only if the maximum likelihood estimate of any data $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$ can be expressed as a rational function of the coordinates of u [16]. We study the maximum divergence to such models in this section. Two dimensional models (toric surfaces) of ML degree one were classified in [9] along with some families of three dimensional models. We treat these families and the generalizations of some of them.

6.1 Multinomial distributions

We start by considering m independent identically distributed $(d+1)$ -ary random variables X_1, \dots, X_m with state spaces $\{0, \dots, d\}$. Let s_j be the probability of state j , and let $p_{i_0 \dots i_d}$ denote the probability of observing exactly i_j occurrences of state j for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d\}$. Thus, $p_{i_0 \dots i_d} = \binom{m}{i_0, \dots, i_d} s_0^{i_0} \dots s_d^{i_d}$ and we have the d -dimensional toric model parametrized as

$$\varphi : \Delta_d \rightarrow \Delta_{n-1} : (s_0, \dots, s_d) \mapsto (p_{i_0 \dots i_d} : \Sigma i_j = m)$$

where $n = \binom{m+d}{d}$. We refer to the the Zariski closure of the image of φ as the *twisted Veronese model* and denote it by $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$. The columns of the matrix A corresponding to the parametrization are the nonnegative integer solutions to $i_0 + \dots + i_d = m$. Note that A has the constant vector $n\mathbf{1}$ in its rowspan. Moreover, it has the same rowspan as the matrix A' whose columns are of the form $(1, v)$ where $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a nonnegative integer solution to the inequality $i_1 + \dots + i_d \leq m$. Thus, geometrically, the model is given by all lattice points in the convex hull of $\{0, me_1, \dots, me_d\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, a d -dimensional simplex dilated by a factor of m . Hence $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ is isomorphic to the Veronese variety, except the weights are modified so that $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ has ML degree one. That is, if we were to change all multinomial coefficients in the definition of $p_{i_0 \dots i_d}$ to 1, we would recover the usual Veronese variety.

Since the ML degree of $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ is one, the MLE can be expressed as a rational function of the data. Fix $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$ and suppose u is in the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_p at some unknown $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in \mathcal{V}_{d,m}$. Let $Ap = b$ where $b = (b_0, \dots, b_d)$ is the point corresponding to p in $\text{conv}(A)$. Then each coordinate of the MLE of u can be expressed as

$$q_{i_0, \dots, i_d} = \binom{m}{i_0, \dots, i_d} \left(\frac{b_0}{m}\right)^{i_0} \dots \left(\frac{b_d}{m}\right)^{i_d}. \quad (1)$$

Example 51 ($d = 2, m = 3$). Consider the twisted Veronese variety $\mathcal{V}_{2,3}$. As discussed above, the defining matrices A and A' can be written as either

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } A' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In our computations, we will usually use the matrix A . The polytope associated to $\mathcal{V}_{2,3}$ is plotted in Figure 4 on the left.




Figure 4: Twisted Veronese models $\mathcal{V}_{2,3}$ and $\mathcal{V}_{3,2}$, respectively.

The maximum divergence from $\mathcal{V}_{2,3}$ is $2 \log 3$, achieved at the unique point $v \in \Delta_9$, uniformly supported on $3e_1, 3e_2$, and $3e_3$, i.e. $v_{300} = v_{030} = v_{003} = 1/3$ and all other coordinates of v are 0. Note that v is a vertex of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b corresponding to the centroid b of $\text{conv}(A)$, i.e. $Aq = b = (1, 1, 1)$. The point q can be computed using (1), so $q = (1/3)^3(1, 3, 3, 3, 6, 3, 1, 3, 3, 1)$. The maximum divergence is

$$\begin{aligned} D(v||q) &= v_{300} \log(v_{300}/q_{300}) + v_{030} \log(v_{030}/q_{030}) + v_{003} \log(v_{003}/q_{003}) \\ &= 1/3 \log(3^3/3) + 1/3 \log(3^3/3) + 1/3 \log(3^3/3) = 2 \log 3. \end{aligned}$$

Example 52 ($d = 3, m = 2$). For the twisted Veronese model $\mathcal{V}_{3,2}$, the maximum divergence is $\log 4$. It is achieved at 10 different vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope at the point $q = 1/16(1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1)$. Note that $Aq = b = (1/2, 1/2, 1/2, 1/2)$, which is again the centroid of $\text{conv}(A)$. One of such vertices is $v = (1/4, 0, 1/4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1/2, 0)$, so the divergence is $D(v||q) = 1/4 \log 4 + 1/4 \log 4 + 1/2 \log 4 = \log 4$. The polytope $\text{conv}(A)$ for this model is shown in Figure 4 on the right. Each of the 10 maximizers arises from one of the 10 permutations in S_4 of order at most two. This will follow from the proof of Theorem 53 in the next section.

The formula for the maximum divergence from a general model $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ as well as the full description of maximizers were given in [18]. We summarize these results in the theorem below. A more detailed discussion about the maximizers will be presented in the next section.

Theorem 53. [18, Theorem 1.1] The maximum divergence to $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ equals $(m - 1) \log(d + 1)$. It is achieved at some vertices of the unique logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b where $b = \left(\frac{m}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{m}{d+1}\right)$. There is a unique vertex of this polytope maximizing divergence if and only if $m > 2$.

6.2 Box model

In this section we consider a generalization of the twisted Veronese model. Suppose we have $k > 1$ groups of random variables, with a_i independent identically distributed $(d + 1)$ -ary random variables with state space $\{0, \dots, d\}$ in the i th group for $i \in [k]$. Let $s_{i\ell}$ be the probability of state ℓ in the group i and let $p_{(j_{10} \dots j_{1d}), \dots, (j_{k0} \dots j_{kd})}$ denote the probability of observing exactly $j_{i\ell}$ occurrences of state ℓ in the group i . Hence, $p_{(j_{10} \dots j_{1d}), \dots, (j_{k0} \dots j_{kd})} = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{a_i}{j_{i0} \dots j_{id}} s_{i0}^{j_{i0}} \dots s_{id}^{j_{id}}$ and we have a kd -dimensional toric model parametrized as

$$\Delta_d \times \dots \times \Delta_d \rightarrow \Delta_{n-1} : ((s_{10}, \dots, s_{1d}), \dots, (s_{k0}, \dots, s_{kd})) \mapsto (p_{(j_{10} \dots j_{1d}), \dots, (j_{k0} \dots j_{kd})} : 0 \leq j_{i\ell} \leq a_i),$$

where $n = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{a_i+d}{d}$. The columns of the corresponding matrix A are naturally identified with the nonnegative integer solutions to the linear system $j_{i0} + \dots + j_{id} = a_i$ for $i \in [k]$. We will refer

to this model as the *box model* motivated by the shape of $\text{conv}(A)$ when $d = 1$. We denote these models by $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$. The special case when $d = 1, k = 2$ was studied in [9]. The box model also has ML degree one, and hence the MLE can be written as a rational function of data. For $u \in \Delta_{n-1}$ such that $Au = b = ((b_{10}, \dots, b_{1a_1}), \dots, (b_{k0}, \dots, b_{ka_k}))$, the MLE is

$$q_{(j_{10} \dots j_{1d}), \dots, (j_{k0} \dots j_{kd})} = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{a_i}{j_{i0}, \dots, j_{id}} \left(\frac{b_{i0}}{a_i} \right)^{j_{i0}} \dots \left(\frac{b_{id}}{a_i} \right)^{j_{id}}.$$

Theorem 54. The maximum divergence to the model $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$ equals $(a_1 + \dots + a_k - 1) \log(d + 1)$. It is achieved at $[(d + 1)!]^{k-1}$ vertices of the unique logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b such that $b = ((\frac{a_1}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{a_1}{d+1}), \dots, (\frac{a_k}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{a_k}{d+1}))$.

Our proof of Theorem 54 relies heavily on the methods used to prove Theorem 53 in [18]. Before we present both proofs, we outline the general theory below.

Let \mathcal{F} be a model inside the simplex Δ_{N-1} . Let S_N be the symmetric group of all permutations on $[N]$. This group acts on Δ_{N-1} by permuting the coordinates of the points in the simplex. Let G be a subgroup of S_N .

Definition 55. The model \mathcal{F} is said to be *G-symmetrical* if for all $\sigma \in G$ and all $p \in \mathcal{F}$, we have $\sigma p \in \mathcal{F}$. A point $p \in \Delta_{N-1}$ is said to be *G-exchangeable* if for all $\sigma \in G$, we have $\sigma p = p$.

Let \mathcal{F} be a *G-symmetrical* model and let \mathcal{F}/G denote the set of all orbits of \mathcal{F} under the action of G . Let

$$\gamma_G : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}/G : p \mapsto \{\sigma p : \sigma \in G\}$$

be the map that sends an element in \mathcal{F} to its orbit. Denote by \mathcal{E} the closure of all *G-exchangeable* distributions in Δ_{N-1} and let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}$ denote the induced model of all exchangeable distributions in \mathcal{F} . The following theorem holds in general.

Theorem 56. [18, Corollary 2.6] Let G be a subgroup of S_N and let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \Delta_{N-1}$ be a *G-symmetrical* family of distributions. If there exists a maximizer of $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ that is exchangeable, then $D(\gamma_G(\mathcal{M})) = D(\mathcal{F})$ and all maximizers of $D_{\gamma_G(\mathcal{M})}$ are of the form $\gamma_G(v)$ where v is an exchangeable maximizer of $D_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Proof of Theorem 53 [18]. Let \mathcal{F} be the independence model of m $(d + 1)$ -ary random variables induced by $\Delta_d \times \dots \times \Delta_d$. Then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \Delta_{N-1}$ where $N = (d + 1)^m$ and it is given by the following parametrization

$$\varphi : ((x_{10}, \dots, x_{1d}), \dots, (x_{m0}, \dots, x_{md})) \mapsto (p_{j_1, \dots, j_m} = x_{1j_1} x_{2j_2} \dots x_{mj_m} : j_1, \dots, j_m \in \{0, \dots, d\}). \quad (2)$$

Let G be the subgroup of S_N given by

$$G = \{\sigma_\rho \in S_N : \rho \in S_m \text{ and } \sigma_\rho((x_{10}, \dots, x_{1d}), \dots, (x_{m0}, \dots, x_{md})) = ((x_{\rho(1)0}, \dots, x_{\rho(1)d}), \dots, (x_{\rho(m)0}, \dots, x_{\rho(m)d}))\}.$$

Note that $G \cong S_m$ and it acts on each coordinate of $p \in \mathcal{F}$ as $\sigma p_{i_1 \dots i_m} = p_{i_{\sigma(1)} \dots i_{\sigma(m)}}$. Under this action, note that \mathcal{F} is *G-symmetrical* and that the set of all *G-exchangeable* distributions in \mathcal{F} is $\mathcal{M} = \{\varphi(x, x, \dots, x) : x \in \Delta_d\}$. Then the twisted Veronese model $\mathcal{V}_{d,m}$ can be identified with the set of all orbits of \mathcal{F} coming from exchangeable distributions, i.e. $\mathcal{V}_{d,m} = \gamma_G(\mathcal{M})$.

Since \mathcal{F} is an independence model, we know that $D(\mathcal{F}) = (m-1)\log(d+1)$ and all of its maximizers are given in Theorem 46. Denote each such maximizer by $v_{\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m} := \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^d \delta_{j, \sigma_2(j), \dots, \sigma_m(j)}$. Note that $v = v_{\text{id}, \dots, \text{id}}$ is the distribution in \mathcal{F} such that $v_{jj\dots j} = \frac{1}{d+1}$ for each $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ and 0 otherwise. By Theorem 56, it then follows that $D(\mathcal{V}_{d,m}) = D(\gamma_G(\mathcal{M})) = D(\mathcal{F}) = (m-1)\log(d+1)$, as desired. Moreover, $w = \gamma_G(v)$ is a maximizer of $D_{\mathcal{V}_{d,m}}$. Explicitly, it is given as $w_x = \frac{1}{d+1}$ if $x = me_j$ for $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ and 0 otherwise.

If $m > 2$, we claim that w is the unique maximizer. Indeed, let $v = v_{\sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_m}$ be another exchangeable maximizer of \mathcal{F} . Without loss of generality, assume $\sigma_2 \neq \text{id}$, so there is some j such that $\sigma_2(j) \neq j$. Since $(j, \sigma_2(j), j_3, \dots, j_m) \in \text{supp}(v)$ for some $j_3, \dots, j_m \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, it has to be the case that $(\sigma_2(j), j, j_3, \dots, j_m) \in \text{supp}(v)$, since v is exchangeable and has to have the same value in both coordinates. But since $m > 2$, it then follows that $j_k = \sigma_k(j) = \sigma_k(\sigma_2(j))$, so σ_k is not injective for every $k \geq 3$, a contradiction.

If $m = 2$, then let $\sigma = \sigma_2$ and note that if $\sigma^2 \neq \text{id}$, then $v_{jk} \in \text{supp}(v)$, but $v_{jk} = 0$ for some $j, k \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, which would contradict exchangeability of v . Hence, every maximizer of $\mathcal{V}_{d,2}$ is of the form $w = \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^d \delta_{e_j} + \delta_{e_{\sigma(j)}}$ for some $\sigma \in S_{d+1}$ of order at most two. Every nonzero coordinate of w is thus either $\frac{1}{d+1}$ or $\frac{2}{d+1}$. The number of maximizers in this case is the number of permutations in S_{d+1} of order at most two. Note that for each of the maximizers, we have $Aw = \left(\frac{m}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{m}{d+1}\right)$ and hence they all lie in the same logarithmic Voronoi polytope at $q \in \mathcal{V}_{d,m}$, corresponding to the centroid of $\text{conv}(A)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 54. Let \mathcal{F} be the independence model of $a_1 + \dots + a_k$ $(d+1)$ -ary random variables divided into k groups, induced by

$$\underbrace{(\Delta_d \times \dots \times \Delta_d)}_{a_1} \times \dots \times \underbrace{(\Delta_d \times \dots \times \Delta_d)}_{a_k}.$$

Then $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \Delta_{N-1}$ where $N = (d+1)^{a_1 + \dots + a_k}$ and has the parametrization φ like (2), except each probability p_\bullet factors as a product of $a_1 + \dots + a_k$ parameters. Let G be a subgroup of S_N defined as

$$G = \left\{ \sigma_{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k} \in S_N : \rho_i \in S_{a_i} \text{ and } \sigma_{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k} \left((y_1^{(1)}, \dots, y_{a_1}^{(1)}), \dots, (y_1^{(k)}, \dots, y_{a_k}^{(k)}) \right) = \left((y_{\rho_1(1)}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{\rho_1(a_1)}^{(1)}), \dots, (y_{\rho_k(1)}^{(k)}, \dots, y_{\rho_k(a_k)}^{(k)}) \right) \right\},$$

where $y_j^{(i)} = (x_{j_1}^{(i)}, \dots, x_{j_d}^{(i)}) \in \Delta_d$. Note that $G \cong S_{a_1} \times \dots \times S_{a_k}$.

Under this action, \mathcal{F} is G -symmetrical and the set of all G -exchangeable distributions in \mathcal{F} is $\mathcal{M} = \{\varphi((x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(1)}), \dots, (x^{(k)}, \dots, x^{(k)})) : x^{(i)} \in \Delta_d \text{ for all } i \in [k]\}$. The box model $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$ is then identified with the set of all orbits of \mathcal{F} coming from exchangeable distributions, i.e. $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)} = \gamma_G(\mathcal{M})$.

Since \mathcal{F} is again an independence model, we know that $D(\mathcal{F}) = (a_1 + \dots + a_k - 1)\log(d+1)$ from Theorem 46. Denote each maximizer by $v_{\sigma_2^{(1)}, \dots, \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \sigma_1^{(k)}, \dots, \sigma_{a_k}^{(k)}} := \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^d \delta_{j, \sigma_2^{(1)}(j), \dots, \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)}(j), \dots, \sigma_1^{(k)}(j), \dots, \sigma_{a_k}^{(k)}(j)}$. First let $\sigma_2^{(1)} = \dots = \sigma_{a_1}^{(1)} = \pi_1 = \text{id}$ and $\sigma_1^{(i)} = \dots = \sigma_{a_i}^{(i)} = \pi_i$ for some $\pi_i \in S_{d+1}$ for all $i > 1$. Then v is a G -exchangeable maximizer of \mathcal{F} , and is explicitly given as $v_{(j \dots j), (\pi_2(j) \dots \pi_2(j)), \dots, (\pi_k(j) \dots \pi_k(j))} = \frac{1}{d+1}$ for any choice of $j \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ and 0 otherwise. The image of this maximizer under γ is then $w = \frac{1}{d+1} \sum_{j=0}^d \delta_{\times_{i=1}^k a_i e_{\pi_i(j)}}$, where \times denotes the Cartesian product of vectors in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . By Theorem 56, w is a maximizer of $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$. There are exactly $[(d+1)!]^{k-1}$ such maximizers: one for every choice of $(\pi_2, \dots, \pi_k) \in S_{d+1} \times \dots \times S_{d+1}$. Note also that for each such maximizer w , we have $Aw = \left(\frac{a_1}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{a_1}{d+1}\right), \dots, \left(\frac{a_k}{d+1}, \dots, \frac{a_k}{d+1}\right)$, so all of them are the vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope at the point $q \in \mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$ corresponding to the centroid of $\text{conv}(A)$.

We claim that there are no other maximizers of $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(d)}$. Indeed, if $a_i > 2$ for all $i \in [k]$, then there are no other G -exchangeable maximizers of \mathcal{F} by the proof of Theorem 53. Indeed, if $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ and $k = 2$, then

all maximizers are of the form discussed in the previous paragraph. If $a_i = 2$ for some $i \in [k]$, without loss of generality assume that $a_1 = 2$ and that v is a G -exchangeable maximizer of \mathcal{F} with $\pi(j) = \sigma_2^{(1)}(j) \neq j$ for some j . If v is G -exchangeable, it has to be the case that there are some values $j_3, \dots, j_{a_1+\dots+a_k}$ such that both $(j, \pi(j), j_3, \dots, j_{a_1+\dots+a_k})$ and $(\pi(j), j, j_3, \dots, j_{a_1+\dots+a_k})$ are in $\text{supp}(v)$. But then $j_3 = \sigma_1^{(2)}(j) = \sigma_1^{(2)}(\pi(j))$, a contradiction to the injectivity of π . Hence, there are no other maximizers. \square

When $d = 1$, the maximizers of the box model $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(1)}$ have the following nice geometric interpretation.

Corollary 57. The maximum divergence from the box model $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, \dots, a_k}^{(1)}$ equals $(a_1 + \dots + a_k - 1) \log 2$. The maximum divergence is achieved at 2^{k-1} vertices of the unique logarithmic Voronoi polytope. These vertices correspond to the main diagonals of $\text{conv}(A)$.

Example 58 ($d = 1, k = 3$). Consider the box model $\mathcal{B}_{3,3,2}^{(1)}$. It is a 3-dimensional model inside Δ_{47} . The columns of the corresponding matrix A can be identified with the lattice points $\{(i, j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : 0 \leq i, j \leq 3, 0 \leq k \leq 2\}$. The maximum divergence of this model is $7 \log 2$ and it is achieved at four vertices of the logarithmic Voronoi polytope Q_b corresponding to the point $b = (3/2, 3/2, 1)$ in $\text{conv}(A)$. This is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Chamber complex of the box model $\mathcal{B}_{3,3,2}^{(1)}$.

The four vertices giving $D(\mathcal{B}_{3,3,2}^{(1)})$ are supported on the main diagonals of $\text{conv}(A)$. Explicitly, the four maximizers are

$$w_1 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{(0,0,0)} + \delta_{(3,3,2)}), \quad w_2 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{(0,0,2)} + \delta_{(3,3,0)}),$$

$$w_3 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{(0,3,0)} + \delta_{(3,0,2)}), \quad w_4 = \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{(3,0,0)} + \delta_{(0,3,2)}).$$

6.3 Trapezoid model

One interesting extension of the box model $\mathcal{B}_{a_1, a_2}^{(1)}$ is the trapezoid model, which we discuss in this section. It also has ML degree one [9]. Fix some positive integers a, b, d . Suppose we have two coins, with the probabilities of flipping heads being s and t , respectively. First, we flip the second

coin b times, and record the number of heads $j \in \{0, \dots, b\}$. Then we flip the first coin a times and record the number of heads, and then flip the first coin again $d(b-j)$ times and record the number of heads. The probability $p_{r,j}$ of getting exactly r heads from the first coin and exactly j heads from the second coin is then

$$p_{r,j} = c_{r,j} s^r (1-s)^{a+d(b-j)-r} t^j (1-t)^{b-j} \quad (3)$$

where

$$c_{r,j} = \binom{b}{j} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq a \\ 0 \leq k \leq d(b-j) \\ i+k=r}} \binom{a}{i} \binom{d(b-j)}{k}.$$

Geometrically, this model is given by all lattice points inside the trapezoid with the vertices $\{(0,0), (0,b), (a,b), (a+db,0)\}$ with the weight of each point (r,j) given by $c_{r,j}$. Hence we will call this model the *trapezoid model* and denote it by $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$. This is a 2-dimensional model inside Δ_{n-1} , parametrized by $(s,t) \mapsto (p_{r,j} : 0 \leq j \leq b, 0 \leq r \leq a+d(b-j))$ where $n = \sum_{j=0}^b \sum_{r=0}^{a+d(b-j)} r$.

The MLE for any data point $u \in \Delta_n$ is a rational function of u . If $Au = (1, b_1, b_2)$, the MLE of u is the point $q \in \mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ such that $Aq = (1, b_1, b_2)$. This point is given as

$$q_{r,j} = c_{r,j} \left(\frac{b_1}{a+d(b-b_2)} \right)^r \left(1 - \frac{b_1}{a+d(b-b_2)} \right)^{a+d(b-j)-r} \left(\frac{b_2}{b} \right)^j \left(1 - \frac{b_2}{b} \right)^{b-j}.$$

Example 59 ($a = b = d = 1$). Consider the simplest nontrivial trapezoid model with $a = b = d = 1$. It is a 2-dimensional toric model in Δ_4 where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the chamber complex is shown in the middle of Figure 6. Note that two-dimensional chambers will not contribute any projection points by Proposition 27. There are only three interior vertices: $(1/2, 1/2)$, $(2/3, 2/3)$ and $(1, 1/2)$. All of them have triangles for logarithmic Voronoi polytopes, with supports $\{14, 25, 234\}$, $\{23, 14, 125\}$, and $\{34, 25, 145\}$, respectively. Therefore, all potential projection points will come from the edges. Running our algorithm on the ten interior edges, we find that there are exactly four projection vertices, corresponding to two different points on the model $\mathcal{T}_{1,1,1}$. The first point maps to $b_1 = (2\sqrt{5}/5, -\sqrt{5}/5 + 1) \in \text{conv}(A)$, and the two projection vertices are

$$\left(\sqrt{5}/5, 0, 0, -\sqrt{5}/5 + 1, 0 \right) \text{ and } \left(0, -\sqrt{5}/5 + 1, 3\sqrt{5}/5 - 1, 0, -2\sqrt{5}/5 + 1 \right).$$

The latter vertex yields the maximum divergence $\log 2 + \log \left(\frac{1}{3-\sqrt{5}} \right)$. Similarly, the second point on the model maps to $b_2 = (-\sqrt{5}/5 + 1, -\sqrt{5}/5 + 1)$, and the two projection vertices are

$$\left(0, \sqrt{5}/5 + 1, 0, 0, \sqrt{5}/5 \right) \text{ and } \left(-2\sqrt{5}/5 + 1, 0, 3\sqrt{5}/5 - 1, -\sqrt{5}/5 + 1, 0 \right).$$

The former vertex yields the same maximum divergence $\log 2 + \log \left(\frac{1}{3-\sqrt{5}} \right)$.

The logarithmic Voronoi polytopes corresponding to both b_1 and b_2 are quadrilaterals. After projecting onto two-dimensional planes, we plot both polytopes in Figure 6.




Figure 6: The chamber complex and two logarithmic Voronoi polytopes that yield maximum divergence.

Theorem 60. The divergence to the trapezoid model $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ is bounded above by $(a + bd + b) \log 2$.

Proof. Fix a model $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ in Δ_{n-1} , parametrized by s and t . Let $u = (u_{r,j}) \in \Delta_{n-1}$ be a general data vector. Then the log-likelihood function is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_u(p) = \sum u_{r,j} \log(p_{r,j}) &= \sum u_{r,j} \log c_{r,j} + \sum u_{r,j} [r \log s + (a + d(b - j) - r) \log(1 - s)] \\ &\quad + \sum u_{r,j} [j \log(t) + (b - j) \log(1 - t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the partial derivatives and solving for the parameters, we get that $\hat{s} = \frac{\sum u_{r,j} r}{\sum u_{r,j} (a + d(b - j))}$ and $\hat{t} = \frac{\sum u_{r,j} j}{b}$. The MLE q is obtained by plugging in these parameters into (3). Hence, the divergence function from the general point u to the model $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} D(u|\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}) &= \sum u_{r,j} \log(u_{r,j}/q_{r,j}) = \underbrace{-H(u) - \sum u_{r,j} \log(c_{r,j})}_{\leq 0} \\ &\quad - \sum u_{r,j} r \log(\hat{s}) - \sum u_{r,j} (a + (b - j) - r) \log(1 - \hat{s}) \\ &\quad - \sum u_{r,j} j \log(\hat{t}) - \sum u_{r,j} (b - j) \log(1 - \hat{t}), \end{aligned}$$

where $H(u) = -\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \log(u_i)$ is the entropy. Let $h(p)$ denote the entropy of a binary random variable with the probability of success p , i.e. $h(p) = -p \log(p) - (1 - p) \log(1 - p)$. Note that $h(p)$ always attains its maximum value at $p = 1/2$. Therefore, we have








$$\begin{aligned} D(u|\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}) &\leq \left(\sum u_{r,j} (a + d(b - j)) \right) h(\hat{s}) + b h(\hat{t}) \\ &\leq \left(\sum u_{r,j} (a + d(b - j) + b) \right) h(1/2) \\ &= (a + db + b) \log 2 - d \sum u_{r,j} j \\ &\leq (a + db + b) \log 2, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Note that the polytope of the trapezoid model $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ sits in-between the polytopes of the two box models $\mathcal{B}_{a,b}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{a+db,b}^{(1)}$. However, the weights assigned to the lattice points are different. This presents the question of whether $D(\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d})$ is bounded by $D(\mathcal{B}_{a,b}^{(1)})$ and $D(\mathcal{B}_{a+db,b}^{(1)})$ below and above, respectively. Note that this is indeed the case for Example 59. We present the following conjecture.

Conjecture 61. The divergence from the trapezoid model $\mathcal{T}_{a,b,d}$ is at least $(a + b - 1) \log 2$ and at most $(a + bd + b - 1) \log 2$. This upper bound is sharp if and only if $d = 0$.

In [9], the authors present several families of 3-dimensional models that have ML degree one. We compute the maximum divergence for the simplest nontrivial examples in those families in the table below.

polytope	$\text{conv}(A)$	$D(\mathcal{M})$	notes
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (0,1,1), (1,1,0), (2,0,0)\}$	$2 \log 2$	conjectured
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (1,0,1), (1,1,0), (2,0,0)\}$	$\log 2 + \log\left(\frac{1}{3-\sqrt{5}}\right)$	
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (1,1,0), (2,0,0)\}$	$\log 2 + \log\left(\frac{1}{3-\sqrt{5}}\right)$	boundary
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (0,1,1), (2,0,0), (2,1,0)\}$	$\log 3$	conjectured
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (1,0,0), (1,1,0)\}$	$\log 2$	boundary
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (1,0,0), (0,0,1), (1,0,1), (1,1,0), (1,1,1)\}$	$2 \log 2$	box model
	$\text{conv}\{(0,0,0), (0,0,1), (0,1,0), (1,0,0), (0,0,1), (1,0,1)\}$	$\log 2$	2×3 independence

Interestingly, the second example in the table has infinitely many maximizers. For the third and the fifth models, all the maximizers of information divergence lie on the boundary of the simplex. For the conjectured examples, we were able to compute most of the ideals in step 3 of the algorithm, but not all. Some of the higher-dimensional ideals that arise in those cases are very complicated and we were not able to solve them using numerical tools.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Guido Montúfar for drawing our attention to the problem of maximizing information divergence and for encouraging us to study this problem from the perspective of logarithmic Voronoi polytopes. We are also grateful for the discussions we had and his valuable comments. Y.A. was partially supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. DGE 2146752.

References

- [1] Yulia Alexandr. Logarithmic Voronoi polytopes for discrete linear models. *Algebraic Statistics*, 2023. To appear.

- [2] Yulia Alexandr and Alexander Heaton. Logarithmic Voronoi cells. *Algebraic Statistics*, 12(1):75–95, 2021.
- [3] David Avis and Komei Fukuda. Reverse search for enumeration. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 65(1-3):21–46, 1996. First International Colloquium on Graphs and Optimization (GOI), 1992 (Grimentz).
- [4] Nihat Ay. An information-geometric approach to a theory of pragmatic structuring. *Ann. Probab.*, 30(1):416–436, 2002.
- [5] Nihat Ay and Andreas Knauf. Maximizing multi-information. *Kybernetika (Prague)*, 42(5):517–538, 2006.
- [6] Daniel J. Bates, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, Andrew J. Sommese, and Charles W. Wampler. Bertini: Software for numerical algebraic geometry. Available at bertini.nd.edu with permanent doi: [dx.doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5](https://doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5).
- [7] Dimitris Bertsimas and John N. Tsitsiklis. *Introduction to linear optimization*. Athena Scientific, 1997.
- [8] Paul Breiding and Sascha Timme. Homotopycontinuation.jl: A package for homotopy continuation in Julia. In James H. Davenport, Manuel Kauers, George Labahn, and Josef Urban, editors, *Mathematical Software – ICMS 2018*, pages 458–465, Cham, 2018. Springer International Publishing.
- [9] Isobel Davies, Eliana Duarte, Irem Portakal, and Miruna-Ştefana Sorea. Families of polytopes with rational linear precision in higher dimensions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, Aug 2022. To appear.
- [10] Jesús A. De Loera, Jörg Rambau, and Francisco Santos. *Triangulations*, volume 25 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. Structures for algorithms and applications.
- [11] Mathias Drton, Bernd Sturmfels, and Seth Sullivant. *Lectures on algebraic statistics*, volume 39 of *Oberwolfach Seminars*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2009.
- [12] Dan Geiger, Christopher Meek, and Bernd Sturmfels. On the toric algebra of graphical models. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(3):1463–1492, 2006.
- [13] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [14] Serkan Hoşten and Jay Shapiro. Primary decomposition of lattice basis ideals. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 29(4-5):625–639, 2000. Symbolic computation in algebra, analysis, and geometry (Berkeley, CA, 1998).
- [15] Serkan Hoşten and Seth Sullivant. Gröbner bases and polyhedral geometry of reducible and cyclic models. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 100(2):277–301, 2002.
- [16] June Huh and Bernd Sturmfels. Likelihood geometry. In *Combinatorial algebraic geometry*, volume 2108 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 63–117. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [17] Anders N. Jensen. Gfan, a software system for Gröbner fans and tropical varieties. Available at <http://home.imf.au.dk/jensen/software/gfan/gfan.html>.

- [18] Josef Juriček. Maximization of the information divergence from multinomial distributions. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Mathematica et Physica*, 52(1):27–35, 2011.
- [19] Steffen L. Lauritzen. *Graphical models*, volume 17 of *Oxford Statistical Science Series*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. Oxford Science Publications.
- [20] František Matúš. Optimality conditions for maximizers of the information divergence from an exponential family. *Kybernetika (Prague)*, 43(5):731–746, 2007.
- [21] František Matúš. Divergence from factorizable distributions and matroid representations by partitions. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 55(12):5375–5381, 2009.
- [22] František Matúš and Nihat Ay. On maximization of the information divergence from an exponential family. In *Proceedings of 6th workshop on uncertainty processing: Hejnice, September 24-27, 2003*, pages 199–204. Oeconomica, [Praha], 2003.
- [23] Guido Montúfar, Johannes Rauh, and Nihat Ay. Expressive power and approximation errors of restricted Boltzmann machines. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 24. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- [24] Guido Montúfar, Johannes Rauh, and Nihat Ay. Maximal information divergence from statistical models defined by neural networks. In *Geometric Science of Information, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, volume 8085, pages 759–766. Springer, 2013.
- [25] Lior Pachter and Bernd Sturmfels. Statistics. In *Algebraic statistics for computational biology*, pages 3–42. Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2005.
- [26] Johannes Rauh. *Finding the Maximizers of the Information Divergence from an Exponential Family*. PhD thesis, Univeristät Leipzig, 2011.
- [27] Johannes Rauh. Finding the maximizers of the information divergence from an exponential family. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57(6):3236–3247, 2011.
- [28] Johannes Rauh. Optimally approximating exponential families. *Kybernetika (Prague)*, 49(2):199–215, 2013.
- [29] Bernd Sturmfels. *Solving systems of polynomial equations*, volume 97 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [30] Seth Sullivant. *Algebraic statistics*, volume 194 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [31] Günter M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*, volume 152 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.