

On determinantal point processes with nonsymmetric kernels

Arnaud Poinas

Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Applications, University of Poitiers, Poitiers, France

arnaud.poinas@univ-poitiers.fr

June 6, 2024

In 1975, Odile Macchi [20] introduced determinantal point processes (or DPPs for short) to model fermion particles. Since then, DPPs have seen a wide range of applications not only in physics but also in random matrix theory [24] to model the distributions of eigenvalues of some classes of random matrices, in statistics [18] to model datasets of repulsive point patterns and in machine learning [16] to select a diverse subset of a large dataset, just to name a few examples. In almost all cases, it is assumed that the determinantal point process possess a symmetric kernel which is an important assumption for a lot of results (well-definedness, simulation, distribution of the number of points, ...). Although, some examples of DPPs with nonsymmetric kernels are known [3] and there has been a few papers working with them [8, 10], usually for machine learning applications. Nevertheless, previous works only focused on some specific questions related to these DPPs but does not establish their general properties. Our goal in this paper is therefore to investigate how the usual results on DPPs are modified when considering a nonsymmetric kernel. In particular, we are interested in using nonsymmetric kernels in order to construct attractive coupling of DPPs to model marked point processes with repulsion between points of the same mark and attraction between points of different marks. One such example is the *ants* dataset [11] in the *spatstat* R package [2] containing locations of nests of two species of ants. While ants of the same species tends to spread out their nests to avoid having to share resources, hence the repulsion in their nest location, it is suspected that one of the two species purposefully put their nest close to one of the other species since they eat dead insects, hence the attraction between the location of nests of different species. While we can use DPPs with symmetric kernels to model the location of the nest of each species, the natural way to create couplings of such DPPs (see Section 1.2) only allows for negative cross correlations hence the interest in using non symmetric kernels in order to allow positive cross correlations between the two DPPs.

In Section 1 we recall the basic definitions of DPPs over a finite set. In Section 2 we use the known results on P_0 matrices to get necessary and sufficient conditions for a DPP to be

well-defined. In Section 3 we show some particular examples of DPP couplings. In Section 4 we present an attempt to generalize the mixing property of DPPs which is used in various cases, the most common one being for their simulation. Finally, in Section 5 we show an example of construction and simulation of an attractive coupling of repulsive DPPs.

1 Definitions and first properties of DPPs

1.1 Notations and definitions

For any integer $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ we write $[n]$ for the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathcal{P}([n])$ for the power set of $[n]$ and $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ for the set of $n \times n$ matrices with real entries. For any finite set S we write $|S|$ for its cardinal. Given any matrix $M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ we write $\|M\|_2$ for its spectral norm. For any $S, T \subset [n]$ we write M_S for the submatrix of M with rows and columns indexed by S and $M_{S,T}$ for the submatrix of M with rows indexed by S and columns indexed by T . We denote by $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$) the set of symmetric (resp. symmetric positive semi-definite) matrices. We write \preceq for the Loewner (partial) order on $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$M \preceq N \Leftrightarrow N - M \in \mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R}).$$

We write I_n for the $n \times n$ identity matrix and 1_n (resp. 0_n) for the vector of \mathbb{R}^n uniquely composed of 1s (resp. 0s). For any vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we write $D(x)$ for the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are x_1, \dots, x_n . Thus, $I_n = D(1_n)$.

We first recall the general definition of determinantal measures and L -ensemble measures.

Definition 1.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.*

- *Let $L \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ such that $I_n + L$ is invertible. The **L -ensemble measure** μ on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ with kernel L is defined by*

$$\forall S \subset [n], \mu(S) = \frac{\det(L_S)}{\det(I_n + L)}.$$

- *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$. The **determinantal measure** μ on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ with kernel K is defined by*

$$\forall S \subset [n], \mu(\{X \in \mathcal{P}([n]) \text{ s.t. } S \subset X\}) = \det(K_S).$$

As shown in [16] these two definitions are almost equivalent since, when $I_n - K$ is invertible, a determinantal measure with kernel K is an L -ensemble measure with kernel $L = K(I_n - K)^{-1}$. Reciprocally, an L -ensemble measure with kernel L is a determinantal measure with kernel $K = L(I_n + L)^{-1}$. These two measures are always well defined and with total mass equal to 1 as a consequence of the identity

$$\forall M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R}), \sum_{S \subset [n]} \det(M_S) = \det(I_n + M).$$

Therefore, these measures are probability measures if and only if $\mu(S) \geq 0$ for all $S \subset [n]$. The associated probability distributions are called L -ensemble and determinantal point processes.

Definition 1.2. Let $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

- An **L -ensemble** with kernel $L \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as a random variable $X \in \mathcal{P}([n])$ such that

$$\forall S \subset [n], \mathbb{P}(X = S) = \frac{\det(L_S)}{\det(I_n + L)}.$$

If this probability distribution is well-defined we write $X \sim DPP_L(L)$.

- A **determinantal point process (DPP)** with kernel $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is defined as a random variable $X \in \mathcal{P}([n])$ such that

$$\forall S \subset [n], \mathbb{P}(S \subset X) = \det(K_S).$$

If this probability distribution is well-defined we say that K is a **DPP kernel** and we write $X \sim DPP(K)$.

There are no general results on which conditions are needed for a matrix K to be a DPP kernel. Given a matrix L , it is easy to see that its associated L -ensemble measure is a probability distribution if and only if its principal minors are non-negative. A matrix satisfying this property is called a P_0 matrix.

Proposition 1.3. The L -ensemble measure with kernel $L \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ is a probability measure if and only if L is a P_0 matrix meaning that

$$\forall S \subset [n], \det(L_S) \geq 0.$$

Proof. We already mentioned that the L -ensemble measure is a probability measure if and only if

$$\forall S \subset [n], \frac{\det(L_S)}{\det(I_n + L)} \geq 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Taking $S = \emptyset$ shows that we need $\det(I_n + L)$ to be positive hence (1.1) is equivalent to $\det(L_S) \geq 0$ for all $S \subset [n]$ and $\det(I_n + L) \geq 0$. But, since $\det(I_n + L) = \sum_{S \subset [n]} \det(L_S)$ then (1.1) is simply equivalent to $\det(L_S) \geq 0$ for all $S \subset [n]$. \square

P_0 matrices were first studied in [7] and we refer to [14] for an extensive review of their properties. We finish by mentioning that when K and L are symmetric matrices, which is the usual setting of determinantal point processes, then it is well known which assumptions are needed on K and L to get probability measures (see [16] for example).

Proposition 1.4. Let $K, L \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{R})$. K is a DPP kernel if and only if its eigenvalues are in $[0, 1]$. The L -ensemble measure with kernel L is a probability measure if and only if $L \in \mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$.

1.2 DPP couplings

There is a natural way of making couplings of determinantal point processes. To express such couplings we begin by pointing out that a coupling of two point processes on $[n]$ can be seen as a point process on $[2n]$ using the bijection

$$\begin{array}{l} [2n] \\ X \end{array} \leftrightarrow \begin{array}{l} [n] \times [n] \\ (X_1, X_2) \end{array} \text{ where } \begin{cases} X_1 = X \cap [n]; \\ X_2 = \{i - n, i \in X \cap \{n + 1, \dots, 2n\}\}. \end{cases}$$

As an abuse of notation, we will often write a DPP on $[2n]$ as (X_1, X_2) using this bijection. Now, we consider two DPP kernels $K^{(1)}, K^{(2)} \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and a 2×2 block matrix of the form

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K^{(1)} & M \\ N & K^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{R})$$

such that \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel. If $(X_1, X_2) \sim DPP(\mathbb{K})$ then $X_1 \sim DPP(K_1)$ and $X_2 \sim DPP(K_2)$. This way, we can write a coupling of two DPPs on $[n]$ as a DPP on $[2n]$. Such a setting has been considered before [9] but only with symmetric kernels. When \mathbb{K} is symmetric then

$$\mathbb{P}(i \in X_1, j \in X_2) - \mathbb{P}(i \in X_1)\mathbb{P}(j \in X_2) = -\mathbb{K}_{i,j+n}^2 \leq 0$$

and therefore this coupling only allows negative cross-correlations. This is why we suggest the possibility of using non-symmetric matrices in order to keep this very natural construction of DPP coupling while allowing some positive cross-dependencies.

1.3 The cardinal of DPPs

Just like in the symmetrical case, the moments of the number of points of a DPP only depends on the set of eigenvalues (taken with multiplicities) of K (and thus L). We recall the proof below which does not use the assumption that K is symmetric.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $X \sim DPP(K)$ with $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$. We denote the complex eigenvalues of K (taken with multiplicities) by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\binom{|X|}{k} \right] = e_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n),$$

where e_k is the k -th elementary symmetric polynomial.

Proof. Since $k! \binom{|X|}{k}$ is the number of k -tuples of elements of $|X|$ then

$$k! \binom{|X|}{k} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]}^{\neq} \mathbb{1}_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in X}$$

hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[k! \binom{|X|}{k} \right] = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]}^{\neq} \mathbb{P}(i_1, \dots, i_k \in X) = k! \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k}} \mathbb{P}(S \subset X) = k! \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k}} \det(K_S).$$

It is well-known (see [12, Theorem 1.2.16] for example) that the sum of minors of size k of K is equal to $e_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ hence the result. \square

As a first consequence, we get a simple expression for the expectation and the variance of the number of points of a DPP.

Corollary 1.6. *Let $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[|X|] = \text{Tr}(K) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}(|X|) = \text{Tr}(K) - \text{Tr}(K^2).$$

As a second consequence, we get that two DPP kernels with the same eigenvalues may not yields the same distribution on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ but their number of points will have the same distribution.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$ and $Y \sim \text{DPP}(K')$ such that K and K' have the same eigenvalues taken with multiplicities. Then, $|X|$ and $|Y|$ have the same distribution.*

1.4 The particle-hole involution

One of the earliest known way to create DPPs with nonsymmetric kernels is to use what is often called the **particle-hole transformation**. For any subset S of $[n]$, the particle-hole transformation is defined by the involution $X \mapsto (X \cap S^c) \cup (X^c \cap S)$ that switches the states of the points in and out of $X \cap S$. It is shown in [4] that determinantal distributions are stable by this operation.

Proposition 1.8 ([4]). *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a DPP kernel and let $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$. For a given set $S \subset [n]$ we define*

$$\widetilde{X} = (X \cap S^c) \cup (X^c \cap S).$$

Then, $\widetilde{X} \sim \text{DPP}(\widetilde{K})$ with

$$\widetilde{K} = D(\mathbb{1}_S)(I_n - K) + D(\mathbb{1}_{S^c})K.$$

After some permutations of the rows and columns of K and \widetilde{K} we can write

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} K_S & K_{S,S^c} \\ K_{S^c,S} & K_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \widetilde{K} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{|S|} - K_S & -K_{S,S^c} \\ K_{S^c,S} & K_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As a direct consequence we get an expression of all probabilities $\mathbb{P}(X = S)$ using only the kernel K :

Corollary 1.9 (Identity (147) in [16]).

$$\mathbb{P}(X = S^c) = \mathbb{P}([n] \subset \widetilde{X}) = \det(D(\mathbb{1}_S)(I_n - K) + D(\mathbb{1}_{S^c})K) = \det \begin{pmatrix} I_{|S^c|} - K_{S^c} & -K_{S^c,S} \\ K_{S,S^c} & K_S \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now give a generalization of Proposition 1.8 where the state of each point in $[n]$ is switched independently with its own probability.

Proposition 1.10. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a DPP kernel and let $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$. Let $p_1, \dots, p_n \in [0, 1]$ and $B_i \sim b(p_i)$ be independent random variables. We define \widetilde{X} as*

$$\widetilde{X} = \{i \in [n] \text{ s.t. } i \in X \text{ and } B_i = 0 \text{ or } i \notin X \text{ and } B_i = 1\}.$$

In other word, when $B_i = 1$ we switch the state of i within X . Then,

$$X \sim \text{DPP}(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K)$$

Proof. By conditioning with respect to the B_i we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S \subset \widetilde{X}) &= \sum_{T \subset S} \mathbb{P}(S \subset \widetilde{X} | B_i = 1 \text{ if } i \in T \text{ and } B_i = 0 \text{ if } i \in T \setminus S) \prod_{i \in T} p_i \prod_{i \in S \setminus T} (1 - p_i) \\ &= \sum_{T \subset S} \mathbb{P}(S \setminus T \subset X, X \cap T = \emptyset) \prod_{i \in T} p_i \prod_{i \in S \setminus T} (1 - p_i). \end{aligned}$$

By using the particle-hole transform on $X \cap S$ for points in T we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S \subset \widetilde{X}) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} I_{|T|} - K_T & -K_{T, S \setminus T} \\ K_{S \setminus T, T} & K_{S \setminus T} \end{pmatrix} \prod_{i \in T} p_i \prod_{i \in S \setminus T} (1 - p_i) \\ &= \sum_{T \subset S} \det \begin{pmatrix} (D(p)_T & 0 \\ 0 & D(1_n - p)_{S \setminus T} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{|T|} - K_T & -K_{T, S \setminus T} \\ K_{S \setminus T, T} & K_{S \setminus T} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Since $D(p)$ and $D(1_n - p)$ are diagonal then the matrix inside the determinant in the last identity has its rows indexed by T corresponding to the rows of $(D(p)(I_n - K))_S$ and its rows indexed by $S \setminus T$ corresponding to the rows of $(D(1_n - p)(K))_S$. Therefore, by the multilinearity of the determinant with respect to its rows we get that

$$\mathbb{P}(S \subset \widetilde{X}) = \det \left((D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K)_S \right),$$

concluding the proof. □

We retrieve the usual particle-hole involution result (Proposition 1.8) by taking $p_i = \mathbb{1}_{i \in S}$ for some $S \subset [n]$. We now show that the particle hole involution is closely linked to a common tool appearing in the theory of P_0 matrices called the **principal pivot transform**.

Definition 1.11. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $S \subset [n]$ such that M_S is invertible. With the right permutation of rows and columns we can write M as $\begin{pmatrix} M_S & M_{S, S^c} \\ M_{S^c, S} & M_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}$. The **principal pivot transform** of M relative to S is then defined as*

$$\text{ppt}(M, S) := \begin{pmatrix} M_S^{-1} & -M_S^{-1}M_{S, S^c} \\ M_{S^c, S}M_S^{-1} & M_{S^c} - M_{S^c, S}M_S^{-1}M_{S, S^c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The definition of the principal pivot transform is often better understood through the following result.

Proposition 1.12. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $S \subset [n]$ such that M_S is invertible and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We use the same permutation as in Definition 1.11 and write $x = \begin{pmatrix} x_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}$ and $y = \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}$.

Then,

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} = M \begin{pmatrix} x_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} = \text{ppt}(M, S) \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, we can link the principal pivot transform and DPPs by proving the following result.

Proposition 1.13. Let $L \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a P_0 matrix such that L_S is invertible and let $X \sim \text{DPP}_L(L)$. For a given set $S \subset [n]$ we define the particle-hole transformation of X as

$$\tilde{X} = (X \cap S^c) \cup (X^c \cap S).$$

If $I_n - \tilde{K}$ is invertible then $\tilde{X} \sim \text{DPP}_L(\text{ppt}(L, S))$.

Proof. Let K (resp. \tilde{K}) the DPP kernel of X (resp. \tilde{X}). After some row and column permutations and using Proposition 1.8 we can write

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} K_S & K_{S,S^c} \\ K_{S^c,S} & K_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{K} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{|S|} - K_S & -K_{S,S^c} \\ K_{S^c,S} & K_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $I_n - \tilde{K}$ is invertible we can define $\tilde{L} = (I_n - \tilde{K})^{-1} - I_n$. We then choose $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y = \tilde{L}x$ indexed as in Proposition 1.13. Then,

$$y = \tilde{L}x \Leftrightarrow (x + y) = (I_n + \tilde{L})x \Leftrightarrow (I_n - \tilde{K})(x + y) = x \Leftrightarrow y = \tilde{K}(x + y).$$

This expression can be extended into

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_S + y_S - K_S(x_S + y_S) - K_{S,S^c}(x_{S^c} + y_{S^c}) \\ K_{S^c,S}(x_S + y_S) + K_{S^c}(x_{S^c} + y_{S^c}) \end{pmatrix} \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -x_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} -K_S(x_S + y_S) - K_{S,S^c}(x_{S^c} + y_{S^c}) \\ K_{S^c,S}(x_S + y_S) + K_{S^c}(x_{S^c} + y_{S^c}) \end{pmatrix} \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= K(x + y) \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= (I_n - K)(x + y) \\ \Leftrightarrow (I_n + L) \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= x + y \\ \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_S \\ y_{S^c} \end{pmatrix} &= L \begin{pmatrix} y_S \\ x_{S^c} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1.12 we can conclude that $\tilde{L} = \text{ppt}(L, S)$. □

The result that determinantal measures are stable by particle-hole transformations is thus almost equivalent to the result that P_0 matrices are stable by principal pivot transforms [14, Theorem 4.8.4]. This illustrates the close link there is between the theory of P_0 matrices and the theory of DPPs with nonsymmetric kernels.

2 Properties of DPPs with nonsymmetric kernel

2.1 Characterization of DPP kernels

Checking whether a matrix L is an L -ensemble kernel or not is equivalent to checking whether or not it is a P_0 matrix. There is already a lot of literature on the subject and we refer to [14, Section 4.6] for an overview. We focus instead on adapting these results on P_0 matrices to characterize whether a given matrix K is a DPP kernel or not. We first recall that it was proven in [6] that the problem of checking if a given matrix is a P matrix (matrix with positive principal minors) is co-NP-complete. The same can be expected for checking if a given matrix is a DPP kernel since we can go from K to L in polynomial time. We thus can't expect any characterization of DPP kernels that is as easy to check as just computing the eigenvalues of K like in the symmetrical case. Instead, we give the following characterizations based on [14, Theorem 4.3.4 and Theorem 4.3.9].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$. K is a DPP kernel if and only if one of the following properties is satisfied:*

$$(i) \quad \forall p \in \{0, 1\}^n, \det(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K) \geq 0. \quad (2.1)$$

$$(ii) \quad \forall p \in]0, 1[^n, \det(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K) > 0. \quad (2.2)$$

(iii) *For all non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $i \in [n]$ such that*

$$x_i(Kx)_i \geq 0, \quad |(Kx)_i| \leq |x_i| \quad \text{and} \quad x_i \neq 0.$$

Proof. The proof of (iii) is directly adapted from the method used in [14, Theorem 4.3.4] while the proof of (i) and (ii) are done differently using the interpretation of (2.1) and (2.2) in the setting of DPPs.

(i) Direct consequence of Corollary 1.9 showing that for any $S \subset [n]$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X = S) = \det \left(D(\mathbb{1}_{S^c})(I_n - K) + D(\mathbb{1}_S)K \right).$$

- (ii) We first remark that $D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K$ is invertible for all $p \in]0, 1[$ if and only if $\det(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K) > 0$ for all $p \in]0, 1[$. This is a consequence of the continuity of the determinant and the fact that if $p = \frac{1}{2}1_n$ then

$$\det(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K) = \det\left(\frac{1}{2}I_n\right) > 0.$$

The continuity of the determinant also directly shows that (ii) \Rightarrow (i) $\Rightarrow K$ is a DPP kernel. Now, let K be a DPP kernel, choose $p \in]0, 1[$ and define $X \sim DPP(K)$ and then \widetilde{X} as in Proposition 1.10. \widetilde{X} is then a determinantal point process with kernel $D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K$. In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X} = [n]) = \mathbb{P}([n] \subset \widetilde{X}) = \det\left(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K\right).$$

Now, let $S \subset [n]$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X = S) > 0$. Then, by definition of \widetilde{X} we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X} = [n]) \geq \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{X} = [n] | X = S) \mathbb{P}(X = S) = \prod_{i \notin S} p_i \prod_{i \in S} (1 - p_i) \mathbb{P}(X = S) > 0.$$

Therefore, $\det(D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K) > 0$ for all $p \in]0, 1[$.

- (iii) We assume that there exists $p \in]0, 1[$ such that $D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K$ is not invertible. This means that for some non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(p)(x - Kx) + D(1_n - p)Kx &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow D(1_n - 2p)Kx &= -D(p)x \\ \Leftrightarrow x &= \begin{pmatrix} 2 - \frac{1}{p_1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ & & 2 - \frac{1}{p_n} \end{pmatrix} Kx. \end{aligned}$$

Since the function $t \mapsto 2 - \frac{1}{t}$ is a bijection from $]0, 1[$ to $] -\infty, 1[$ then we can conclude that K is not a DPP kernel if and only if there exists a non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\forall i \in [n], \exists \mu_i \in] -\infty, 1[\text{ s.t. } x_i = \mu_i(Kx)_i$$

which is equivalent to

$$\forall i \in [n], x_i(Kx)_i < 0 \text{ or } |(Kx)_i| > |x_i| \text{ or } x_i = 0.$$

As a consequence, K is a DPP kernel iff for all non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there exists $i \in [n]$ such that

$$x_i(Kx)_i \geq 0, |(Kx)_i| \leq |x_i| \text{ and } x_i \neq 0. \quad \square$$

A direct consequence of these characterizations is that the set of DPP kernels is a star-shaped set centered at $\frac{1}{2}I_n$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a DPP kernel. Then, for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $(1 - \lambda)K + \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}I_n\right)$ is a DPP kernel.*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{K} = (1 - \lambda)K + \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}I_n\right)$ and $p \in]0, 1[^n$. By Theorem 2.1 (ii) we need to show that $D(p)(I_n - \widetilde{K}) + D(1_n - p)\widetilde{K}$ is invertible to conclude that \widetilde{K} is a DPP kernel. We write

$$\begin{aligned} D(p)(I_n - \widetilde{K}) + D(1_n - p)\widetilde{K} &= D(p)I_n + D(1_n - 2p)\widetilde{K} \\ &= D(p)I_n + D(1_n - 2p)\left((1_n - \lambda)K + \frac{\lambda}{2}I_n\right) \\ &= D\left(p + \frac{\lambda}{2}1_n - \lambda p\right)I_n + D(1_n - 2p - \lambda 1_n + 2\lambda p)K \\ &= D\left(p + \frac{\lambda}{2}1_n - \lambda p\right)(I_n - K) + D\left(1_n - \left(p + \frac{\lambda}{2}1_n - \lambda p\right)\right)K \end{aligned}$$

Now, for all $i \in [n]$,

$$\left|p_i + \frac{\lambda}{2} - \lambda p_i - \frac{1}{2}\right| = |1 - \lambda|\left|\frac{1}{2} - p_i\right| < \frac{1}{2}$$

hence $p_i + \frac{\lambda}{2} - \lambda p_i \in]0, 1[$ and thus $D(p)(I_n - \widetilde{K}) + D(1_n - p)\widetilde{K}$ is invertible by Theorem 2.1 (ii), concluding the proof. \square

2.2 Generating DPP kernels

It is known that row-diagonally dominant matrices are P_0 [14, Proposition 4.5.1] and we can get a similar result for DPP kernels.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ such that K and $I_n - K$ are row diagonally dominant, meaning that the diagonal elements of K are in $[0, 1]$ and satisfy*

$$\forall i \in [n], \min(K_{i,i}, 1 - K_{i,i}) > \sum_{j \neq i} |K_{i,j}|.$$

Then K is a DPP kernel.

Proof. Let $p \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\widetilde{K} = D(p)(I_n - K) + D(1_n - p)K$. Then for all $i \in [n]$,

$$\widetilde{K}_{i,i} = p_i(1 - K_{i,i}) + (1 - p_i)K_{i,i} \geq \min(K_{i,i}, 1 - K_{i,i})$$

and for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$,

$$\widetilde{K}_{i,j} = p_i(-K_{i,j}) + (1 - p_i)K_{i,j}.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{j \neq i} |\widetilde{K}_{i,j}| \leq p_i \sum_{j \neq i} |K_{i,j}| + (1 - p_i) \sum_{j \neq i} |K_{i,j}| \leq p_i(1 - K_{i,i}) + (1 - p_i)K_{i,i} = \widetilde{K}_{i,i}.$$

Using the Gershgorin circle theorem we get that that any real eigenvalue λ of \widetilde{K} is non-negative hence $\det(\widetilde{K}) \geq 0$ and by Theorem 2.1 (i) we can conclude that K is a DPP kernel. \square

It is also known that matrices with a positive definite hermitian part are P_0 [14, Proposition 4.5.1] and adapting this result for DPP kernels yields the following proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\|M\|_2 \leq 1$. Then, $K := \frac{1}{2}(I_n - M)$ is a DPP kernel.*

Proof. We can write for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\langle Kx, (I_n - K)x \rangle = \frac{1}{4} \langle (I_n - M)x, (I_n + M)x \rangle = \frac{1}{4} (\|x\|^2 - \langle x, MM^T x \rangle) \geq 0. \quad (2.3)$$

This is a consequence of the largest eigenvalue of MM^T being $\|M\|_2^2 = 1$ by assumption. Now, if K is not a DPP kernel then by Theorem 2.1 (ii) there exists a non-zero $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and some $p \in]0, 1[$ such that

$$D(p)(I_n - K)x + D(1 - p)Kx = 0.$$

In particular, for all $i \in [n]$ we have

$$p_i((I_n - K)x)_i + (1 - p_i)(Kx)_i = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

hence $(Kx)_i$ and $((I_n - K)x)_i$ are either both equal to 0 or of opposite sign and thus $\langle Kx, (I_n - K)x \rangle \leq 0$. Combining (2.3) and (2.4) shows that $\langle Kx, (I_n - K)x \rangle = 0$ and by (2.4) we must have $Kx = (I_n - K)x = 0$ and therefore $x \in \text{Ker}(K) \cap \text{Ker}(I_n - K) = \{0_n\}$ which contradicts the assumption that $x \neq 0_n$ and therefore prove the proposition. \square

This result shows that all matrices close to $\frac{1}{2}I_n$ are DPP kernels. Combining this result with Proposition 2.2 illustrates that $\frac{1}{2}I_n$ can be seen as the center of the set of DPP kernels. It suggests that maybe it is natural to write DPP kernels as $\frac{1}{2}(I_n + M)$. We point out that with this notation and if $I_n - K$ is invertible then $L = K(I_n - K)^{-1} = (I_n + M)(I_n - M)^{-1}$ corresponding to the Cayley transform of $-M$.

2.3 Eigenvalues of DPP kernels

It is already well known that symmetric DPP kernels have eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$. We also point out in Corollary 1.7 that the eigenvalues of a DPP characterize the distribution of its number of points which is why it is useful to understand their behaviour. First, we give some bound on these eigenvalues using the result of [15] on P_0 matrices that we recall below.

Proposition 2.5 ([15]). *Let $L \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a P_0 matrix and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ be a non-zero eigenvalue of L . Then,*

$$|\arg(\lambda)| \leq \pi - \frac{\pi}{n}.$$

In particular, any real eigenvalue of L is in \mathbb{R}_+ .

Adapting this result in the determinantal setting gives the following bounds on the eigenvalues of a DPP kernel.

Proposition 2.6. *Let λ be an eigenvalue of a DPP kernel $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$. Then,*

$$\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} i, \frac{1}{2 \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} \right) \cup \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2 \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} i, \frac{1}{2 \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} \right), \quad (2.5)$$

where we denote by $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(x, r)$ the complex ball centered in x with radius r . In particular, any real eigenvalue of a DPP kernel is in $[0, 1]$.

Proof. We begin by pointing out that when $n = 1$ then (2.5) becomes $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ which is obvious since the only DPP kernels of size 1×1 have values in $[0, 1]$. We now consider that $n \geq 2$ and first assume that $I_n - K$ is invertible. In that case, $\lambda/(1 - \lambda)$ is an eigenvalue of $K(I_n - K)^{-1}$ which is a P_0 matrix and by Proposition 2.5 we get that either $\lambda = 0$ or

$$\left| \arg \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \right) \right| \leq \pi - \frac{\pi}{n}.$$

If $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ then $\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda}$ is also real and thus in \mathbb{R}_+ by Proposition 2.5 which is only possible when $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Otherwise, if $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ then $\bar{\lambda}$ is also an eigenvalue of K so we can assume that $\Im(\lambda) > 0$ and write $\lambda = a + bi$ with $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b > 0$. Then,

$$\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} = \frac{\lambda - |\lambda|^2}{|1 - \lambda|} \Rightarrow \arg \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \right) = \arg(\lambda - |\lambda|^2) = \arg(a - (a^2 + b^2) + bi).$$

Since $b > 0$ then

$$\arg(a - (a^2 + b^2) + bi) = \begin{cases} \arctan \left(\frac{b}{a - (a^2 + b^2)} \right) & \text{if } a > a^2 + b^2. \\ \frac{\pi}{2} & \text{if } a = a^2 + b^2. \\ \arctan \left(\frac{b}{a - (a^2 + b^2)} \right) + \pi & \text{if } a < a^2 + b^2. \end{cases}$$

In the case where $a \geq a^2 + b^2$ (equivalent to $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}} \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right)$) then $|\arg(a - (a^2 + b^2) + bi)| \leq \pi/2$ and thus $\left| \arg \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \right) \right| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \leq \pi - \frac{\pi}{n}$. In the case where $a < a^2 + b^2$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \arg \left(\frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \right) \right| \leq \pi - \frac{\pi}{n} &\Leftrightarrow \arctan \left(\frac{b}{a - (a^2 + b^2)} \right) \leq -\frac{\pi}{n} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{b}{a - (a^2 + b^2)} \leq -\tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \frac{b}{\tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} \geq (a^2 + b^2) - a \\ &\Leftrightarrow (a^2 - a) + \left(b^2 - \frac{b}{\tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} \right) \leq 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left(a - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + \left(b - \frac{1}{2 \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)} \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4 \sin \left(\frac{\pi}{n} \right)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}(1/2, 1/2) \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \tan(\frac{\pi}{n})}i, \frac{1}{2 \sin(\frac{\pi}{n})}\right)$ hence

$$\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \tan(\frac{\pi}{n})}i, \frac{1}{2 \sin(\frac{\pi}{n})}\right)$$

and by symmetry over the real line we get the desired result. Finally, if $I_n - K$ is not invertible then there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $I_n - pK$ is invertible for all $p \in [1 - \varepsilon, 1[$. Since pK is a DPP kernel (corresponding to a p -thinning of a DPP with kernel K) then

$$p\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \tan(\frac{\pi}{n})}i, \frac{1}{2 \sin(\frac{\pi}{n})}\right) \cup \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2 \tan(\frac{\pi}{n})}i, \frac{1}{2 \sin(\frac{\pi}{n})}\right)$$

for all $p \in [1 - \varepsilon, 1[$ and we get the desired result by taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

We illustrate the set of possible values for the eigenvalues of K and L in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Set of eigenvalues of P_0 matrices and DPP kernels of size $n \times n$ for $n \in \{2, \dots, 7\}$.

Since the distribution of the number of points of a DPP only depends on the eigenvalues of its kernel (see Corollary 1.7) then a good method for finding the distribution of $|X|$ when $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$ is to find a DPP kernel \tilde{K} with the same eigenvalues as K but with a simpler form from which we can easily infer the distribution of its number of points. With this method we get the following two results.

Proposition 2.7. *Let K be a DPP kernel with only real eigenvalues (written with multiplicities) $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in [0, 1]$. If $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$ then $|X|$ has the same distribution as $B_1 + \dots + B_n$ where the B_i are independent Bernoulli random variables with $B_i \sim b(\lambda_i)$.*

Proof. Obviously, the matrix $D(\lambda)$ has the same eigenvalues as K and is a DPP kernel corresponding to choosing if each $i \in [n]$ is in X or not independently with probability λ_i hence the result. \square

Proposition 2.8. *Let K be a DPP kernel with eigenvalues in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. We write $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ the real eigenvalues (written with multiplicities) of K and $(\mu_1, \bar{\mu}_1), \dots, (\mu_l, \bar{\mu}_l)$ the complex pairs of eigenvalues (written with multiplicities) of K . If $X \sim DPP(K)$ then $|X|$ has the same distribution as $B_1 + \dots + B_k + C_1 + \dots + C_l$ where the B_i are independent Bernoulli random variables with $B_i \sim b(\lambda_i)$ and the C_j are independent random variables in $\{0, 1, 2\}$ where*

$$\mathbb{P}(C_j = 0) = |\mu_j - 1|^2, \quad \mathbb{P}(C_j = 1) = 2 \left(\frac{1}{4} - \left| \mu_j - \frac{1}{2} \right|^2 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(C_j = 2) = |\mu_j|^2.$$

Proof. We write $\mu_j = a_j + b_j i$ for each j . It can be easily seen that K has the same eigenvalues as

$$\tilde{K} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & & & \\ 0 & & \lambda_k & & \\ & & & M_1 & 0 \\ & & & & \ddots \\ 0 & & & 0 & & M_l \end{pmatrix}$$

where each M_j is the 2×2 matrix $\begin{pmatrix} a_j & -b_j \\ b_j & a_j \end{pmatrix}$. It is straightforward to show that each M_j is a DPP kernel by using Proposition 3.8 or by directly computing the associated probabilities. Therefore, by Proposition 3.5 the matrix \tilde{K} is a DPP kernel and if $X \sim DPP(K)$ then $|X|$ has the same distribution as the sum of independent random variables $B_i \sim b(\lambda_i)$ and C_j where C_j is the number of points of a DPP with kernel M_j hence

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{P}(C_j = 0) = \det(I_2 - M_j) = (a_j - 1)^2 + b_j^2 = |\mu_j - 1|^2; \\ \mathbb{P}(C_j = 2) = \det(M_j) = a_j^2 + b_j^2 = |\mu_j|^2; \\ \mathbb{P}(C_j = 1) = 1 - |\mu_j|^2 - |\mu_j - 1|^2 = 1 - \frac{|\mu_j - (\mu_j - 1)|^2 + |\mu_j + (\mu_j - 1)|^2}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - |2\mu_j - 1|^2). \end{cases} \quad \square$$

Proposition 2.7 is a standard result for symmetric DPP kernels but shows that this result stays true for any DPP kernel with real eigenvalues. Proposition 2.8 is a direct extension of 2.7 and can be applied to any DPP kernel of the form $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n - M)$ where $\|M\|_2 \leq 1$ since, using the properties of the spectral norm, any eigenvalue λ of K satisfy $|2\lambda - 1| \leq \|M\|_2 \leq 1$ hence $\lambda \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$. These results can be extended further by using the same reasoning as in the proof of 2.8 combined with Proposition 3.3. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of a DPP kernel K and consider a partition S_1, \dots, S_k of $[n]$ such that, for each S_i , either S_i is of size 1 and $\lambda_s \in [0, 1]$ where $S_i = \{s\}$ or $\prod_{s \in S_i} (X + \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda_s - 1})$ is a polynomial with non-negative coefficients. Then, the distribution of the number of points of a DPP with kernel K is the same as the distribution of $C_1 + \dots + C_k$ where the C_i are independent random variables with

$C_i \in \{0, \dots, |S_i|\}$. While such a partition always exist, finding the optimal decomposition of a polynomial in $\mathbb{R}_+[X]$ into product of lower order polynomials in $\mathbb{R}_+[X]$ is not a solved problem to our knowledge.

3 Particular cases

In this section we give some known cases or simple examples where it is easy to check whether a DPP is well defined or not.

3.1 Examples in the literature

A lot of example of determinantal point processes are detailed in [24, Section 2.5] with some of them having non-symmetrical kernels. We mention for example the Coulomb gas in [5] or the result in [4] showing that, when taking a random partition using a Plancherel measure (later generalized in [21] to Schur measures) and transforming it into a point process on $\frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$ using a natural transformation we get a DPP with a non-symmetric kernel. We also recall below the result of [3] that 1-dependent binary processes are DPPs whose kernel can be written as an upper Hessenberg matrix.

Proposition 3.1 ([3]). *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \{0, 1\}$ be a 1-dependent process ($X_i \perp\!\!\!\perp X_j$ if $|j - i| \geq 2$) and $X = \{i \text{ s.t. } X_i = 1\}$. Then X is a DPP with kernel of the form*

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ -1 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & -1 & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

3.2 Construction with some specific eigenvalues

It was shown in [15] how to construct some specific P_0 matrices with a given set of eigenvalues. By adapting these results into the DPP setting we can construct some DPP kernels with specific eigenvalues.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$ be the eigenvalues (taken with multiplicities) of some P_0 matrix M . We consider the polynomial*

$$P(X) = \prod_{i=1}^n (X + \lambda_i) = c_0 + c_1 X + \dots + c_{n-1} X^{n-1} + X^n$$

and the kernel

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & -1 \\ c_0 & \cdots & \cdots & c_{n-2} & c_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then L is a P_0 matrix. Moreover, if $X \sim \text{DPP}_L(L)$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(X = S) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_{k-1}}{c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} + 1} & \text{if } S = \{k, \dots, n\}; \\ \frac{1}{c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} + 1} & \text{if } S = \emptyset; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By definition we have $c_k = e_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ which is equal to the sum of the principal minor of M and thus non-negative since M is P_0 . Moreover, notice that $-L$ is the companion matrix of $P(X)$ hence the eigenvalues of $-L$ are the root of $P(-X)$ and therefore the eigenvalues of L are the λ_i . Now, let $S \subset [n]$. Obviously, if $n \notin S$ then L_S is a submatrix of a triangular matrix with zero diagonal entries hence $\det(L_S) = 0$. Otherwise, we write $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_{k-1}, s_k\}$ with $s_1 < \dots < s_k = n$ and we can write L_S as

$$L_S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & \\ \vdots & & & & \\ 0 & & M & & \\ c_{s_1} & c_{s_2} & \cdots & c_{s_k} & \end{pmatrix}.$$

where M is an upper triangular matrix whose diagonal elements are $L_{s_1, s_2}, \dots, L_{s_{k-1}, s_k}$ and therefore

$$\det(L_S) = (-1)^{k+1} c_{s_1} \det(M) = (-1)^{k+1} c_{s_1} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} L_{s_{i-1}, s_i}.$$

Now, L_{s_{i-1}, s_i} is equal to -1 if $s_i = s_{i-1} + 1$ and 0 otherwise hence $\det(L_S)$ is nonzero only when S is of the form $\{k, \dots, n\}$ with $\det(L_S) = c_k \geq 0$ in this case. We can conclude that L is a P_0 matrix. \square

As a direct consequence, computing $K = I_n - (I_n + L)^{-1}$ when L is of the form (3.1) yields the following result.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$ be the eigenvalues of some DPP kernel K . We consider the polynomial*

$$P(X) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(X + \frac{\lambda_i}{1 - \lambda_i} \right) = c_0 + c_1 X + \cdots + c_{n-1} X^{n-1} + X^n$$

and the kernel

$$K = \frac{1}{c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} + 1} \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_0 + c_1 & \cdots & c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ c_0 & c_0 + c_1 & \cdots & c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then K is a DPP kernel. Moreover, if $X \sim \text{DPP}(K)$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(X = S) = \begin{cases} \frac{c_{k-1}}{c_0 + \dots + c_{n-1} + 1} & \text{if } S = \{k, \dots, n\}; \\ \frac{1}{c_0 + \dots + c_{n-1} + 1} & \text{if } S = \emptyset; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3.3 Examples of particular couplings

We showcase in this part some particular examples of DPP couplings. We begin by recalling some already known couplings that uses symmetric kernels.

3.3.1 Some already known repulsive couplings

One of the earliest example of construction of a specific DPP coupling (using only symmetric DPP kernels) comes from [19] where the author considered a symmetric DPP kernel K and the coupling with kernel

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & (K(I_n - K))^{1/2} \\ (K(I_n - K))^{1/2} & I_n - K \end{pmatrix}$$

which has the nice property of having a deterministic number of points since \mathbb{K} is a projection matrix. A more recent example by [1] consists on simulating a DPP X with some symmetric kernel K and then splitting each point of X into two subsets X_1 and X_2 such that each point has a probability $\frac{1}{2}$ of going into each set. Such a coupling can be expressed as a DPP with the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ such that $2K$ is a DPP kernel. Let $X \sim \text{DPP}(2K)$. We randomly split X into two disjoint subsets X_1 and X_2 such that for each $i \in X$ we choose independently and with probability $1/2$ whether $i \in X_1$ or $i \in X_2$. Then, $(X_1, X_2) \sim \text{DPP}(\mathbb{K})$ where*

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & K \\ K & K \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. From the definition of X_1 and X_2 we have for all $S, T \subset [n]$:

$$\mathbb{P}(S \subset X_1, T \subset X_2) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S \cap T \neq \emptyset; \\ \frac{1}{2^{|S \cap T|}} \mathbb{P}(S \cup T \subset X) & \text{if } S \cap T = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Now, we verify that this is the case if $(X_1, X_2) \sim \text{DPP}(\mathbb{K})$. Obviously if $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}$ has two identical rows and columns thus its determinant is equal to 0. Otherwise, if $S \cap T = \emptyset$ then

$$\det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}) = \det(K_{S \cup T}) = \frac{1}{2^{|S \cap T|}} \det(2K_{S \cup T}) = \frac{1}{2^{|S \cap T|}} \mathbb{P}(S \cup T \subset X),$$

concluding the proof. □

Note that the assumption that K is symmetrical used in [1] is not necessary for such a DPP to be well-defined.

3.3.2 Complete independency

Any independent coupling of DPPs can be written as a DPP with a block triangular form.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and write $n = n_1 + \dots + n_k$. Consider matrices $K^{(i,j)} \in \mathcal{M}_{n_i, n_j}(\mathbb{R})$ with $j \geq i$ and define the block triangular matrix*

$$\mathbb{K} := \begin{pmatrix} K^{(1,1)} & \dots & K^{(1,k)} \\ & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & K^{(k,k)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R}).$$

Then, \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel if and only if $K^{(i,i)}$ is a DPP kernel for all $i \in [k]$. In this case, if we define $\Omega_i = \{1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} n_j, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^i n_j\}$ and $X_i := X \cap \Omega_i$ then all X_i are independent with $X_i \sim \text{DPP}(K^{(i,i)})$.

Proof. Direct consequence of

$$\mathbb{P}(S \subset X) = \det(\mathbb{K}_S) = \prod_{i=1}^k \det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cap \Omega_i}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{P}(S \cap \Omega_i \subset X_i). \quad \square$$

Since the $K^{(i,j)}$ with $j > i$ have no influence in this case then it is more common to simply write \mathbb{K} as the block diagonal matrix of the $K^{(i,i)}$.

3.3.3 Maximum dependency

We can consider that the most attractive coupling possible of two DPPs with the same distribution is a coupling of (X_1, X_2) where $X_1 = X_2$ almost surely. Such a coupling has a determinantal form as a consequence of the following two results.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a DPP kernel and define*

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & I_n - K \\ K & I_n - K \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel. If $(X_1, X_2) \sim \text{DPP}(\mathbb{K})$ then $X_1 \sim \text{DPP}(K)$, $X_2 \sim \text{DPP}(I - K)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = X_2^c) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $X_1 \sim \text{DPP}(K)$. It suffices to show that $\mathbb{P}(S \subset X_1, T \subset X_1^c) = 0 = \det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)})$ for any $S, T \subset [n]$ in order to prove the proposition.

- If $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}$ has two identical rows and thus $\det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}) = 0$ hence

$$\mathbb{P}(S \subset X_1, T \subset X_1^c) = 0 = \det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}).$$

- If $S \cap T = \emptyset$ then

$$\det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} K_S & -K_{S,T} \\ K_{T,S} & I_T - K_T \end{pmatrix}.$$

Using the particle hole involution (Proposition 1.8) we get

$$\det(\mathbb{K}_{S \cup (T+n)}) = \mathbb{P}(S \subset X_1, T \cap X_1 = \emptyset) = \mathbb{P}(S \subset X_1, T \subset X_1^c).$$

□

Proposition 3.7. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a DPP kernel and define*

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & I - K \\ -K & K \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel. If $(X_1, X_2) \sim DPP(\mathbb{K})$ then $X_1, X_2 \sim DPP(K)$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = X_2) = 1.$$

Proof. Direct consequence of applying the particle-hole transform (Proposition 1.8) on X_2 in Proposition 3.6. □

3.3.4 Transformation of a symmetric coupling

By using the particle-hole transform we can show a first example of general construction of a coupling between any two DPPs with symmetric kernels.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $K^{(1)}$ and $K^{(2)}$ be two $n \times n$ symmetric matrices with eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$ (and thus DPP kernels). Let $N \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ and define the matrix*

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K^{(1)} & -N \\ N^T & K^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel if and only if the symmetric matrix

$$\tilde{\mathbb{K}} = \begin{pmatrix} K^{(1)} & N \\ N^T & I_n - K^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}$$

has eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition 1.8 with $S = \{n + 1, \dots, 2n\}$. □

In this specific case we don't need to use the general results established in Section 2 to study these DPPs but we can simply use the usual results on DPPs with symmetric kernel combined with the fact that

$$(X_1, X_2) \sim DPP(\mathbb{K}) \Leftrightarrow (X_1, X_2^c) \sim DPP(\tilde{\mathbb{K}}).$$

3.4 Examples using low rank matrices

We finish this section by giving a few examples of construction of DPPs using the nice properties of low-rank matrices regarding the determinant.

3.4.1 Rank one matrix

Proposition 3.9. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be of rank 1. We can write $K = \lambda uv^T$ where λ is the only non-zero eigenvalue of K and $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are left and right eigenvectors chosen such that $\langle u, v \rangle = 1$. Then K is a DPP kernel if and only if*

$$\forall i \in [n], u_i v_i \geq 0 \text{ and } \lambda \in [0, 1]$$

Proof. Since K is of rank one then $\det(K_S) = 0$ when $|S| \geq 2$. Thus, if X is a DPP with kernel K then $|X| \leq 1$ almost surely. Now, for any $i \in [n]$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X = \{i\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{i\} \subset X) = \lambda u_i v_i \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(X = \emptyset) = 1 - \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i = 1 - \lambda,$$

proving the result. □

3.4.2 Rank one perturbation of the half identity matrix

Proposition 3.10. *Let $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be of the form $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + uv^T)$ for some vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then K is a DPP kernel if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i| \leq 1$.*

Proof. We first assume that $\langle u, v \rangle \neq 1$. Writing $(I_n - K) = \frac{1}{2}(I_n - uv^T)$ and using the Sherman–Morrison formula gives

$$(I_n - K)^{-1} = 2(I_n - uv^T)^{-1} = 2 \left(I_n + \frac{1}{1 - \langle u, v \rangle} uv^T \right)$$

hence

$$L = K(I_n - K)^{-1} = (I_n - K)^{-1} - I_n = I_n + \frac{2}{1 - \langle u, v \rangle} uv^T.$$

Now, we show that L is a P_0 matrix. Taking $S \subset [n]$ we write

$$\det(L_S) = \det \left(I_{|S|} + \frac{2}{1 - \langle u, v \rangle} u_S v_S^T \right) = \sum_{T \subset S} \det \left(\frac{2}{1 - \langle u, v \rangle} u_T v_T^T \right).$$

Since uv^T is a rank one matrix then all its principal minors of size $k \times k$ with $k \geq 2$ are equal to 0. Therefore,

$$\det(L_S) = 1 + \sum_{i \in S} \frac{2}{1 - \langle u, v \rangle} u_i v_i.$$

Moreover, using the matrix determinant Lemma gives

$$\frac{1}{\det(I_n + L)} = \det(I_n - K) = \frac{1}{2^n} (1 - \langle u, v \rangle)$$

thus

$$\frac{\det(L_S)}{\det(I_n + L)} = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(1 - \langle u, v \rangle + 2 \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i \right) = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(1 + \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i - \sum_{i \notin S} u_i v_i \right).$$

This proves that the smallest possible value for $\det(L_S)$ is $2^{-n} \det(I_n + L) (1 - \sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i|)$ which is nonnegative if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i| \leq 1$ proving the result. We get the proof for the case $\langle u, v \rangle = 1$ using a limit argument. \square

Note that the only non-zero singular value of uv^T is $\|u\|_2 \|v\|_2$ and, by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i| = \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2$ only when u and v are proportional and thus uv^T is symmetrical. This illustrates that among the rank one perturbations of the half identity matrix (and likely all matrices) the only ones for which Proposition 2.4 is a necessary and sufficient result are the symmetrical matrices. We also note that for these specific DPPs we have the identity

$$\mathbb{P}(X = S) = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(1 + \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i - \sum_{i \notin S} u_i v_i \right) \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(X = S) + \mathbb{P}(X = S^c) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$$

which can be used to easily simulate these DPPs.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i| \leq 1$. Let S be a random subset of $[n]$ with a uniform distribution on $\mathcal{P}([n])$. We define the random subset X of $[n]$ conditionally to S by*

$$\mathbb{P}(X = T | S) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i - \sum_{i \notin S} u_i v_i \right) & \text{if } T = S; \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \sum_{i \notin S} u_i v_i - \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i \right) & \text{if } T = S^c; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

X is then a DPP with kernel $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + uv^T)$.

Proof. Direct consequence of the fact that for all $T \in [n]$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X = T) = \mathbb{P}(X = T | S = T) \mathbb{P}(S = T) + \mathbb{P}(X = T | S = T^c) \mathbb{P}(S = T^c)$$

$$\text{and } \mathbb{P}(S = T) = \mathbb{P}(S = T^c) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \quad \square$$

Finally, for these DPPs we can also directly express the distribution of its number of points.

Proposition 3.12. *Let X be a DPP with kernel $K \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ of the form $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + uv^T)$ where $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i v_i| \leq 1$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| = k) = \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\binom{n}{k} + \left(\binom{n-1}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k-1} \right) \langle u, v \rangle \right).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|X| = k) &= \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k}} \mathbb{P}(X = S) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k}} \left(1 - \langle u, v \rangle + 2 \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\binom{n}{k} (1 - \langle u, v \rangle) + 2 \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k}} \sum_{i \in S} u_i v_i \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\binom{n}{k} (1 - \langle u, v \rangle) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i \sum_{\substack{S \subset [n] \\ |S|=k \\ i \in S}} 1 \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\binom{n}{k} (1 - \langle u, v \rangle) + 2 \binom{n-1}{k-1} \langle u, v \rangle \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2^n} \left(\binom{n}{k} + \left(\binom{n-1}{k} - \binom{n-1}{k-1} \right) \langle u, v \rangle \right). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

4 Mixing of DPPs

The most common method used to simulate DPPs with a symmetric kernel K is based on a first result stating that all the eigenvalues λ_i of K can be replaced with independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter λ_i (see [13, Theorem 4.5.3] for example), turning K into a projection matrix. Then, we can use a specific algorithm for simulating DPPs with a projection matrix kernel (see [13, Algorithm 4.4.2] for example). Such a method cannot be used for DPPs with a nonsymmetric kernel for various reasons. Instead, we are currently investigating a different method for kernels of the form $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + M)$ where $\|M\|_2 \leq 1$. Similarly to the method used for symmetric kernels we show that we can replace the singular values of M with independent Bernoulli random variables.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a matrix such that $\|M\|_2 \leq 1$ and write $M = PD(\sigma)Q^T$ its singular value decomposition where P, Q are $n \times n$ unitary matrices and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n) \in [0, 1]^n$ is the vector of singular values of M . Let $B = (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be a vector of n independent Bernoulli random variables with $B_i \sim b(\sigma_i)$ and $\tilde{K} = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + PD(B)Q^T)$. Note that \tilde{K} is always a DPP kernel by Proposition 2.4. If X is a DPP with kernel \tilde{K} conditionally to the B_i then X is a DPP with kernel $K = \frac{1}{2}(I_n + M)$.*

Proof. Let $S \subset [n]$, we can write

$$\det(K_S) = \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \det(I_{|S|} + M_S) = \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \sum_{T \subset S} \det(M_T) = \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \sum_{T \subset S} \det(P_{T, \bullet} D Q_{\bullet, T}^T).$$

Using the Cauchy-Binet formula twice gives

$$\begin{aligned} \det(K_S) &= \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \sum_{T \subset S} \sum_{\substack{U, V \subset [n] \\ |U|=|V|=|T|}} \det(P_{T,U}) \det(D_{U,V}) \det(Q_{T,V}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \sum_{T \subset S} \sum_{\substack{U \subset [n] \\ |U|=|T|}} \det(P_{T,U}) \det(Q_{T,U}) \prod_{i \in U} \sigma_i. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\det(\widetilde{K}_S) = \frac{1}{2^{|S|}} \sum_{T \subset S} \sum_{\substack{U \subset [n] \\ |U|=|T|}} \det(P_{T,U}) \det(Q_{T,U}) \prod_{i \in U} B_i$$

hence $\mathbb{E}[\det(\widetilde{K}_S)] = \det(K_S)$ and thus

$$\mathbb{P}(S \subset X) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(S \subset X | B_1, \dots, B_n)] = \mathbb{E}[\det(\widetilde{K}_S)] = \det(K_S). \quad \square$$

Unfortunately, the matrix \widetilde{K} doesn't have the nice properties of projection matrices as in the symmetrical case. It is a (often) low-rank perturbation of the half identity matrix. We saw in Proposition 3.11 that its associated DPP can be easily simulated when M is of rank 1 and we are currently investigating if this could be generalized.

5 Simulating attractive couplings of DPPs

Various algorithms for simulating DPPs with non-symmetric kernels have been developed in the literature. For our simple simulations we just used the basic algorithm of [23] but more complex cases would require using some improved algorithms as in [10, 17].

5.1 Construction of the couplings

We consider DPP couplings (X_1, X_2) on $[2n]$ such that X_1 and X_2 have the same distribution. So, if \mathbb{K} is the kernel of (X_1, X_2) then it has to be of the form

$$\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & M \\ N & K \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.1)$$

where K is the kernel of X_1 and X_2 . The cross dependency between X_1 and X_2 can be observed using the quantities

$$\mathbb{P}(i \in X_1, j \in X_2) - \mathbb{P}(i \in X_1)\mathbb{P}(j \in X_2) = -M_{i,j}N_{j,i}.$$

In order to have positive cross correlations we thus need to assume that at least $M_{i,i}N_{i,i} \leq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. One natural way of doing it is to take $M = -N^T$ which corresponds to the setting of Proposition 3.8. Although, the kernel of the most attractive coupling of DPPs presented in Proposition 3.7 does not have this shape and in simulations we were only able to use such kernels to generate DPP coupling with barely any attraction. Another natural way of constructing positive cross correlations is to take M (resp. N) to be a symmetric positive (resp. negative) semidefinite matrix. By additionally assuming that M, N and K commute, and are therefore simultaneously diagonalizable, and then using Proposition 2.4 we can choose M and N such that \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel with the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$ with eigenvalues $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in [0, 1]^n$ taken with multiplicities and write $K = PD(\lambda)P^T$ the spectral decomposition of K . Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ such that*

$$(\lambda_i - 1/2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mu_i^2 + \nu_i^2 \pm |\mu_i - \nu_i| \sqrt{4 \left(\lambda_i - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + (\mu_i + \nu_i)^2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad (5.2)$$

and define $M = PD(\mu)P^T \in \mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$ and $-N = PD(\nu)P^T \in \mathcal{S}_n^+(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mathbb{K} = \begin{pmatrix} K & M \\ N & K \end{pmatrix}$ is a DPP kernel.

Proof. We can write \mathbb{K} as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{K} &= \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D(\lambda) & D(\mu) \\ -D(\nu) & D(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^T \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} I_{2n} + \mathbb{M} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{M} = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n) & D(\mu) \\ -D(\nu) & D(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^T \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$\mathbb{M}\mathbb{M}^T = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} D((\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n)^2 + \mu^2) & D((\mu - \nu)(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n)) \\ D((\mu - \nu)(\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n)) & D((\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_n)^2 + \nu^2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^T & 0 \\ 0 & P^T \end{pmatrix}$$

we can then deduce that the $2n$ eigenvalues of $\mathbb{M}\mathbb{M}^T$ (and thus the singular values squared of \mathbb{M}) are the 2 eigenvalues of the n matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\lambda_i - 1/2)^2 + \mu_i^2 & (\mu_i - \nu_i)(\lambda_i - 1/2) \\ (\mu_i - \nu_i)(\lambda_i - 1/2) & (\lambda_i - 1/2)^2 + \nu_i^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

for each $i \in [n]$. It is straightforward to show that they are equal to

$$(\lambda_i - 1/2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mu_i^2 + \nu_i^2 \pm |\mu_i - \nu_i| \sqrt{4 \left(\lambda_i - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + (\mu_i + \nu_i)^2} \right).$$

If these quantities are all $\leq 1/4$ then Proposition 2.4 shows that \mathbb{K} is a DPP kernel. \square

Note that since the first term of (5.2) has values in $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and the second term can be made arbitrarily small by choosing μ_i and ν_i close to 0 then it is always possible to find some μ and ν satisfying (5.2).

5.2 Numerical results

For our simulations, we use DPPs to simulate random subsets of a regular grid in $[0, 1]^2$ as an approximation of a continuous DPPs on the unit box. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the regular grid of $n = (k + 1)^2$ points of points of the form $(\frac{i}{k}, \frac{j}{k}) \in [0, 1]^2$ and denote by P_i the i -th point of this grid with some arbitrary ordering. We then consider kernels of the form $K_{i,j} = f(\|P_i - P_j\|)$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^2 and f is some well-chosen function. Such a finite DPP approximates a continuous one [22]. We give an illustration of a regular DPP with a symmetric kernel in Figure 2.






Figure 2: Example of a simulation of a DPP on a 31×31 regular grid of $[0, 1]^2$ with kernel $K_{i,j} = 0.02 \exp\left(-\frac{\|P_i - P_j\|_2^2}{0.018}\right)$.

We then show in Figures 3 and 4 two attractive couplings of two repulsive DPPs with the same kernel on a regular grid of $[0, 1]^2$ with 31×31 points. In both cases we simulate a coupling with kernel of the form (5.1) where $K_{i,j} = 0.02 \exp\left(-\frac{\|P_i - P_j\|_2^2}{0.018}\right)$ in Figure 3 and $K_{i,j} = 0.02 \left(1 + \left(\frac{\|y-x\|}{0.075}\right)^2\right)^{-1.1}$ in Figure 4. In both cases, the matrices M and N were chosen using the method described in Proposition 5.1 with the μ_i and ν_i being chosen randomly among the eigenvalues satisfying (5.2).




(a) DPP coupling simulation




(b) Inclusion probability for the orange DPP conditionally to the blue DPP

Figure 3: Simulation of a coupling of two DPPs with a Gaussian Kernel.



(a) DPP coupling simulation



(b) Inclusion probability for the orange DPP conditionally to the blue DPP

Figure 4: Simulation of a coupling of two DPPs with a Cauchy Kernel. Identical points in both DPPs are shown in red.

The simulation in Figure 3 has the intended behaviour we expected with points of both DPPs being likely to be close to each other. Although, the main drawback of this method is that it is not currently possible to control the range and the strength of the attraction

since it is not clear how modifying the eigenvalues of M and N affect the final result. This is clearly illustrated in Figure 4 which has a very strong attraction between both DPPs but which is very localized. As a result the coupling tends to have some points of the two DPPs being very close (or even identical since we are in a discrete setting) but all other points behaving almost independently from both DPPs.

References

- [1] R.H. Affandi, A. Kulesza, and E.B. Fox. Markov determinantal point processes. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2012.
- [2] Adrian Baddeley, Ege Rubak, and Rolf Turner. *Spatial Point Patterns: Methodology and Applications with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, London, 2015.
- [3] A. Borodin, P. Diaconis, and J. Fulman. On adding a list of numbers (and other one-dependent determinantal processes). *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 47, 05 2009.
- [4] A. Borodin, A. Okounkov, and G. Olshanski. Asymptotics of plancherel measures for symmetric groups. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 13:481–515, 1999.
- [5] F. Cornu and B. Jancovici. The electrical double layer: A solvable model. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 90:2444–2452, 1989.
- [6] G.E. Coxson. The P-matrix problem is co-NP-complete. *Mathematical Programming*, 64:173–178, 1994.
- [7] M. Fiedler and V. Pták. Some generalizations of positive definiteness and monotonicity. *Numerische Mathematik*, 9:163–172, 1966.
- [8] M. Gartrell, V. Brunel, E. Dohmatob, and S. Krichene. Learning nonsymmetric determinantal point processes. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [9] C. Gouieroux and Y. Lu. Markov determinantal point process for dynamic random sets. Not published, 2023.
- [10] I. Han, M. Gartrell, J. Gillenwater, E. Dohmatob, and A. karbasi. Scalable sampling for nonsymmetric determinantal point processes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [11] R.D. Harkness and V. Isham. A bivariate spatial point pattern of ants’ nests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C*, 32(3):293–303, November 1983.
- [12] R.A. Horn and C.R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- [13] J.B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virag. *Zeros of Gaussian Analytic Functions and Determinantal Point Processes*. American Mathematical Society, 2009.
- [14] C.R. Johnson, R.L. Smith, and M.J. Tsatsomeros. *Matrix Positivity*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [15] R.B. Kellogg. On complex eigenvalues of M and P matrices. *Numerische Mathematik*, 19:170–175, 1972.
- [16] A. Kulesza and B. Taskar. Determinantal point process models for machine learning. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 5:123–286, 2012.
- [17] C. Launay, B. Galerne, and A. Desolneux. Exact sampling of determinantal point processes without eigendecomposition. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 57(4):1198–1221, 2020.
- [18] F. Lavancier, J. Møller, and E. Rubak. Determinantal point process models and statistical inference. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 77:853–877, 2015.
- [19] R. Lyons. Determinantal probability measures. *Publ. Math.*, 98:167–212, 2003.
- [20] O. Macchi. The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 7:83–122, 1975.
- [21] A. Okounkov. Infinite wedge and random partitions. *Selecta Mathematica*, 7:57–81, 1999.
- [22] A. Poinas and F. Lavancier. Asymptotic approximation of the likelihood of stationary determinantal point processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 50(2):842–874, 2023.
- [23] J. Poulson. High-performance sampling of generic determinantal point processes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 378(2166), 2020.
- [24] A. Soshnikov. Determinantal random point fields. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 55:923–975, 2000.