

Complete Log Concavity of Coverage-Like Functions

Dorna Abdolazimi* and Shayan Oveis Gharan[†]

University of Washington

March 8, 2023

Abstract

We introduce an expressive subclass of non-negative almost submodular set functions, called strongly 2-coverage functions which include coverage and (sums of) matroid rank functions, and prove that the homogenization of the generating polynomial of any such function is completely log-concave, taking a step towards characterizing the coefficients of (homogeneous) completely log-concave polynomials. As a consequence we obtain that the “level sets” of any such function form an ultra-log concave sequence.

1 Introduction

A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is *log-concave* over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, if p is non-negative and $\log p$ is a concave function on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. Note that the identically zero polynomials are log-concave. We say $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is *completely log-concave/Lortenzian* if for any $k \geq 0$, and any set of vectors $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, $D_{a_1} \dots D_{a_k} p$ is non-negative and log-concave over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, where for a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $D_a = \sum_i a_i \partial_{z_i}$ is the directional derivative operator. Completely log-concave polynomials were introduced in [AOV18] and extended in [Ana+18a; BH20]. We say a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is *multiaffine* if every monomial of p is square-free, i.e., $\text{supp}(p) \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$. A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is *d-homogeneous* if $p(\alpha z) = \alpha^d p(z)$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Given a non-negative function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we say f is a completely log-concave set function if the generating polynomial of f , i.e.,

$$p_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} f(S) \cdot \prod_{i \in S} z_i$$

is completely log-concave. Note that p_f is a multiaffine polynomial. We define $\deg(f)$ to be the degree of polynomial p_f .

Completely log-concave polynomials have nice properties that make them useful tools for design and analysis of algorithms and studying mathematical objects like matroids. One of these

*Research supported in part by NFS grants CCF-1813135.

[†]shayan@cs.washington.edu. Research supported by Air Force Office of Scientific Research grant FA9550-20-1-0212, NSF grants CCF-1552097, CCF-1907845, ONR YIP grant N00014-17-1-2429, and a Sloan fellowship.

properties is that, as first shown in [Gur10], if the polynomial $\sum_{i=0}^n c_i y^{n-i} x^i$ is completely log-concave, then c_0, \dots, c_n is an ultra log-concave sequence. This property is used in [Ana+18b] to prove Mason's ultra log-concavity conjecture for independent sets of matroids. Another useful property is that, as first shown in [Ana+18a] and later improved in [CGM19; Ana+21a], given a d -homogeneous log-concave set function, a natural random walk can be used to rapidly sample a subset S of the ground set with probability proportional to $f(S)$. Note that any homogeneous log-concave set function, or equivalently any multiaffine homogeneous polynomial, is completely log-concave [Ana+18b].

An interesting aspect of homogeneous completely log-concave polynomials is that the family of sets that can serve as the support of these polynomials can be nicely characterized. Given a polynomial $p = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} c_\alpha z^\alpha$, the Newton polytope of p is defined as

$$\text{supp}(p) = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : c_\alpha \neq 0\}, \quad \text{Newt}(p) = \text{conv}(\text{supp}(p)).$$

The following theorem gives a nice characterization of the supports of homogeneous completely log-concave polynomials.

Theorem 1.1 ([Ana+18b; BH20]). *Given a homogeneous completely log-concave polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$, the Newton polytope of p is a generalized permutahedron, namely it is a polytope all of whose edges are parallel to $\mathbf{1}_i - \mathbf{1}_j$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and every integer point in this polytope also belongs to the $\text{supp}(p)$. Conversely, for any generalized permutahedron, there is a homogeneous completely log-concave polynomial with support equal to all integer points in the polytope.*

An immediate consequence of the above theorem is that if p is homogeneous multiaffine and log-concave then $\text{Newt}(p)$ is the base polytope of a matroid M with ground set of elements $[n]$ (see [Gel+87]). Having the above theorem that characterizes supports of homogeneous log-concave polynomials, a natural question is whether one can give a more fine characterization of the set of possible coefficients of homogeneous log-concave polynomials. While such characterizations are not known, there are a number of results that give interesting necessary conditions for coefficients of log-concave polynomials. One such condition is implied by the following lemma.

Lemma 1.2 ([Ana+18b]). *A polynomial $h(y, z) = a + by + cz + dyz \in \mathbb{R}[y, z]$ with non-negative coefficients is log-concave if and only if $2bc \geq ad$.*

Corollary 1.3 ([BH20]). *If p_f is log-concave for a non-negative set function $f \in 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, then f is almost log-submodular, i.e. for any $S \subset [n]$ and $i, j \in [n] \setminus S$,*

$$2f(S \cup \{i\})f(S \cup \{j\}) \geq f(S)f(S \cup \{i, j\}).$$

Proof. To see this, note that the set of multiaffine log concave polynomials is closed under differentiation and specialization (see Proposition 2.4). In particular, the following polynomial is log-concave:

$$\begin{aligned} q(z_i, z_j) &= \left(\prod_{k \in S} \partial_{z_k} \right) p_f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \Big|_{\{z_\ell = 0\}_{\ell \in [n] \setminus (S \cup \{i, j\})}} \\ &= f(S) + f(S \cup \{i\})z_i + f(S \cup \{j\})z_j + f(S \cup \{i, j\})z_i z_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 1.2, f is almost submodular. □

Given a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$, we define the homogenization of p as $\text{Hom}(p, y) := \sum_{i=0}^n y^{n+1-i} p_i$, where p_i is the i -homogeneous part of p , i.e. $p = p_0 + \dots + p_n$ and p_i is a i -homogeneous polynomial. Then, [Corollary 1.3](#) implies that given a non-negative set function $f \in 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, if $\text{Hom}(p_f, y)$ is completely log-concave, then f is almost log-submodular. Thus, to take a step toward finding a classification of coefficients of homogeneous completely log-concave polynomials, a natural question to ask is whether one can find a large subclass of non-negative almost log-submodular functions such that for every f in that subclass, $\text{Hom}(p_f, y)$ is completely log-concave. Note that if $\text{Hom}(p_f, y)$ is completely log-concave, then all homogeneous parts of p_f are also log-concave. An important subclass of non-negative log-submodular functions with numerous applications is the class of non-negative monotone submodular functions (see [Fact 2.9](#)). Note that, however, even within this subclass, one can find functions that are not log-concave, and thus their homogenizations are not log-concave either (see [Corollary 7.2](#) for an example).

Our Contribution. In this paper, we introduce an expressive subclass of non-negative monotone functions, called strongly 2-coverage functions, and prove that $\text{Hom}(p_f, y)$ is completely log-concave. We show that the set of strongly 2-coverage functions includes several fundamental classes of non-negative monotone submodular functions including matroid rank functions, coverage functions, and, more generally, matroid rank sum functions, which are positive linear combination of rank functions and include a large subset of submodular functions that have been studied in the mechanism design literature [[Cal+07](#); [DRY11](#); [Dug11](#); [DV11](#)]. As a consequence we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. *If $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a coverage function or a sum of matroid rank functions, then the sequence f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n is ultra log-concave where $f_i = \sum_{S: |S|=i} f(S)$.*

Moreover, we introduce a strictly larger class of non-negative submodular functions called 2-coverage functions, which, for instance, also include the indicator function of independent sets of any matroid. We prove that if p_f is 2-coverage, all homogeneous parts of p_f are log-concave. As a consequence, given a 2-coverage function, one can use the results of [[Ana+18a](#); [Ana+21b](#); [CGM19](#)] to rapidly sample a subset S of $[n]$ with probability proportional to $f(S)$.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, we assume that for any set function $f^{[n]} : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that we work with, we have $f(\emptyset) = 0$. We write $[n]$ to denote $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For a function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an integer $0 \leq d \leq n$ define the d -homogeneous restriction of f , $f^{(d)} : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$f^{(d)}(S) = \begin{cases} f(S) & \text{if } |S| = d, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Fact 2.1. *For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $-2xy \leq cx^2 + \frac{1}{c}y^2$.*

2.1 Linear Algebra

We write J_n to denote the $n \times n$ all-ones matrix. For any integer $n > 0$ and indices i, j , define $E_{n,ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as $E_{n,ij}(i, j) = 1$ and let every other entry to be zero. We drop the subscript n when the dimension is clear from context.




Figure 1: Summary of results

Lemma 2.2. For any diagonal matrix $D \succeq 0$, $JD + DJ$ has at most one positive eigenvalue.

Proof. We can write

$$JD + DJ = (D + I)J(D + I) - DJD - J.$$

Now, the statement follows from the fact that $(D + I)J(D + I)$, J , and DJD are all rank-one PSD matrices. \square

Lemma 2.3 ([Ana+19]). Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a symmetric matrix. For any $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, if A has at most one positive eigenvalue, PAP^\top has at most one positive eigenvalue.

2.2 Log Concave Polynomials

Proposition 2.4 ([BH20]; [Ana+18b]). Given a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$

- i If p is (completely) log-concave, then $p|_{z_i=a}$ is also (completely) log-concave for any $a \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$.
- ii If p is (completely) log-concave, any $c, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $cp(\lambda_1 z_1, \dots, \lambda_n z_n)$ is also (completely) log-concave.
- iii If p is completely log-concave, then $\partial_{z_i} p$ is also completely log-concave for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. Moreover, if p is multiaffine and log-concave, then $\partial_{z_i} p$ is also log-concave for any $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Proof. **Item i** and **Item ii** follow from definition. The first part of **Item iii** also follows from the definition of log-concavity. We prove the second part without loss of generality for $\partial_{z_1} p$. Let

$q_t(z_1, \dots, z_n) = t^{-1}(tz_1, \dots, z_n)$. By **Item ii**, q_t is log-concave for any $t \geq 0$. Note that since p is multiaffine, we can write $p = z_1g + h$, where $g, h \in \mathbb{R}[z_2, \dots, z_n]$, and hence $\partial_{z_1}p = g$. Assume that g is not log-concave. Therefore, for some $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $g(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) > g(a)^\lambda + g(b)^{1-\lambda}$. Note that $q_t = z_1g + t^{-1}h$. So for sufficiently large $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $q_t(\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b) > \lambda q_t(a) + (1 - \lambda)q_t(b)$, which is a contradiction with the fact that q_t is log-concave. \square

For d -homogeneous polynomials, the following lemma gives an equivalent condition to log-concavity that in many cases is much easier to verify.

Lemma 2.5 ([AOV18]). *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a d -homogeneous polynomial for some integer $d \geq 0$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $p(a) \neq 0$, p is log-concave at a if and only if, $\nabla^2 p(a)$ has at most one positive eigenvalue.*

A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is *decomposable* if it can be written as a sum of two nonzero polynomials f and g such that f and g are supported on disjoint sets of variables. We say p is *indecomposable* otherwise. For a vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ and a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$, define $\partial^\alpha p \in \mathbb{R}[\{z_i\}_{i \notin \tau}]$ as

$$\partial^\alpha p := \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \partial_{z_i}^{\alpha_i} \right) p.$$

When $p \in \mathbb{R}[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ is a multiaffine polynomial, we might represent partial derivatives by subsets $\tau \subseteq [n]$, i.e. $\partial^\tau p := (\prod_{i \in \tau} \partial_{z_i}) p$. In this case, we sometimes write p_τ to denote $\partial^\tau p$. The following theorem by [Ana+18b], provides a very useful tool for proving a d -homogeneous polynomial is completely log-concave.

Theorem 2.6 ([Ana+18b]). *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a d -homogeneous polynomial. Then, p is completely log-concave if*

- i) *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, of size $\|\alpha\|_1 \leq d - 2$, $\partial^\alpha p$ is indecomposable.*
- ii) *For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, of size $\|\alpha\|_1 = d - 2$, the quadratic polynomial $\partial^\alpha p$ is log-concave.*

The following proposition is a slight modification of a statement by Gurvits [Gur10]. For completeness, we include a short proof for this slightly modified version.

Proposition 2.7. *If $p = \sum_{k=0}^n c_k y^{n-k+1} z^k \in \mathbb{R}[y, z]$ is completely log-concave, then the sequence c_0, \dots, c_n satisfies the following: for any $1 < k < n$,*

$$\left(\frac{c_k}{\binom{n+1}{k}} \right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\binom{n+1}{k-1}} \right) \left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{\binom{n+1}{k+1}} \right).$$

We call such sequences *ultra log-concave*.

Proof. Fix $1 < k < n$. Define $q(y, z) := \partial_y^{n-k} \partial_z^{k-1} p$. Using the fact that $\partial_y^{n+1-m} \partial_z^m p = (n+1-m)! m! c_m = (n+1)! \frac{c_m}{\binom{n+1}{m}}$ for any $0 \leq m \leq n+1$, we compute $\nabla^2 q$ as follows

$$\nabla^2 q = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_y^2 q & \partial_y \partial_z q \\ \partial_y \partial_z q & \partial_z^2 q \end{bmatrix} = (n+1)! \begin{bmatrix} \frac{c_{k-1}}{\binom{n+1}{k-1}} & \frac{c_k}{\binom{n+1}{k}} \\ \frac{c_k}{\binom{n+1}{k-1}} & \frac{c_{k+1}}{\binom{n+1}{k+1}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since p is completely log-concave, by [Proposition 2.4](#), q is log-concave. By [Lemma 2.5](#), the 2×2 matrix $\nabla^2 q$ has at most one positive eigenvalue. Since all entries of $\nabla^2 q$ are positive, the matrix has exactly one positive eigenvalue (and one negative eigenvalue), therefore its determinant is non-positive. Therefore, we have

$$\left(\frac{c_k}{\binom{n+1}{k}}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\binom{n+1}{k-1}}\right)\left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{\binom{n+1}{k+1}}\right) \leq 0,$$

as desired. \square

Note that, our definition of ultra log-concavity is slightly different from the more common definition which says that a sequence c_0, \dots, c_n is ultra log-concave if it satisfies $\left(\frac{c_k}{\binom{n}{k}}\right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\binom{n}{k-1}}\right)\left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{\binom{n}{k+1}}\right)$.

For any set function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\tau \subseteq [n]$, define f_τ as the (non-negative) function with generating polynomial $(p_f)_\tau$, where p_f is the generating polynomial of f . We say f is d -homogeneous (resp. indecomposable) if p_f is d -homogeneous (resp. indecomposable).

2.3 Random Walks and Completely Log-Concave Set Functions

The mixing of a Markov chain quantifies the rate of its convergence to its stationarity distribution μ . Given the transition probability matrix P of a random walk on the state space Ω , we define the mixing time as follows. For an initial state $S_0 \in \Omega$ in and an error parameter $\epsilon > 0$, define

$$t_{\text{mix}}(P, S_0, \epsilon) := \min\{t \geq 0 : \|P^t(S_0, \cdot) - \pi\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \epsilon\},$$

where $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{S \in \Omega} |\mu(S) - \nu(S)|$ gives the total variation distance between two distributions μ, ν on Ω . Now, we define the down-up walk on the support of a measure $\mu : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as follows. The state space of the walk is all $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $|S| = d$ and $\mu(S) \neq 0$. At each step of the walk, we drop an element $i \in S$ uniformly at random, then we go to $j \notin S \setminus \{i\}$ with probability $\frac{\mu(S \setminus \{i\} \cup \{j\})}{\sum_{k \notin S \setminus \{i\}} \mu(S \setminus \{i\} \cup \{k\})}$. Note that this markov chain is reversible and its stationary distribution is μ , i.e. $\mu(S)P(S, T) = \mu(T)P(T, S)$, where P is the transition probability matrix of the down-up walk. It was first shown by [\[Ana+18a\]](#) that if $\mu : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is log-concave, then the down-up walk mixes rapidly. Later, tighter mixing time results were shown by [\[CGM19; Ana+21a\]](#).

Theorem 2.8. [\[Ana+21a\]](#) *Let $\mu : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a log-concave d -homogeneous set function. Then, starting at any state S_0 , the mixing time of the down-up walk on the support of this polynomial is*

$$t_{\text{mix}}(P, S_0, \epsilon) \leq O(d \log(d/\epsilon)).$$

2.4 Submodular Functions

A function $2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *submodular* if it has the diminishing return property, i.e.

$$\forall S \subseteq T \subseteq [n], i \in [n] : f(S \cup \{i\}) - f(S) \geq f(T \cup \{i\}) - f(T).$$

Such a function is *monotone* if $f(A) \leq f(B)$ for all $A \subseteq B$.

Fact 2.9. Any non-negative monotone submodular function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is log-submodular, i.e. $\log f$ is submodular.

Proof. Fix set $S \subseteq T \subseteq [n]$. It is enough to show that

$$\log \frac{f(S \cup \{i\})}{f(S)} = \log f(S \cup \{i\}) - \log f(S) \geq \log f(T \cup \{i\}) - \log f(T) = \log \frac{f(T \cup \{i\})}{f(T)}.$$

But one can easily verify that the diminishing return property combined with the fact that f is non-negative and monotone implies $\frac{f(S \cup \{i\})}{f(S)} \geq \frac{f(T \cup \{i\})}{f(T)}$. Since \log is an increasing function, this finishes the proof. \square

A fundamental class of non-negative monotone submodular functions are coverage functions.

Definition 2.10 (Coverage Functions). Given a finite universe U and sets $A_1, \dots, A_n \subseteq U$ and a measure w on U , we define $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to be

$$\forall T \subseteq [n] : f(T) = w \left(\bigcup_{i \in T} A_i \right).$$

Linear set functions are a subclass of coverage functions.

Definition 2.11 (Linear Set Functions). $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a linear function if

$$\forall T \subseteq [n] : f(T) = \sum_{i \in T} f(\{i\}).$$

We will use the following proposition which characterizes coverage set functions.

Proposition 2.12. [CH12] A function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a coverage function if and only if there exists a non-negative real number x_T for any $T \subseteq [n]$, such that for any $S \subseteq [n]$ we can write $f(S) = \sum_{T: T \cap S \neq \emptyset} x_T$.

Many interesting classes of nonnegative monotone submodular functions are special cases of coverage functions. For example, given a set of random variables $\Omega = \{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$, the joint entropy function defines a coverage function on $2^{[n]}$.

Proposition 2.13. Given random variables $\Omega = \{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$, let $H : 2^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the joint entropy function of these variables. Define $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as $f(S) = H(Y_S)$ for any $S \subseteq [n]$, where $Y_S := \{Y_i | i \in S\}$. Then, f is a coverage function.

A proof of this proposition can be found in [Appendix A](#)

Coverage functions are themselves special cases of matroid rank functions, as any coverage function can be written as a weighted sum of rank 1 matroids each corresponding to the coverage of an individual element.

Fact 2.14. Any coverage function can be written as positive sum of matroid rank functions.

3 Main Contributions

We define the following classes of set functions.

Definition 3.1 (2-Coverage Set Functions). *A set function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is 2-coverage with respect to an integer $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$ if the following conditions holds.*

- (i) *For any $\tau \subseteq [n]$ with $|\tau| \leq d - 2$, $(f^{(d)})_\tau$ is indecomposable.*
- (ii) *For all $\tau \subseteq [n]$ with $|\tau| = d - 2$, there exists $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau^1$, a coverage function $g : 2^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and a linear set function $\ell : 2^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (that are possibly dependent on τ), such that*
 - $\ell(\{i\}) \leq g(\{i\})$ for all $i \in S$
 - For any $T \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau$ of size $|T| = 2$,

$$f_\tau(T) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T \not\subseteq S, \\ g(T) - \frac{1}{2}\ell(T), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We say $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is 2-coverage if it is 2-coverage with respect to any $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$.

Definition 3.2 (Strongly 2-Coverage Set Functions). *A set function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is strongly 2-coverage if the following holds. For all $\tau \subseteq [n]$ such that $0 \leq |\tau| \leq n - 2$, there exists a coverage function $g : 2^{[n] \setminus \tau} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $(f_\tau)^{(1)} = g^{(1)} + f(\tau)$, and $(f_\tau)^{(2)} = g^{(2)} + f(\tau)$.*

The following propositions capture basic properties of these classes of set functions. A proof of these lemmas are included in section [Section 4](#).

Proposition 3.3. *Let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be strongly 2-coverage, then f is monotone and submodular.*

Proposition 3.4. *Any strongly 2-coverage function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is 2-coverage.*

Proposition 3.5. *The set of strongly 2-coverage functions on $[n]$ is a convex cone, i.e., if $f_1, f_2 : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are strongly 2-coverage set functions, then for any $\alpha \geq 0$, αf_1 and $f_1 + f_2$ are strongly 2-coverage functions.*

The following proposition provides some examples of strongly 2-coverage and 2-coverage functions. A proof of this proposition is included in section [Section 4](#).

Proposition 3.6. (i) *For any matroid $M = ([n], I)$, its rank function $\text{rk}_M : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a strongly 2-coverage set function.*

- (ii) *For any matroid $M = ([n], I)$, the indicator function of its independent sets is 2-coverage. Combined with [Theorem 3.7](#), this gives another proof for the complete log-concavity of bases generating polynomial of a matroid that is proved in [\[AOV18\]](#).*

A consequence of [Proposition 3.6](#) and [Proposition 3.5](#) is that matroid rank sum functions are strongly 2-coverage. Therefore, by [Fact 2.14](#) and [Proposition 2.13](#), the joint entropy functions and coverage functions are strongly 2-coverage.

One of our main results is the following theorem. A proof of this theorem is included in [Section 5](#).

¹Intuitively S corresponds to the non-loop elements of the "contracted" version of f .

Theorem 3.7. *If $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is 2-coverage with respect to some $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$, then $f^{(d)}$ is completely log-concave.*

One of the consequences of [Theorem 3.7](#) is that for any $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that is 2-coverage with respect to some $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$, one can sample a set $S \subseteq [n]$ of size d proportionate to $f(S)$ in polynomial time.

Corollary 3.8. *Given a set function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that is 2-coverage with respect to some $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$, let μ_d be the distribution induced by $f^{(d)}$, i.e. $\mu_d(S) = \frac{f(S)}{\sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=d} f(S)}$, for any set S of size d . For any $\epsilon > 0$, starting from an arbitrary set S_0 , the up-down walk P on sets of size d generates a sample from $\hat{\mu}_d$ such that $\|\hat{\mu}_d - \mu_d\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \epsilon$ in time $O(d \log(d/\epsilon))$, i.e.,*

$$t_{\text{mix}}(P, S_0, \epsilon) \leq O(d \log(d/\epsilon)).$$

The following theorem is our other main result. This theorem is proved in [Section 6](#).

Theorem 3.9. *Let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ be a strongly 2-coverage set function. Then, the polynomial $q_f(y, x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{i=0}^n y^{n+1-i} \sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=i} f(S) x^S$ is completely log-concave.*

The following corollary simply follows by an application of [Proposition 2.7](#).

Corollary 3.10. *Let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ be a strongly 2-coverage set function. Let c_k be the k -th coefficient of $p_f(y, x) = \sum_{i=0}^n (\sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=i} f(S)) y^{n+1-i} x^i$. Then, for $1 < k < n$, we get*

$$\left(\frac{c_k}{\binom{n+1}{k}} \right)^2 \geq \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\binom{n+1}{k-1}} \right) \left(\frac{c_{k+1}}{\binom{n+1}{k+1}} \right)$$

4 Basic Properties of 2-Coverage and Strongly 2-Coverage Functions

Proof of [Proposition 3.3](#). Fix $A \subseteq [n]$. We show that for any $B \supseteq A$, $f(A) \leq f(B)$ and for all $i \in [n]$, $f(A \cup \{i\}) - f(A) \geq f(B \cup \{i\}) - f(B)$. We prove by induction on $|B \setminus A|$. The claims trivially hold for $|B \setminus A| = 0$. Now, let $|B \setminus A| = \ell$ for some $1 \leq \ell \leq n - |A|$. Take some $j \in B \setminus A$ and let $C := B \setminus \{j\}$. By induction hypothesis, $f(A) \leq f(C)$. Furthermore, by definition there a coverage function $g : 2^{[n] \setminus C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $f(B) = f_C(\{j\}) = g(\{j\}) + f(C)$. Therefore, $f(A) \leq f(C) \leq f(B)$. To prove the submodularity condition, note that by induction hypothesis, we have $f(A \cup \{i\}) - f(A) \geq f(C \cup \{i\}) - f(C)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, by submodularity of g , we have

$$f(C \cup \{i\}) - f(C) = g(\{i\}) \geq g(\{j, i\}) - g(\{j\}) = f(C \cup \{i, j\}) - f(C \cup \{j\}) = f(B \cup \{i\}) - f(B).$$

Therefore, $f(A \cup \{i\}) - f(A) \geq f(B \cup \{i\}) - f(B)$ as desired. \square

Proof of [Proposition 3.4](#). It is enough to show that given for any $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$, and any $\tau \subseteq [n]$ with $|\tau| \leq d - 2$, $(f^{(d)})_{\tau}$ is indecomposable. If $(f^{(d)})_{\tau} = 0$ this claim follows trivially. Assume $(f^{(d)})_{\tau} \neq 0$ and let $p := p_{f^{(d)}}$ be the generating polynomial of $f^{(d)}$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that $p_{\tau} = h + g$ such that h, g are both non-zero. Let h and g be respectively supported

on disjoint set of variables S_h and S_g . By [Proposition 3.3](#), we know that f is monotone. Therefore, for any $x_i \in S_h, x_j \in S_g$, we must have

$$f(\tau \cup \{i\}) \leq f(\tau \cup \{i, j\}) = f_\tau(\{i, j\}) = 0.$$

This implies that $f_\tau(\{i\}) = f(\tau \cup \{i\}) = 0$. Similarly, $f_\tau(\{j\}) = 0$. Therefore, f_τ is 0 on all sets of size 1. By monotonicity of f , we get $f_\tau = 0$ which contradicts our assumption. \square

Proof of [Proposition 3.5](#). Fix a $\tau \in [n]$ such that $0 \leq |\tau| \leq n - 2$. Let $g_1, g_2 : 2^{[n] \setminus \tau} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be coverage functions such that $((f_1)_\tau)^{(2)} = (g_1)^{(2)}$ and $((f_2)_\tau)^{(2)} = (g_2)^{(2)}$. The statement follows from the fact that if g_1, g_2 are coverage functions, then αg and $g_1 + g_2$ are also coverage functions. \square

Proof of [Proposition 3.6](#). We prove [Item \(i\)](#). Let $f := \text{rk}_M$. For any $\tau \subseteq [n]$ with $|\tau| \leq n - 2$, $f_\tau(S) = \text{rk}_M(\tau) + \text{rk}_{M/\tau}(S)$ for all sets $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau$ of size 1 or 2. Note that $f(\tau) = \text{rk}_M(\tau)$. To satisfy the condition of [Definition 3.2](#), it is enough to show that there is a coverage function g that takes the same values as $\text{rk}_{M/\tau}(S)$ on sets of size 1 and 2. Using matroid partition property, M/τ can be partitioned into sets S_0, \dots, S_k such that the following holds.

$$\text{rk}_{M/\tau}(\{x, y\}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x, y \in S_0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in S_0, y \in S_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ 1 & \text{if } x, y \in S_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ 2 & \text{if } x \in S_i, y \in S_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq i < j \leq k \end{cases}$$

Define g as follows. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $x \in S_i$, let $A_x := \{i\}$, and for any $x \in S_0$, let $A_x = \emptyset$. For any $T \in [n] \setminus \tau$, define $g(T) := |\cup_{x \in T} A_x|$. One can easily check that $(f_\tau)^{(1)} = g^{(1)} + f(\tau)$, and $(f_\tau)^{(2)} = g^{(2)} + f(\tau)$.

Now, we prove [Item \(ii\)](#). Let $M = ([n], I)$ be a matroid of rank r and let $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an indicator function of independent sets, i.e. $f(S) = \mathbf{1}_I(S)$. We want to show that f is 2-coverage. The indecomposability holds because of the exchange property of matroids. We verify the second condition. Fix $2 \leq d \leq r$ and $\tau \subseteq [n]$ with $|\tau| = d - 2$. Let S be the set of non-loop elements of M/τ . Using the matroid partition property, S can be partitioned into sets S_1, \dots, S_k such that

$$(f_\tau)^{(2)}(\{x, y\}) = \begin{cases} 0 & x, y \in S_i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq k \\ 1 & x \in S_i, y \in S_j \text{ for some } 1 \leq i < j \leq k \end{cases}$$

For any $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $x \in S_i$, let $A_x := \{i\}$. Define the coverage function $g : 2^S \rightarrow [n]$ as $g(T) = |\cup_{x \in T} A_x|$ for every $T \subseteq S$. Furthermore, consider the linear set function $\ell : 2^S \rightarrow [n]$ given by $\ell(\{i\}) = 1$ for all $i \in S$. It is easy to check that $f_\tau(T) = g(T) - \frac{\ell}{2}(T)$, for any $T \subseteq S$ of size 2. \square

5 Complete Log-Concavity of Homogeneous Parts

In this section, we prove that if a set function f is 2-coverage with respect to some $2 \leq d \leq \deg(f)$, then $f^{(d)}$ is log-concave.

Lemma 5.1. Let $g : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a coverage function and D be a diagonal matrix with $D(i, i) = g(\{i\})$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then, $R := (DJ + JD) - \nabla^2 p_{g^{(2)}} \succeq D$, where $p_{g^{(2)}}$ is the generating polynomial of $g^{(2)}$.

Proof. By [Proposition 2.12](#), there exists non-negative $\{x_T\}_{T \subseteq [m]}$ such that for any $i \neq j \in [n]$

$$\begin{aligned} g(\{i, j\}) &= \sum_{T: T \cap \{i, j\} \neq \emptyset} x_T = \sum_{T: i \in T} x_T + \sum_{T: j \in T} x_T - \sum_{T: i, j \in T} x_T \\ &= g(\{i\}) + g(\{j\}) - \sum_{T: i, j \in T} x_T. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for all $i \neq j \in [n]$, $(DJ + JD)(i, j) = g(\{i\}) + g(\{j\})$. Therefore, we can write R as

$$R(i, j) = \begin{cases} 2g(\{i\}) & \text{if } i = j \\ \sum_{T: i, j \in T} x_T & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, for any $T \subseteq [m]$ define matrix B_T as $B_T(i, j) = 1$ if $\{i, j\} \subseteq T$ and 0 otherwise. We can rewrite R as follows

$$R = \sum_{T \subseteq [m]} x_T B_T + D.$$

For any T , $B_T \succeq 0$. Therefore, since $x_T \geq 0$, we have $\sum_{T \subseteq [m]} x_T B_T \succeq 0$. This implies that $R \succeq D$, as desired. \square

Proof of [Theorem 3.7](#). Let $p := p_{f^{(d)}}$ be the generating polynomial of $f^{(d)}$. We use [Theorem 2.6](#) to prove the theorem. Note that the indecomposability condition holds by definition. Now, we use [Lemma 2.5](#) to prove that the second condition of [Theorem 2.6](#) holds. Fix $\tau = \{i_1, \dots, i_{d-2}\}$. We want to show that p_τ is log-concave. If p_τ is identically zero, the condition trivially holds. So, assume that $p_\tau \neq 0$. By [Lemma 2.5](#), it is enough to show that $\nabla^2(p_\tau)$ has at most one positive eigenvalue. By definition, there is a set $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau$, a coverage function $g : 2^{[S]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and a linear set function $\ell : 2^S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for any $T \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau$ of size 2, $f_\tau(T) = g(T) - \frac{\ell(T)}{2}$ if $T \subseteq S$, and $f_\tau(T) = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, it is enough to show that $Q = \nabla^2 p_{g^{(2)}} - \nabla^2 p_{\frac{\ell^{(2)}}{2}}$ has at most one positive eigenvalue, where Q is the principle minor of $\nabla^2(p_\tau)$ obtained by restricting it to the rows and columns indexed by S . We can write, $Q = \nabla^2 p_{g^{(2)}} - (\frac{JC + CJ}{2} - C)$ where C is a diagonal matrix with $C(i, i) = \ell(\{i\})$. Furthermore, let D be a diagonal matrix with $D(i, i) = g(\{i\})$ for all $i \in S$. Note that by [Lemma 5.1](#), we can write $p_{g^{(2)}} + D \preceq DJ + JD$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2(p_\tau) &= \nabla^2 p_{g^{(2)}} + C - \frac{JC + CJ}{2} \preceq \nabla^2 p_{g^{(2)}} + D - \frac{JC + CJ}{2} \\ &\preceq DJ + JD - \frac{JC + CJ}{2} = (D - \frac{C}{2})J + J(D - \frac{C}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by [Lemma 2.2](#), $\nabla^2(p_\tau)$ has at most one positive eigenvalue. \square

6 Complete Log-Concavity of the Homogenization of the Generating Polynomial of Strongly 2-Coverage Functions

Proof of [Theorem 3.9](#). We use [Theorem 2.6](#). First, we show that q_f is indecomposable. We want to show that for any $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, $0 \leq \ell \leq n - 1 - k$ and any $\tau = \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\}$, $\partial^\tau \partial_y^k q_f(y, x)$ is

indecomposable (assuming it is non-zero). Note that, for some polynomial $g(y, x)$, we can write $\partial^\tau \partial_y^k q_f(y, x) = yg(y, x) + \partial^\tau p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}(x)$, where $p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}$ is the generating polynomial of $f^{(n-k+1)}$. Now, by [Proposition 3.4](#), $\partial^\tau p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}$ is indecomposable. Furthermore, $yg(y, x)$ is indecomposable since y appears in all of its monomials. It is enough to show that there exists a variable that appears in monomials of both $yg(y, x)$ and $\partial^\tau p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}$. If $\partial^\tau p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}$ is identically zero, we are done. Otherwise, since f_τ is monotone and submodular by [Proposition 3.3](#), there exists j such that $f_\tau(\{j\}) > 0$. Therefore, $x_j y^{n-\ell-k}$ is a monomial in $yg(y, x)$. By monotonicity of f_τ , for any set $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau$ of size $n - k - \ell + 1$ such that $j \in S$, x^S is a monomial in $\partial^\tau p_{f^{(n-k+1)}}$. This finishes the proof of indecomposability. Now, we prove that the second condition of [Theorem 2.6](#) holds. It is enough to show that for any $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and $\tau = \{i_1 \dots, i_k\}$, $\partial^\tau \partial_y^{n-1-k} q_f(y, x)$ is log-concave.

Let $p = \frac{\partial^\tau \partial_y^{n-1-k} q_f(y, x)}{(n-1-k)!}$. We can write

$$p = \frac{(n-k+1)(n-k)}{2} f(\tau) y^2 + (n-k) \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \tau} f(\tau \cup \{i\}) y x_i + \sum_{\{i, j\} \subseteq [n] \setminus \tau} f(\tau \cup \{i, j\}) x_i x_j.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that p is supported on variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\} \cup \{y\}$ for $m := n - k$. We compute the Hessian matrix. In order to write the Hessian as a matrix indexed by $\{0, \dots, m\}$, we assume that y corresponds to 0 and for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, x_i corresponds to integer i . With this indexing, we can write the Hessian matrix as

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} (m+1)mf(\tau) & mf_\tau(\{1\}) & \dots & mf_\tau(\{m\}) \\ mf_\tau(\{1\}) & 0 & \dots & f_\tau(\{1, m\}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ mf_\tau(\{m\}) & f_\tau(\{m, 1\}) & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By [Lemma 2.5](#), it is enough to show that H has at most one positive eigenvalue. By [Lemma 2.3](#), this is equivalent to showing that the following matrix has at most one positive eigenvalue.

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{m+1}{m}f(\tau) & g(\{1\}) + f(\tau) & \dots & g(\{m\}) + f(\tau) \\ g(\{1\}) + f(\tau) & 0 & \dots & g(\{1, m\}) + f(\tau) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ g(\{m\}) + f(\tau) & g(\{m, 1\}) + f(\tau) & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & g(\{1\}) & \dots & g(\{m\}) \\ g(\{1\}) & 0 & \dots & g(\{1, m\}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ g(\{m\}) & g(\{m, 1\}) & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \frac{m+1}{m}f(\tau) & f(\tau) & \dots & f(\tau) \\ f(\tau) & 0 & \dots & f(\tau) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ f(\tau) & f(\tau) & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

where the coverage function g satisfies $f(S) = f(\tau) + g(S \setminus \tau)$ for sets S such that $|\tau| + 1 \leq |S| \leq |\tau| + 2$ and $\tau \subseteq S$. In the above line, let H, K denote the first and second matrix respectively. Let $D \in R^{(m+1) \times (m+1)}$ be a diagonal matrix such that $D(0, 0) = \frac{m+1}{2m}f(\tau)$ and $D(i, i) = \frac{m-1}{2m}f(\tau)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Let $D' \in R^{(m+1) \times (m+1)}$ be a diagonal matrix with $D'(0, 0) = 0$ and $D'(i, i) = g(\{i\})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Note that by [Lemma 2.2](#), $(D + D')J + J(D + D')$ has exactly one positive eigenvalue. Therefore, to show that $H + K$ has at most one positive eigenvalue, it is enough to prove that $(D + D')J + J(D + D') - H - K \succeq 0$. Note that $D'J + JD' - H \succeq 0$. To see this, first note that the

first row and column of $D'J + JD' - H$ are zero. Furthermore, one can check that after eliminating the first row and column of K , the remaining matrix is equal to the Hessian of the generating polynomial of $g^{(2)}$. Thus, the claim follows from [Lemma 5.1](#). Therefore, it is enough to show that $DJ + JD - K \succeq 0$. Again, it is easy to check that the first row and column of $DJ + JD - K$ are zero. After removing the first row and column of $DJ + JD - K$, the remaining matrix is equal to $f(\tau)(I_m - \frac{1}{m}J_m)$. Now, note that $J_m \preceq mI_m$, as m is the the largest eigenvalue of J_m . Therefore, $DJ + JD - K \succeq 0$, as desired. \square

7 Negative Results

We showed that for an expressive class of nonnegative monotone submodular functions, the generating polynomial of d -homogenous restriction of the function is completely log-concave for any $d \geq 1$. We show that this claim does not hold for all nonnegative monotone submodular functions.

Proposition 7.1. *There exist integers $n \geq d \geq 1$ and a non-negative monotone submodular function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $f^{(d)}$ is not log-concave.*

Proof. Let $[12]$ be the ground set. Furthermore, define $w_0 = \dots = w_5 = 1$, $w_6 = \dots = w_9 = 2$, and $w_{10} = w_{11} = 0$. Now, take the following set function $f : 2^{[12]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be $f(S) = \min\{\sum_{i \in S} w_i, 2\}$. Note that this function is a budget additive function and is non-negative, monotone and submodular. But, one can verify that the polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{\{i,j\} \subseteq [12]} f(\{i,j\})x_i x_j$ is not log-concave as $\nabla^2 p(x)$ has two positive eigenvalues. \square

Corollary 7.2. *There exists monotone submodular function $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that f is not log-concave.*

Proof. This follows by the fact that if a function f is log-concave, all of its homogeneous parts are also log-concave. \square

Gelfand, Goresky, MacPherson, and Serganova proved that the support of any homogeneous multiaffine log-concave polynomial correspond to bases of a matroid [[Gel+87](#)]. But there is not much known about the coefficient of these polynomials. A natural question to ask is that if the coefficients come from a monotone submodular function that is non-negative on non-empty sets. Another natural question to consider is whether the coefficients of these polynomials come from 2-coverage functions. The following proposition provides a counter-example to both of these statements.

Proposition 7.3. *There exist integers $n \geq d \geq 1$ and a d -homogeneous multiaffine log-concave $p \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that for any $f : 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, if the generating polynomial of $f^{(d)}$ is equal to p , f is neither a monotone submodular function that is non-negative on non-empty sets nor a 2-coverage function.*

Proof. Let $p(x_1, x_2, x_3) := 3x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3$. We have

$$\nabla^2 p = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 1 \\ 3 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

One can easily check that $\nabla^2 p$ has exactly 1 positive eigenvalue. So, using [Lemma 2.5](#), p is log-concave. Take an arbitrary $f : 2^{[3]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the generating polynomial of $f^{(2)}$ is equal to p . To show the first part of the statement, we assume that f is a monotone function that is non-negative on non-empty sets, and show that f is not submodular. By monotonicity, we have $f(\{1,2,3\}) \geq f(\{1,2\})$. Therefore

$$f(\{1,2,3\}) - f(\{1,3\}) \geq f(\{1,2\}) - f(\{1,3\}) = 2.$$

Moreover, $f(\{2,3\}) - f(\{3\}) \leq f(\{2,3\}) \leq 1$. Therefore, f is not submodular.

To show the second part of the statement, assume for contradiction that f is a 2-coverage function. Since f is non-zero on all sets of size 2, we must have $S = \{1,2,3\}$ (for $\tau = \emptyset$). So, there exists a coverage function $g : 2^{[3]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a linear set function $\ell : 2^{[3]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $f^{(2)} = (g - \frac{\ell}{2})^{(2)}$ and that $\ell(\{i\}) \leq g(\{i\})$ for $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. We show that g is not submodular, so it cannot be a coverage function. Therefore

$$g(\{1,2\}) - g(\{1,3\}) = f(\{1,2\}) - f(\{1,3\}) + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) - \ell(\{3\})}{2} = 2 + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) - \ell(\{3\})}{2}.$$

This implies that $g(\{1,2,3\}) - g(\{1,3\}) \geq 2 + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) - \ell(\{3\})}{2}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\{2,3\}) - g(\{3\}) &= f(\{2,3\}) + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) + \ell(\{3\})}{2} - g(\{3\}) \\ &= 1 - g(\{3\}) + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) + \ell(\{3\})}{2} \leq_{\ell(\{3\}) \leq g(\{3\})} 1 + \frac{\ell(\{2\}) - \ell(\{3\})}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these, we get $g(\{1,2,3\}) - g(\{1,3\}) \geq g(\{2,3\}) - g(\{3\})$, which is a contradiction with submodularity of g . \square

References

- [Ana+18a] Nima Anari et al. “Log-Concave Polynomials II: High-Dimensional Walks and an FPRAS for Counting Bases of a Matroid”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01816* (2018).
- [Ana+18b] Nima Anari et al. “Log-Concave Polynomials III: Mason’s Ultra-Log-Concavity Conjecture for Independent Sets of Matroids”. 1811.01600. 2018.
- [Ana+19] Nima Anari et al. “Log-Concave Polynomials II: High-Dimensional Walks and an FPRAS for Counting Bases of a Matroid”. In: *STOC*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2019, pp. 1–12. ISBN: 9781450367059.
- [Ana+21a] Nima Anari et al. “Log-Concave Polynomials IV: Approximate Exchange, Tight Mixing Times, and near-Optimal Sampling of Forests”. In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 408–420. ISBN: 9781450380539.
- [Ana+21b] Nima Anari et al. “Log-concave polynomials IV: approximate exchange, tight mixing times, and near-optimal sampling of forests”. In: *STOC*. Ed. by Samir Khuller and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. ACM, 2021, pp. 408–420.

- [AOV18] Nima Anari, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Cynthia Vinzant. “Log-Concave Polynomials I: Entropy, and a Deterministic Approximation Algorithm for Counting Bases of Matroids”. In: *FOCS*. Ed. by Mikkel Thorup. IEEE Computer Society, 2018, pp. 35–46.
- [BH20] Petter Brändén and June Huh. “Lorentzian polynomials”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 192.3 (2020), pp. 821–891.
- [Cal+07] Gruia Calinescu et al. “Maximizing a Submodular Set Function Subject to a Matroid Constraint (Extended Abstract)”. In: *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*. Ed. by Matteo Fischetti and David P. Williamson. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 182–196. ISBN: 978-3-540-72792-7.
- [CGM19] Mary Cryan, Heng Guo, and Giorgos Mousa. “Modified log-Sobolev Inequalities for Strongly Log-Concave Distributions”. In: *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. 2019, pp. 1358–1370.
- [CH12] Deeparnab Chakrabarty and Zhiyi Huang. “Testing Coverage Functions”. In: *Automata, Languages, and Programming*. Ed. by Artur Czumaj et al. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012, pp. 170–181.
- [DRY11] Shaddin Dughmi, Tim Roughgarden, and Qiqi Yan. “From Convex Optimization to Randomized Mechanisms: Toward Optimal Combinatorial Auctions”. In: *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC ’11. San Jose, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, pp. 149–158. ISBN: 9781450306911.
- [Dug11] Shaddin Dughmi. “A Truthful Randomized Mechanism for Combinatorial Public Projects via Convex Optimization”. In: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*. EC ’11. San Jose, California, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2011, pp. 263–272. ISBN: 9781450302616.
- [DV11] Shaddin Dughmi and Jan Vondrák. “Limitations of Randomized Mechanisms for Combinatorial Auctions”. In: *2011 IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 2011, pp. 502–511.
- [Gel+87] I.M Gelfand et al. “Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and schubert cells”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 63.3 (1987), pp. 301–316. ISSN: 0001-8708.
- [Gur10] Leonid Gurvits. “On multivariate Newton-like inequalities”. In: *Advances in Combinatorial Mathematics*. Ed. by Ilias S. Kotsireas and Eugene V. Zima. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 61–78. ISBN: 978-3-642-03562-3.

A Entropy as a Coverage Function

Proof of Proposition 2.13. We use Proposition 2.12. For any $T \subseteq [n]$, define $x_T := I(Y_T|Y_{\bar{T}})$, where $Y_{\bar{T}} = [n] \setminus T$ and I is the multivariate mutual information. We prove inductively that $H(Y_S|Z) = \sum_{T:T \cap S \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T|Y_{\bar{T}}, Z)$ for an arbitrary set of random variables Z . This would imply that for any $S \subseteq [n]$, $f(S) = H(Y_S) = \sum_{T:T \cap S \neq \emptyset} x_T$, which would finish the proof. When $n = 1$, the statement trivially holds. Assuming the statement is true for $n = k - 1$, we prove it for $n = k$. First, let

$S = \{i\}$. We have

$$\sum_{T: T \cap S \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = \sum_{T: i \in T} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = \left(\sum_{T: i \in T, T \neq \{i\}} I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) - I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T} \cup \{i\}}, Z) \right) + H(Y_i | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z),$$

where we used the fact that for any set of random variables X_1, \dots, X_k , $k \geq 2$, and any set of random variables Z ,

$$I(X_1, \dots, X_k | Z) := I(X_1, \dots, X_{k-1} | Z) - I(X_1, \dots, X_{k-1} | X_k, Z).$$

Using induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{T: i \in T, T \neq \{i\}} I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) - I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T} \cup \{i\}}, Z) &= \sum_{T \subseteq [n] \setminus \{i\}: T \cap ([n] \setminus \{i\}) \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{[n] \setminus (T \cup \{i\})}, Z) - I(Y_T | Y_{[n] \setminus T} | Z) \\ &= H(Y_{[n] \setminus \{i\}} | Z) - H(Y_{[n] \setminus \{i\}} | Y_i, Z) \\ &= H(Y_{[n] \setminus \{i\}} | Z) - H(Y_{[n]} | Z) + H(Y_i | Z) \\ &= -H(Y_i | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) + H(Y_i | Z) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{T: T \cap S \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = H(Y_i | Z).$$

Now, assume that this equation holds for any S such that $|S| < l$. We want to show that it holds for $|S| = l$. Choose $i \in S$. We have

$$\sum_{T: T \cap S \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = \sum_{T: T \cap (S \setminus \{i\}) \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) + \sum_{T \cap S = \{i\}} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z).$$

Note that $\sum_{T: T \cap (S \setminus \{i\}) \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = H(Y_{S \setminus \{i\}} | Z)$ by the second induction hypothesis. Furthermore,

$$\sum_{T \cap S = \{i\}} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = \left(\sum_{T \cap S = \{i\}, T \neq \{i\}} I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) - I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T} \cup \{i\}}, Z) \right) + H(Y_i | Y_{\bar{T}}).$$

Similar to what we did before, using the first induction hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{T \cap S = \{i\}, T \neq \{i\}} I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) - I(Y_{T \setminus \{i\}} | Y_{\bar{T} \cup \{i\}}, Z) &= H(Y_{[n] \setminus S} | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z) - H(Y_{[n] \setminus S} | Y_S, Z) \\ &= H(Y_{[n] \setminus S} | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z) \\ &\quad - H(Y_{([n] \setminus S) \cup \{i\}} | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z) + H(Y_i | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z) \\ &= -H(Y_i | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) + H(Y_i | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{T \cap S = \{i\}} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = H(Y_i | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z).$$

So

$$\sum_{T: T \cap S \neq \emptyset} I(Y_T | Y_{\bar{T}}, Z) = H(Y_i | Y_{S \setminus \{i\}}, Z) + H(Y_{S \setminus \{i\}} | Z) = H(Y_S | Z),$$

as desired. \square