

On Sinkhorn’s Algorithm and Choice Modeling

Zhaonan Qu

Department of Economics, Stanford University, California, USA zhaonanq@stanford.edu

Alfred Galichon

Department of Mathematics and Department of Economics, New York University, New York, USA
Department of Economics, Sciences Po, Paris, France alfred.galichon@nyu.edu

Johan Ugander

Department of Management Science & Engineering, Stanford University, California, USA jugander@stanford.edu

For a broad class of choice and ranking models based on Luce’s choice axiom, including the Bradley–Terry–Luce and Plackett–Luce models, we show that the associated maximum likelihood estimation problems are equivalent to a classic matrix balancing problem with target row and column sums. This perspective opens doors between two seemingly unrelated research areas, and allows us to unify existing algorithms in the choice modeling literature as special instances or analogs of Sinkhorn’s celebrated algorithm for matrix balancing. We draw inspirations from these connections and resolve important open problems on the study of Sinkhorn’s algorithm. We first prove the global linear convergence of Sinkhorn’s algorithm for non-negative matrices whenever finite solutions to the matrix balancing problem exist. We characterize this global rate of convergence in terms of the algebraic connectivity of the bipartite graph constructed from data. Next, we also derive the sharp asymptotic rate of linear convergence, which generalizes a classic result of Knight (2008), but with a more explicit analysis that exploits an intrinsic orthogonality structure. To our knowledge, these are the first quantitative linear convergence results for Sinkhorn’s algorithm for general non-negative matrices and positive marginals. The connections we establish in this paper between matrix balancing and choice modeling could help motivate further transmission of ideas and interesting results in both directions.

Key words: Choice Modeling, Matrix Balancing, Sinkhorn’s Algorithm, Algebraic Connectivity

1. Introduction

The modeling of choice and ranking data is an important topic across many disciplines. Given a collection of m objects, a universal problem is to aggregate choice or partial ranking data over them to arrive at a reasonable description of either the behavior of decision makers, the intrinsic qualities of the objects, or both. Work on such problems dates back over a century at least to the work of Landau, who considered m chess players and a record of their match results against one another, aiming to aggregate the pairwise comparisons to arrive at a global ranking of all players (Landau 1895, Elo 1978). More generally, comparison data can result from choices from subsets

of *varying* sizes, from partial or complete rankings of objects, or from mixtures of different data types.

The modern rigorous study of comparisons primarily builds on the foundational works of Thurstone (1927) and Zermelo (1929). Both proposed models based on a numerical “score” for each item (e.g., chess player), but with different specifications of choice probabilities. Zermelo (1929) builds on the intuition that choice probability should be proportional to the score, and proposes an iterative algorithm to estimate the scores from pairwise comparison data. As one of the foundational works in this direction, Luce (1959) formalized the multinomial logit model of discrete choice starting from the axiom of *independence of irrelevant alternatives* (IIA). It states that the relative likelihood of choosing an item j over another item k is independent of the presence of other alternatives. In other words, if S and S' are two subsets of the m alternatives, both containing j and k , and $\Pr(j, S)$ denotes the probability of choosing item j from S , then for $\Pr(k, S) > 0$,

$$\frac{\Pr(j, S)}{\Pr(k, S)} = \frac{\Pr(j, S')}{\Pr(k, S')}.$$

This invariance property, together with a condition for zero probability alternatives, are often referred to as Luce’s choice axioms. They guarantee that each alternative can be summarized by a non-negative score s_j such that the probability of choice can be parameterized by

$$\Pr(j, S) = \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S} s_k}, \tag{1}$$

for any set S that contains j . The parameters s_j reflect the “intrinsic” value of item i , and are unique up to a normalization, which can be set to $\sum_j s_j = 1$. This choice model generalizes the Bradley–Terry–Luce model (BTL) for pairwise comparisons (Bradley and Terry 1952), and also applies to ranking data when each k -way ranking is broken down into $k - 1$ choice observations, where an item is chosen over the set of items ranked lower (Critchlow et al. 1991, Plackett 1975, Hausman and Ruud 1987). The many subsequent works that build on Luce’s choice axioms speak to its fundamental importance in choice modeling. Other works have also sought to address the limitations of Luce choice models. Prominent among them are probit models (Thurstone 1927, Berkson 1944), random utility (RUM) models (McFadden and Train 2000), context-dependent (CDM) models (Batsell and Polking 1985, Seshadri et al. 2020), and behavioral models from psychology (Tversky 1972).

Matrix balancing, meanwhile, is a seemingly unrelated mathematical problem. In its most common form (what we study in this paper), the problem seeks positive column and row scalings D^0, D^1 of a non-negative matrix A , such that the scaled matrix $D^0 A D^1$ has row and column sums equal to some prescribed positive marginals p, q (Sinkhorn 1967). Over the years,

numerous applications and problems across different domains, including statistics (Yule 1912, Deming and Stephan 1940), economics (Stone 1962, Galichon 2021), transportation and networks (Kruithof 1937, Lamond and Stewart 1981, Chang et al. 2021), optimization (Ruiz 2001), and machine learning (Cuturi 2013, Peyré et al. 2019), have found themselves essentially solving a new incarnation of the old matrix balancing problem, which attests to its universality and importance.

A major appeal of the matrix balancing problem lies in the simplicity and elegance of its popular solution method, Sinkhorn's algorithm. It simply alternates between updating the scalings to satisfy one of the two marginal conditions, leading to lightweight implementations that have proved extremely effective for practical problems. Despite this widespread use, the convergence behavior of Sinkhorn's algorithm has still not been fully understood. In particular, while there have been extensive studies of convergence, many assume that the matrix A is (entry-wise) strictly positive. In contrast, *quantitative* analyses for the case when A contains zeros entries are rare and fragmented, employing different assumptions whose connections and distinctions remain unclear. For example, the recent work of Léger (2021) establishes a *global* sub-linear $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ error bound, where t is the number of iterations, under minimal assumptions that guarantee convergence. On the other hand, for square matrix A and uniform marginals p, q , Knight (2008) shows that the convergence is *asymptotically* linear whenever finite scalings D^0, D^1 exist, i.e., errors $e^{(t)}$ satisfy $e^{(t+1)}/e^{(t)} \rightarrow \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. It has remained as important open problems to establish quantitative global geometric (linear) convergence with an $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^t)$ error bound, as well as sharp asymptotic bounds for Sinkhorn's algorithm that are applicable to general non-negative A and non-uniform p, q . Moreover, it remains to clarify the convergence behavior under different assumptions on the problem structure.

In this paper, we resolve several long-standing convergence questions. Surprisingly, the inspirations for our results come from connections to choice modeling and seemingly independent results in that domain. Our first contribution is in recognizing choice modeling *a la* Luce as yet *another* instance where a central problem reduces to that of matrix balancing. We clarify the equivalence between problem assumptions in each setting. Furthermore, we demonstrate that classic and new algorithms from the choice literature, including those of Zermelo (1929), Dykstra (1956), Ford (1957), Berry et al. (1995), Hunter (2004), Maystre and Grossglauser (2017), Agarwal et al. (2018), can be viewed as variants of or analogous to Sinkhorn's algorithm.

These intimate mathematical and algorithmic connections allow us to provide a unifying perspective on works from both areas. More importantly, they enable researchers to import insights and tools from one domain to the other. In particular, recent works on choice modeling (Shah et al. 2015, Seshadri et al. 2020, Vojnovic et al. 2020) have highlighted the importance of *algebraic connectivity* of data for estimation and computation, which motivates us to consider this measure in the analysis of Sinkhorn's algorithm.

Our next contribution is to obtain a global $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^t)$ linear convergence bound for Sinkhorn's algorithm, whenever the matrix balancing problem has a finite solution pair D^0, D^1 . Moreover, the convergence rate λ depends on the algebraic connectivity of a bipartite graph associated with A . This result complements the linear convergence result of Franklin and Lorenz (1989) for positive matrices, and the sub-linear bound of Léger (2021) for non-negative matrices under weaker conditions. In addition, we also characterize the asymptotic linear rate of convergence in terms of the solution matrix D^0AD^1 and target marginals p, q , directly generalizing the result of Knight (2008), but with a more explicit analysis that exploits an intrinsic orthogonality structure of Sinkhorn's algorithm. The convergence analyses and results developed in this paper apply irrespective of whether A is strictly positive or not, making them applicable to a wide array of settings. They also clarify the convergence behavior of Sinkhorn's algorithm under two regimes: when a finite scaling exists, Sinkhorn's algorithm always converges linearly; otherwise, it only converges sub-linearly under the minimum conditions required for convergence.

Our convergence results highlight the importance of algebraic connectivity and related spectral properties for the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm. At first glance, this dependence may seem unintuitive. However, once we interpret Sinkhorn's algorithm as a distributed optimization algorithm on a bipartite graph (Appendix B), it is less surprising that the convergence behavior is governed by the spectral properties of that graph.

The challenges of ill-defined matrix balancing problems and non-convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm in practice also motivate us to propose a regularized version of Sinkhorn's algorithm. It is inspired by the regularization of Luce choice models using Gamma priors, and is guaranteed to converge even when the necessary condition for the convergence of the standard algorithm does not hold. This regularized Sinkhorn's algorithm could be useful in practice, especially in applications with very sparse data.

We believe that the connections we establish in this paper between choice modeling and matrix balancing can lead to more interesting results in both directions, and are therefore relevant to researchers from both communities.

2. Related Work

This section includes an extensive review of related works in choice modeling and matrix balancing. Well-versed readers may skip ahead to the mathematical preliminaries (Section 3) and our core results (Sections 4 and 5).

2.1. Choice Modeling

Methods for aggregating choice and comparison data usually take one of two closely related approaches: maximum likelihood estimation of a statistical model or ranking according to the stationary distributions of a random walk on a Markov chain. Recent connections between maximum

likelihood and spectral methods have put these two classes of approaches in increasingly close conversation with each other.

Spectral Methods. The most well-known spectral method for rank aggregation is perhaps the PageRank algorithm (Page et al. 1999), which ranks web pages based on the stationary distribution of a random walk on a hyperlink graph. The use of stationary distributions also features in the work of Dwork et al. (2001), the Rank Centrality (RC) algorithm (Negahban et al. 2012, 2016), which generates consistent estimates for the Bradley–Terry–Luce pairwise comparison model under assumptions on the sampling frame, and the Luce Spectral Ranking (LSR) and iterative LSR (I-LSR) algorithms of Maystre and Grossglauser (2015) for choices from pairs as well as larger sets. Following that work, Agarwal et al. (2018) proposed the Accelerated Spectral Ranking (ASR) algorithm with provably faster mixing times than RC and LSR, and better sample complexity bounds than Negahban et al. (2016). Knight (2008) is an intriguing work partially motivated by Page et al. (1999) that applies Sinkhorn’s algorithm, which is central to the current work, to compute authority and hub scores similar to those proposed by Kleinberg (1999) and Tomlin (2003), although the focus in Knight (2008) is on Markov chains rather than maximum likelihood estimation of choice models. For ranking data, Soufiani et al. (2013) decompose rankings into pairwise comparisons and develop consistent estimators for Plackett–Luce models based on a generalized method of moments. Other notable works that make connections between Markov chains and choice modeling include Blanchet et al. (2016) and Ragain and Ugander (2016).

Maximum Likelihood Methods. Maximum likelihood estimation of the Bradley–Terry–Luce model dates back to Zermelo (1929), Dykstra (1956), and Ford (1957), which all give variants of the same iterative algorithm and prove its convergence to the MLE when the directed comparison graph is strongly connected. Much later, Hunter (2004) observed that their algorithms are instances of the class of minorization-maximization (MM) algorithms, and develops MM algorithms for the Plackett–Luce model for ranking data, among others. Vojnovic et al. (2020) further investigate the convergence of the MM algorithm for choice models. Newman (2023) proposes an alternative to the classical iterative algorithm for pairwise comparisons based on a reformulated moment condition, achieving impressive empirical speedups. Negahban et al. (2012) is arguably the first work that connects maximum likelihood estimation to Markov chains, followed by Maystre and Grossglauser (2015), whose spectral method is based on a balance equation interpretation of the optimality condition. Kumar et al. (2015) consider the problem of inverting the stationary distribution of a Markov chain, and embed the maximum likelihood problem of the Luce choice model into this framework, where the MLEs parameterize the desired transition matrix. Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) consider the estimation of a network choice model with similarly parameterized random walks. Lastly, a vast literature in econometrics on discrete choice also considers different aspects

of the ML estimation problem. In particular, the present paper is related to the Berry–Levinsohn–Pakes (BLP) framework of Berry et al. (1995), well-known in econometrics. The matrix balancing interpretation of maximum likelihood estimation of choice models that we develop in this paper connects many of the aforementioned works.

Besides the optimization of a given maximum likelihood problem, there have also been extensive studies of the statistical properties of the maximum likelihood estimator for these choice problems. Hajek et al. (2014) prove that the MLE is minimax optimal for k -way rankings, and Rajkumar and Agarwal (2014) show that the MLE for Bradley–Terry–Luce can recover the correct *ranking* under model mis-specification when noise is “bounded”. As a byproduct of analysis for a context-dependent generalization of the Luce choice model, Seshadri et al. (2020) obtain tight expected risk and tail risk bounds for the MLEs of Luce choice models (which they call MNL) and Plackett–Luce ranking models, extending and improving upon previous works by Hajek et al. (2014), Shah et al. (2015), Vojnovic and Yun (2016).

Our present work is primarily concerned with the optimization aspects of the maximum likelihood problem. Nonetheless, the importance of *algebraic connectivity*—as quantified by the Fiedler eigenvalue (Fiedler 1973)—in the results of Shah et al. (2015), Seshadri et al. (2020) as well as Vojnovic et al. (2020) provides motivations in our convergence analysis of Sinkhorn’s algorithm for matrix balancing.

Lastly, a short note on terminology. Even though a choice model based on (1) is technically a “multinomial logit model” with only intercept terms (McFadden et al. 1973), there are subtle differences. When (1) is applied to model ranking and choice data with distinct items, each observation i usually consists of a possibly *different* subset S_i of the universe of all alternatives, so that there is a large number of different configurations of the choice menu in the dataset. On the other hand, common applications of multinomial logit models, such as classification models in statistics and machine learning (Bishop and Nasrabadi 2006) and discrete choice models in econometrics (McFadden et al. 1973), often deal with repeated observations consisting of the *same* number of alternatives. However, these alternatives now possess “characteristics” that vary across observations, which are often mapped *parametrically* to the scores in (1). In this paper, we primarily use the term *Luce choice model* to refer to the model (3), although it is also called MNL (for multinomial logit) models in some works. We refrain from using the term MNL to avoid confusion with parametric models for featurized items used in ML and econometrics.

2.2. Matrix Balancing

The matrix balancing problem we study in this paper and its variants (Ruiz 2001, Bradley 2010) underlie a diverse range of applications from different disciplines. The question of scaling rows and

columns of a matrix A so that the resulting matrix has target row and column norms p, q has been studied as early as the 1930s, and continue to intrigue researchers from different backgrounds. The present paper only contains a partial survey of the vast literature on the topic. Schneider and Zenios (1990) and Idel (2016) provide excellent discussions of many applications. In Appendix D, we present concise summaries of some applications to illustrate the ubiquity of the matrix balancing problem.

The standard iterative algorithm for the matrix balancing problem has been rediscovered independently quite a few times. As a result, it has domain-dependent names, including the iterative proportional fitting (IPF) procedure (Deming and Stephan 1940), biproportional fitting (Bacharach 1965) and the RAS algorithm (Stone 1962), but is perhaps most widely known as *Sinkhorn's algorithm* (Sinkhorn 1964, Cuturi 2013). A precise description can be found in Algorithm 1. This algorithm is also closely related to relaxation and coordinate descent type methods for solving the dual of entropy minimization problems (Bregman 1967b, Cottle et al. 1986, Tseng and Bertsekas 1987, Luo and Tseng 1992), as well as message passing and belief propagation algorithms in distributed optimization (Balakrishnan et al. 2004, Agarwal et al. 2018).

The convergence behavior of Sinkhorn's algorithm has been extensively studied by Sinkhorn (1964), Bregman (1967a), Lamond and Stewart (1981), Franklin and Lorenz (1989), Ruschendorf (1995), Kalantari et al. (2008), Knight (2008), Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009), Altschuler et al. (2017), Chakrabarty and Khanna (2021), Léger (2021), among many others. For A with strictly *positive* entries, Franklin and Lorenz (1989) first established the global linear convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm in the Hilbert projective metric d . In particular, if $r^{(t)}$ denotes the row sum of the scaled matrix after t iterations of Sinkhorn's algorithm that enforce column constraints, then

$$d(r^{(t)}, p) \leq \lambda^t \cdot d(r^{(0)}, p) \tag{2}$$

for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ dependent on A . See Bushell (1973) for details on the Hilbert metric. Altschuler et al. (2017) and Chakrabarty and Khanna (2021) show global sub-linear convergence in terms of iteration complexity bounds on the ℓ^1 distance independent of matrix dimension.

However, the matter of convergence is more delicate when the matrix contains zero entries, and additional assumptions on the problem structure are required. For non-negative A , convergence is first established by Sinkhorn and Knopp (1967) in the special case of *square* A and uniform $p = q = \mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_m$. Their necessary and sufficient condition is that A has *total support*, i.e., any non-zero entry of A must be in $(A_{1\sigma(1)}, A_{2\sigma(2)}, \dots, A_{n\sigma(n)})$ for some permutation σ . Soules (1991) shows the convergence is linear, and Knight (2008) provides an explicit and tight *asymptotic* linear convergence rate in terms of the sub-dominant (second largest) singular value of the scaled doubly

stochastic matrix D^0AD^1 . However, no asymptotic linear convergence rate is previously known for non-uniform marginals.

For general non-negative matrices and non-uniform marginals, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the matrix balancing problem that generalize that of Sinkhorn and Knopp (1967) have been studied by Thionet (1964), Bacharach (1965), Brualdi (1968), Menon (1968), Djoković (1970), Sinkhorn (1974), Balakrishnan et al. (2004), Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009), and convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm under these conditions is well-known. Connecting Sinkhorn's algorithm to dual coordinate descent for entropy minimization, Luo and Tseng (1992) show that the dual objective converges linearly with some unknown rate λ when finite scalings D^0, D^1 exist. However, their result is implicit and there are no results that quantify this rate λ , even for special classes of non-negative matrices. When convergence results on positive matrices in previous works are applied to non-negative matrices, the bounds often blow up or become degenerate as soon as $\min_{ij} A_{ij} \downarrow 0$. For example, in (2) the contraction factor $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ when A contains zero entries. In contrast, under a *weaker* condition that guarantees the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm, Léger (2021) gives a *quantitative* global $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ bound for non-negative matrices. It remains to reconcile the results of these works and characterize the linear rate λ for non-negative A .

Our work precisely fills the gaps left by these works. The global linear convergence result in Theorem 3 establishes a contraction like (2) whenever finite scalings D^0, D^1 exist, and characterize λ in terms of the algebraic connectivity. Moreover, the asymptotic linear rate in Theorem 5 directly extends the result of Knight (2008). See Table 1 for a detailed summary and comparison of the convergence results in previous works and this paper.

The dependence of Sinkhorn's convergence rate on spectral properties of graphs can be compared to convergence results in the literature on decentralized optimization and gossip algorithms, where a spectral gap quantifies the convergence rate (Boyd et al. 2006, Xiao et al. 2007).

3. Preliminaries on Choice Modeling and Matrix Balancing

We start by providing brief but self-contained introductions to the two main subjects of this paper, choice modeling and matrix balancing, including their respective underlying mathematical problems and assumptions. Then we formally establish their equivalence in Section 4.

3.1. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Luce Choice Models

In the Luce choice modeling framework, we have n observations $\{(j_i, S_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, each consisting of a choice set $S_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\} = [m]$ that is a subset of the total m alternatives/items/objects, and the alternative selected, denoted by $j_i \in S_i$. The choice probability is prescribed by Luce's axiom of choice given model parameter $s \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$ in the interior of the probability simplex Δ_m :

$$\Pr(j_i, S_i) = \frac{s_{j_i}}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k},$$

and the likelihood of the observed data is thus given by

$$L(s; \{(j_i, S_i)\}_{i=1}^n) := \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{s_{j_i}}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k}. \quad (3)$$

Importantly, the fact that (3) has potentially different choice sets S_i across observations have structure-dependent implications for both the optimization and the statistical efficiencies of the model.

The log-likelihood of the choice model described by (3) is

$$\ell(s) := \log L(s) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log s_{j_i} - \log \sum_{k \in S_i} s_k. \quad (4)$$

To estimate $s = \{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$, we focus on the maximum likelihood estimation approach, which maximizes (4) over the interior of the probability simplex. If we reparameterize $\exp(u_j) = s_j$, it is obvious that (4) is concave in u . However, to ensure the log-likelihood (4) has a unique maximizer in the *interior* of the simplex, additional assumptions on the comparison structure of the dataset $\{(j_i, S_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are needed. The following classic condition is necessary and sufficient for the maximum likelihood problem to be well-posed.

ASSUMPTION 1 (Strong Connectivity). *In any partition of $[m]$ into two nonempty subsets S and its complement S^C , some $j \in S$ is selected at least once over some $k \in S^C$. Equivalently, the directed comparison graph, with items as vertices and an edge $j \rightarrow k$ iff k is selected in some S_i for which $j, k \in S_i$, is strongly connected.*

Assumption 1 is standard in the literature (Hunter 2004, Noothigattu et al. 2020) and appeared as early as the work of Zermelo (1929) and Ford (1957) for pairwise comparisons. Hunter (2004) shows that Assumption 1 is necessary and sufficient for the upper-compactness of (4), which guarantees the existence of a maximizer in the interior of the probability simplex. In fact, when an interior maximizer exists, it is also *unique*, since Assumption 1 implies the following weaker condition, which guarantees the strict concavity of (4).

ASSUMPTION 2 (Connectivity). *In any partition of $[m]$ into two nonempty subsets S and S^C , some $j \in S$ and some $k \in S^C$ appear in the same choice set S_i for some i .*

The intuitions provided by Ford (1957) and Hunter (2004) are helpful for understanding Assumptions 1 and 2. If items from some $S \subsetneq [m]$ are never compared with those in S^C , i.e., never appeared together in any choice set S_i , it is impossible to rank across the two subsets. In this case, we can rescale the relative weights of S and S^C of an interior maximizer and obtain another maximizer. On the other hand, if items in S are always preferred to those in S^C , we can increase the likelihood by scaling s_j for items $j \in S^C$ towards 0, and no maximizer in the *interior* of the probability simplex

exists. Nevertheless, a boundary solution can still exist. This case turns out to be important in the present work: in the equivalent matrix balancing problem, it corresponds to the *slowdown* regime of Sinkhorn's algorithm, where scalings diverge but the scaled matrix converges (Section 5).

Assumption 2 also has a concise graph-theoretic interpretation. Define the weighted *undirected comparison graph* G_c on m vertices with adjacency matrix A^c given by

$$A_{jk}^c = \begin{cases} 0 & j = k \\ |\{i \mid j, k \in S_i\}| & j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

In other words, there is an undirected edge between j and k if and only if they are both in some choice set, with the edge weight equal to the number of their co-occurrences. We can verify that Assumption 2 requires G_c to be connected.

Under these standard assumptions, previous works have studied the statistical efficiency of the MLE (Hajek et al. 2014, Shah et al. 2015, Seshadri et al. 2020) as well as the computational efficiency of the MM algorithm (Vojnovic et al. 2020). In both cases, the algebraic connectivity of G_c , quantified by the second smallest eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian of G_c , plays an important role. See Appendix A for details. In Section 5, we focus on the classic Sinkhorn's algorithm for matrix balancing, and show that its convergence is also characterized by the algebraic connectivity of a bipartite graph. In Appendix C, we extend our framework to settings where Assumption 1 does not hold, by introducing Gamma priors on s_j , inspired by Caron and Doucet (2012) and Maystre and Grossglauser (2017). These priors regularize the maximum likelihood problem and guarantee that a unique solution in the interior of the probability simplex always exists. They also speed up the associated iterative algorithm by improving the algebraic connectivity.

3.2. The Canonical Matrix Balancing Problem

Matrix balancing is a classic problem that shows up in a wide range of disciplines. See Appendix D for a short survey on some applications. The underlying mathematical problem can be stated concisely in matrix form as:

Given positive vectors $p \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, $q \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$ with $\sum_i p_i = \sum_j q_j$ and non-negative matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$, find positive diagonal matrices D^1 , D^0 satisfying the conditions $D^1 A D^0 \cdot \mathbf{1}_m = p$ and $D^0 A^T D^1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_n = q$.

We henceforth refer to the above as the ‘‘canonical’’ matrix balancing problem. It seeks positive row and column scalings of an (entry-wise) non-negative rectangular matrix A such that the scaled matrix has positive target row and column sums p and q . Other variants of the problem replace the row and column sums (the 1-norm) with other norms (Bauer 1963, Ruiz 2001). Note that for any $c > 0$, $(D^0/c, cD^1)$ is also a solution whenever (D^0, D^1) is. A finite positive solution (D^0, D^1) to the canonical matrix balancing problem is often called a *direct scaling*.

Algorithm 1 Sinkhorn's Algorithm

Input: $A, p, q, \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$.

initialize $d^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$

repeat

$d^1 \leftarrow p / (A d^0)$

$d^0 \leftarrow q / (A^T d^1)$

$\epsilon \leftarrow \text{update of } (d^0, d^1)$

until $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$

The structure of the matrix balancing problem suggests a simple iterative scheme: starting from any initial positive diagonal D^0 , invert $D^1 A D^0 \mathbf{1}_m = p$ using $p / (A D^0 \mathbf{1}_m)$ to update D^1 . Then invert $D^0 A^T D^1 \mathbf{1}_n = q$ using $q / (A^T D^1 \mathbf{1}_n)$ to compute the new estimate of D^0 , and repeat the procedure. Here divisions involving two vectors of the same length are *entry-wise*. This simple scheme is precisely Sinkhorn's algorithm, described in Algorithm 1, where vectors d^0, d^1 are the diagonals of D^0, D^1 . An important dichotomy occurs depending on whether the entries of A are strictly positive. If A contains no zero entries, then direct scalings and a unique scaled matrix $D^1 A D^0$ always exist (Sinkhorn 1964). Moreover, Sinkhorn's algorithm converges linearly (Franklin and Lorenz 1989). On the other hand, when A contains zero entries, the canonical problem becomes more complicated. Additional conditions are needed to guarantee meaningful solutions, and the convergence behavior of Sinkhorn's algorithm is less understood. Well-posedness of the matrix balancing problem has been studied by Brualdi (1968), Sinkhorn (1974), Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009), among others, who characterize the following equivalent existence conditions.

ASSUMPTION 3 (Strong Existence). *(a) There exists a non-negative matrix $A' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ with the same zero patterns as A and with row and column sums p and q . Or, equivalently,*

(b) For every pair of sets of indices $N \subsetneq [n]$ and $M \subsetneq [m]$ such that $A_{ij} = 0$ for $i \notin N$ and $j \in M$, $\sum_{i \in N} p_i \geq \sum_{j \in M} q_j$, with equality iff $A_{ij} = 0$ for all $i \in N$ and $j \notin M$ as well.

It is well-known in the matrix balancing literature that the above two conditions are equivalent, and that a positive finite solution (D^0, D^1) to the canonical problem exists iff they hold. See, for example, Theorem 6 in Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009). Clearly, Assumption 3(a) is the minimal necessary condition when a solution to the matrix balancing problem exists. Assumption 3(b) is closely connected to conditions for perfect matchings in bipartite graphs (Hall 1935). In flow networks (Gale et al. 1957, Ford and Fulkerson 1956, 1957), it is a capacity constraint that guarantees the maximum flow on a bipartite graph with source and sink is equal to $\sum_i p_i = \sum_j q_j$ and with positive

flow on every edge (Idel 2016). The bipartite graph, denoted by G_b , is related to A through its adjacency matrix $A^b \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times (n+m)}$ given by

$$A^b := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & A \\ A^T & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

See Appendix A for a detailed discussion. The structure of G_b turns out to be important for the linear convergence rate of Sinkhorn's algorithm (Section 5).

On the other hand, the necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness of finite scalings essentially requires that A is not block-diagonal, and guarantees that G_b is *connected*.

ASSUMPTION 4 (Uniqueness). D^0 and D^1 are unique modulo normalization iff A is indecomposable, i.e., there does not exist permutation matrices P, Q such that PAQ is block diagonal.

With a proper introduction to both problems, we are now ready to formally establish the equivalence between Luce choice model estimation and matrix balancing in the next section. In Section 5, we return to Sinkhorn's algorithm for the matrix balancing problem, and settle important open problems concerning its linear convergence for non-negative A . In Appendix B, we discuss further connections of matrix balancing and Sinkhorn's algorithm to choice modeling and optimization.

4. Connecting Choice Modeling and Matrix Balancing

In this section, we formally establish the connection between choice modeling and matrix balancing. We show that maximizing the log-likelihood (4) is equivalent to solving a canonical matrix balancing problem. We also precisely describe the correspondence between the relevant conditions in the two problems. In view of this equivalence, we show that Sinkhorn's algorithm, when applied to estimate Luce choice models, is in fact a *parallelized* generalization of the classic iterative algorithm for choice models, dating back to Zermelo (1929), Dykstra (1956), Ford (1957), and studied extensively also by Hunter (2004), Vojnovic et al. (2020).

4.1. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Luce Choice Model as Matrix Balancing

The optimality conditions for maximizing the log-likelihood (4) for each s_j are given by

$$\partial_{s_j} \ell(s) = \sum_{j|(j, S_i)} \frac{1}{s_j} - \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k} = 0.$$

Multiplying by s_j and dividing by $1/n$, we have

$$\frac{W_j}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k}, \quad (5)$$

where $W_j := |\{i \mid (j, S_i)\}|$ is the number of observations where j is selected.

Note that in the special case where $S_i \equiv [n]$, i.e., every choice set contains *all* items, the MLE simply reduces to the familiar empirical frequencies $\hat{s}_j = W_j/n$. However, when the choice sets S_i

vary, no closed form solution to (5) exists, which is the primary motivation behind the long line of works on the algorithmic problem of solving (5).

With varying S_i , we can interpret the optimality condition as requiring the *observed* frequency of j being chosen (left hand side) be equal to the conditional *expected* probability of j being chosen among all observations i where it is part of the choice set S_i (right hand side). In addition, note that since the optimality condition in (5) only involves the *frequency* of selection, distinct datasets could yield the same optimality condition and hence the same MLEs. For example, suppose that two alternatives j and k both appear in choice sets S_i and $S_{i'}$, with j selected in S_i and k selected in $S_{i'}$. Then switching the choices in S_i and $S_{i'}$ does not alter the likelihood and optimality conditions. This feature holds more generally with longer cycles of items and choice sets, and can be viewed as a consequence of the context-independent nature of Luce's choice axiom. In some sense, it is also the underpinning of many works in economics that estimate choice models based on *marginal* sufficient statistics. A famous example is Berry et al. (1995), which estimates consumer preferences using only *aggregate* market shares of products.

In practice, the choice sets S_i of many observations may be identical to each other. Because (5) only depends on the total winning counts of items, we may aggregate over observations with the same S_i :

$$\sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k} = \sum_{i'|j \in S_{i'}^*} R_{i'} \cdot \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_{i'}^*} s_k},$$

where each $S_{i'}^*$ is a unique choice set that appears in $R_{i'} \geq 1$ observations, for $i' = 1, \dots, n^* \leq n$. By construction, $\sum_{i'=1}^{n^*} R_{i'} = n$. Note, however, that the selected item could vary across different appearances of $S_{i'}^*$, but the optimality conditions only involve each item's winning count W_j . From now on, we assume this reduction and drop the * superscript. In other words, we assume that we observe n unique choice sets, and choice set S_i has *multiplicity* R_i . The resulting problem has optimality conditions

$$W_j = \sum_{i|j \in S_i} R_i \cdot \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k}. \quad (6)$$

We are now ready to reformulate (6) as a canonical matrix balancing problem. Define $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $p_i = R_i$, i.e., the number of times choice set S_i appears in the data. Define $q \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as $q_j = W_j$, i.e., the number of times item j was *selected* in the data. By construction we have $\sum_i p_i = \sum_j q_j$, and $p_i, q_j > 0$ whenever Assumption 1 holds.

Now define the $n \times m$ binary matrix A by $A_{ij} = 1\{j \in S_i\}$, so the i -th row of A is the indicator of which items appear in the (unique) choice set S_i , and the j -th column of A is the indicator of which choice sets item j appears in. We refer to this A constructed from a choice dataset as the

participation matrix. By construction, A has distinct rows, but may still have identical columns. If necessary, we can also remove repeated columns by “merging” items and their win counts. Their estimated scores can be computed from the score of the merged item proportional to their respective win counts.

Let $D^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be the diagonal matrix with $D_j^0 = s_j$ and $D^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the diagonal matrix with $D_i^1 = R_i / \sum_{k \in S_i} s_k$, and define the scaled matrix

$$\hat{A} := D^1 A D^0. \quad (7)$$

The matrices D^1 and D^0 are scalings of rows and columns of A , respectively, and

$$\hat{A}_{ij} = \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k} \cdot \mathbf{1}\{j \in S_i\} \cdot s_j.$$

The key observation is that the optimality condition (6) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n = q. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, by construction \hat{A} also satisfies

$$\hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m = p. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, if s_j 's satisfy the optimality conditions for maximizing (4), then D^0, D^1 defined above solve the matrix balancing problem in Equations (7) to (9). Moreover, the converse is also true, and we thus establish the equivalence between choice maximum likelihood estimation and matrix balancing. All omitted proofs appear in Appendix F.

THEOREM 1. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $p_i = R_i$, $q \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $q_j = W_j$, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with $A_{ij} = \mathbf{1}\{j \in S_i\}$ be constructed from the choice dataset. Then $D^0, D^1 > 0$ with $\sum_j D_j^0 = 1$ solves the matrix balancing problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A} &= D^1 A D^0 \\ \hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m &= p \\ \hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n &= q \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

if and only if $s \in \Delta_m$ with $s_j = D_j^0$ satisfies the optimality condition (6) of the ML estimation problem.

In particular, (4) has a unique maximizer s in the interior of the probability simplex if and only if (10) has a unique normalized solution D^0 as well. The next question, naturally, is then how Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 for choice modeling are connected to Assumption 3 and Assumption 4 for matrix balancing.

THEOREM 2. *Let (A, p, q) be constructed from the choice dataset as in Theorem 1, with $p, q > 0$. Assumption 2 is equivalent to Assumption 4. Furthermore, Assumption 1 holds if and only if (A, p, q) satisfy Assumption 3 and A satisfies Assumption 4.*

Thus when the ML estimation problem is cast as a matrix balancing problem, Assumption 3 exactly characterizes the *gap* between Assumption 2 and Assumption 1. We provide some intuition for Theorem 2. When we construct a triplet (A, p, q) from a choice dataset, with p the numbers of appearances of unique choice sets and q the winning counts, Assumption 4 precludes the possibility of partitioning the items into two subsets that never get compared with each other, i.e., Assumption 2. Then Assumption 3 requires that whenever a strict subset $M \subsetneq [m]$ of objects only appear in a strict subset $N \subsetneq [n]$ of the observations, their total winning counts are *strictly* smaller than the total number of these observations, i.e., there is some object $j \notin M$ that is selected in S_i for some $i \in N$, which is required by Assumption 1.

Interestingly, while Assumption 1 requires the directed comparison graph, defined by the $m \times m$ matrix of counts of item j being chosen over item k , to be strongly connected, the corresponding conditions for the equivalent matrix balancing problem concern the $n \times m$ participation matrix A and positive vectors p, q , which do not explicitly encode the specific *choice* of each observation. This apparent discrepancy is due to the fact that (A, p, q) form the *sufficient statistics* of the Luce choice model. In other words, there can be more than one choice dataset with the same optimality condition (6) and (A, p, q) defining the equivalent matrix balancing problem.

Remark. This feature where “marginal” quantities constitute the sufficient statistics of a parametric model is an important one that underlies many works in economics and statistics (Kullback 1997, Stone 1962, Good 1963, Birch 1963, Theil 1967, Fienberg 1970, Berry et al. 1995, Fofana et al. 2002, Maystre and Grossglauser 2017). It makes the task of estimating a *joint* model from marginal quantities feasible. This feature is useful because in many applications, only marginal data is available due to high sampling cost or privacy reasons.

Having formulated a particular matrix balancing problem from the estimation problem given choice data, we may ask how one can go in the other direction. In other words, when/how can we construct a “choice dataset” whose sufficient statistics is a given triplet (A, p, q) ? First off, for (A, p, q) to be valid sufficient statistics of a Luce choice model, p, q need to be positive integers. Moreover, A has to be a binary matrix, with each row containing at least two non-zero elements (valid choice sets have at least two items). Given such a (A, p, q) satisfying Assumptions 3 and 4, a choice dataset can be constructed efficiently. Such a procedure is described, for example, in Kumar et al. (2015), where A is motivated by random walks on a graph instead of matrix balancing (Appendix B). Their construction relies on finding the max flow on the bipartite graph G_b . For

rational p, q , this maximum flow can be found efficiently in polynomial time (Balakrishnan et al. 2004, Idel 2016). Moreover, the maximum flow implies a matrix A' satisfying Assumption 3(a), thus providing a feasibility certificate for the matrix balancing problem as well.

We have thus closed the loop and fully established the equivalence of the maximum likelihood estimation of Luce choice models and the canonical matrix balancing problem.

COROLLARY 1. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between classes of maximum likelihood estimation problems with the same optimality conditions (6) and canonical matrix balancing problems with (A, p, q) , where A is a valid participation matrix and $p, q > 0$ have integer entries.*

We next turn our attention to the algorithmic connections between choice modeling and matrix balancing.

4.2. Algorithmic Connections between Matrix Balancing and Choice Modeling

Given the equivalence between matrix balancing and choice modeling, we can naturally consider applying Sinkhorn's algorithm to maximize (4). In this case, one can verify that the updates in each full iteration of Algorithm 1 reduce algebraically to

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = W_j / \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}} \quad (11)$$

in the t -th iteration. Comparing (11) to the optimality condition in (6), which we recall is given by

$$W_j = \sum_{i|j \in S_i} R_i \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k} = s_j \cdot \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k},$$

we can therefore interpret the iterations as simply dividing the winning count W_j by the coefficient of s_j on the right repeatedly, in the hope of converging to a *fixed point*. A similar intuition was given by Ford (1957) in the special case of pairwise comparisons. Indeed, the algorithm proposed by Ford (1957) is a cyclic variant of (11) applied to pairwise comparisons. However, this connection is mainly algebraic, as the optimality condition in Ford (1957) does not admit a reformulation as the matrix balancing problem in (10).

In Appendix B, we provide further discussions on the connections of Sinkhorn's algorithm to existing frameworks and algorithms in the choice modeling literature, and connect it to distributed optimization as well. We demonstrate that many existing algorithms for Luce choice model estimation are in fact special cases or analogs of Sinkhorn's algorithm. These connections also illustrate the many interpretations of Sinkhorn's algorithm, e.g., as a distributed optimization algorithm as well as a minorization-majorization (MM) algorithm. However, compared to most algorithms for choice modeling discussed in this work, Sinkhorn's algorithm is more general as it applies to non-binary A and non-integer p, q , and has the critical advantage of being parallelized and distributed, hence more efficient in practice.

Table 1 Summary of some convergence results on Sinkhorn's algorithm. In Franklin and Lorenz (1989), $\kappa(A) = \frac{\theta(A)^{1/2}-1}{\theta(A)^{1/2}+1}$, where $\theta(A)$ is the diameter of A in the Hilbert metric. The norm in Knight (2008) is not explicitly specified, and $\sigma_2(\hat{A})$ denotes the second largest singular value of the scaled doubly stochastic matrix \hat{A} . The bound in Altschuler et al. (2017) was originally stated as $\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1 \leq \epsilon'$ in $t = O(\epsilon'^{-2} \log(\frac{\sum_{ij} A_{ij}}{\min_{ij} A_{ij}}))$ iterations. The result in Léger (2021) applies more generally to couplings of probability distributions. In view of Pinsker's inequality, it implies the bound in Altschuler et al. (2017) but with a constant that is finite even when A has zero entries. In the bound in Knight (2008) and our asymptotic result, the $\lambda + \epsilon$ denotes an asymptotic rate, with the bound valid for any $\epsilon > 0$ and all t sufficiently large. In our global bound, the linear rate $\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$ is the second smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian of the bipartite graph defined by A (see Appendix A), $l = \min\{\max_j(A^T \mathbf{1}_n)_j, \max_i(A \mathbf{1}_m)_i\}$, $c_B = \exp(-4B)$, and B is a bound on the initial sub-level set, which is finite if and only if Assumption 3 holds.

	convergence statement	λ	A	p, q
Franklin and Lorenz (1989)	$d_{\text{Hilbert}}(r^{(t)}, p) \leq \lambda^t d_{\text{Hilbert}}(r^{(0)}, p)$	$\kappa^2(A)$	$A > 0$, rectangular	uniform
Luo and Tseng (1992)	$g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g^* \leq \lambda^t (g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}) - g^*)$	unknown	$A \geq 0$, rectangular	general
Knight (2008)	$\ D_{t+1}^0 - D^0\ _* \leq (\lambda + \epsilon) \ D_t^0 - D^0\ _*$	$\sigma_2^2(\hat{A})$	$A \geq 0$, square	uniform
Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009)	$\ r^{(t)} - p\ _1 \rightarrow 0$	no rate	$A \geq 0$, rectangular	general
Altschuler et al. (2017)	$\ r^{(t)} - p\ _1 \leq c \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{t}}$	$\log(\frac{\sum_{ij} A_{ij}}{\min_{ij} A_{ij}})$	$A > 0$, rectangular	general
Léger (2021)	$D_{\text{KL}}(r^{(t)} \ p) \leq \frac{\lambda}{t}$	$D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{A} \ A)$	$A \geq 0$, continuous	general
current work, asymptotic	$\ \frac{r^{(t+1)}}{\sqrt{p}} - \sqrt{p}\ _2 \leq (\lambda + \epsilon) \ \frac{r^{(t)}}{\sqrt{p}} - \sqrt{p}\ _2$	$\lambda_2(\tilde{A}^T \tilde{A})$	$A \geq 0$, rectangular	general
current work, global	$g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g^* \leq \lambda^t (g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}) - g^*)$	$1 - c_B \lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})/l$	$A \geq 0$, rectangular	general

The mathematical and algorithmic connections between matrix balancing and choice modeling we establish in this paper allow the transfusion of ideas in both directions. For example, inspired by regularized maximum likelihood estimation (Maystre and Grossglauser 2017), we propose a regularized version of Sinkhorn's algorithm in Appendix C, which is guaranteed to converge even when the original Sinkhorn's algorithm does not converge. Moreover, the importance of algebraic connectivity in quantifying estimation and computation efficiency in choice modeling motivates us to solve some important open problems on the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm. We turn to this topic next.

5. Linear Convergence of Sinkhorn's Algorithm for Non-negative Matrices

In this section, we turn our focus to matrix balancing and study the global and asymptotic linear convergence rates of Sinkhorn's algorithm for general non-negative matrices and positive marginals. We first discuss relevant quantities and important concepts before presenting the convergence results in Section 5.2 and Section 5.3. Throughout, we use superscript (t) to denote quantities after t iterations of Sinkhorn's algorithm.

5.1. Preliminaries

We start with the optimization principles associated with matrix balancing and Sinkhorn's algorithm. Consider the following KL divergence (relative entropy) minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\hat{A} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}} D_{\text{KL}}(\hat{A} \| A) \\ \hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m = p \\ \hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n = q. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

It is well-known that solutions $\hat{A} = D^1 A D^0$ to the matrix balancing problem with (A, p, q) are minimizers of (12) (Ireland and Kullback 1968, Bregman 1967a). Moreover, Sinkhorn's algorithm can be interpreted as a block coordinate descent type algorithm applied to minimize the following dual problem of (12):

$$g(d^0, d^1) := (d^1)^T A d^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log d_i^1 - \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0, \tag{13}$$

Luo and Tseng (1992) study the linear convergence of block coordinate descent algorithms. Their result implies that the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm, measured in terms of the optimality gap of g , is linear with some implicit rate $\lambda > 0$, as long as finite positive scalings D^0, D^1 exist for the matrix balancing problem. Minimizers d^0, d^1 of (13) precisely give the diagonals of D^0, D^1 . The function g , known to be a *potential function* of Sinkhorn's algorithm, also turns out to be crucial in quantifying the global linear convergence rate in the present work.

Remark. Interestingly, minimizing (13) is in fact equivalent to maximizing the log-likelihood function $\ell(s)$ in (4) for valid (A, p, q) , because $\min_{d^1} g(d^0, d^1) = -\ell(d^0) + c$ for some $c > 0$. Moreover, the optimality condition of minimizing g with respect to d^0 reduces to the optimality condition (6). A detailed discussion can be found in Section B.4. This connection relates choice modeling and matrix balancing from an optimization perspective.

Although convergence results on Sinkhorn's algorithm are abundant, the recent work of Léger (2021) stands out as the first *explicit* global convergence result applicable to general non-negative matrices, with a sub-linear $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ bound on the KL divergence with respect to target marginals. It implies the bounds in Chakrabarty and Khanna (2021), Altschuler et al. (2017) but with a constant that is finite even when A has zero entries. The result in Léger (2021) applies more generally to couplings of continuous probability distributions, but when restricted to the discrete matrix balancing problem, it holds under the following equivalent conditions that are weaker than Assumption 3.

ASSUMPTION 5 (Weak Existence). (a) *There exists a non-negative matrix $A' \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$ that inherits all zeros of A and has row and column sums p and q . Or, equivalently,*

(b) *For every pair of sets of indices $N \subsetneq [n]$ and $M \subsetneq [m]$ such that $A_{ij} = 0$ for $i \notin N$ and $j \in M$, $\sum_{i \in N} p_i \geq \sum_{j \in M} q_j$.*

The equivalence of these conditions follows from Theorem 4 in Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009), which also shows that they are the minimal requirements for the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm. Assumption 5(a) precisely guarantees that the optimization problem (12) is feasible and bounded. It relaxes Assumption 3(a) by allowing additional zeros in the matrix A' . Similarly, Assumption 5(b) relaxes Assumption 3(b) by allowing equality between $\sum_{i \in N} p_i$ and $\sum_{j \in M} q_j$ even when M, N do not correspond to a block-diagonal structure.

The distinction between Assumption 3 and Assumption 5 is crucial for the matrix balancing problem and Sinkhorn's algorithm. Recall that Assumption 3 guarantees the matrix balancing problem has a solution (D^0, D^1) , and $D^1 A D^0$ is always a solution to (12). On the other hand, the weaker condition Assumption 5 guarantees that (12) has a solution \hat{A} . If indeed \hat{A} has additional zeros relative to A , then no direct (finite and positive) scaling (D^0, D^1) exists such that $\hat{A} = D^1 A D^0$. However, the sequence of scaled matrices $\hat{A}^{(t)}$ from Sinkhorn's algorithm still converges to \hat{A} . In this case, the matrix balancing problem is said to have a *limit* scaling, where some entries of d^0, d^1 in Sinkhorn iterations approach 0 or ∞ , resulting in additional zeros in \hat{A} . Below we give an example adapted from Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009), where $p, q = (3, 3)$ and the scaled matrices $\hat{A}^{(t)}$ converge but no direct scaling exists:

$$D^{1(t)} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} D^{0(t)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{3t}{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{t} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Given these discussions, it is therefore important to clarify the convergence behaviors of Sinkhorn's algorithm in different regimes. In particular, it remains to reconcile the gap between the implicit linear convergence result of Luo and Tseng (1992) under strong existence, and the quantitative sub-linear bound of Léger (2021) under weak existence. Furthermore, it remains to provide explicit characterizations of both the global and asymptotic (local) rates when Sinkhorn's algorithm does converge linearly.

Our results in this section provide answers to these questions. We show that the $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ rate can be sharpened to a global $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^t)$ bound if and only if the weak existence condition (Assumption 5) is replaced by the strong existence condition (Assumption 3). Moreover, we provide an explicit global linear convergence rate λ in terms of the *algebraic connectivity*, revealing the structure-dependent nature of Sinkhorn's algorithm for problems with non-negative matrices. This generalizes the implicit result of Luo and Tseng (1992) and sheds light on how different assumptions impact Sinkhorn's convergence, which is explicitly reflected in the constants of the bound. Going further, we characterize the sharp asymptotic rate of linear convergence in terms of the second largest singular value of $\mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{q})$, where \mathcal{D} denotes the diagonalization of a vector. This asymptotic rate reduces to that given by Knight (2008) for $m = n$ and uniform p, q .

The choice of convergence measure is important, and previous works have used different convergence measures. First note that after each iteration in Algorithm 1, the column constraint is always satisfied: $A^{(t)}\mathbf{1}_n = q$, where $A^{(t)}$ is the scaled matrix after t iterations. Léger (2021) uses the KL divergence $D_{\text{KL}}(r^{(t)}\|p)$ between the row sum $r^{(t)} = A^{(t)}\mathbf{1}_m$ and the target row sum p to measure convergence. Franklin and Lorenz (1989) use the Hilbert projective metric between $r^{(t)}$ and p . Pukelsheim and Simeone (2009) and Altschuler et al. (2017) use the ℓ^1 distance, which is upper bounded by the KL divergence via Pinsker's inequality. Knight (2008) focuses on the convergence of the scaling diagonal matrix $D^0 = \mathcal{D}(d^0)$ to the optimal solution *line*, but does not explicitly specify the norm. Some bounds are *a priori* and hold globally for all iterations, while others hold locally in a neighborhood of the optimum. We summarize the relevant convergence results in Table 1. Here $\lambda_{-2}(S)$ denotes the second smallest eigenvalue of a real symmetric matrix S , and $\lambda_2(S)$ the second largest eigenvalue. In our work, we characterize the global linear convergence through the optimality gap of (13), which naturally leads to a bound on $\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1$. For the sharp asymptotic rate, we choose to use the ℓ^2 distance $\|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2$ in order to exploit an intrinsic orthogonality structure afforded by Sinkhorn's algorithm. This approach results in a novel analysis compared to Knight (2008) that most explicitly reveals the importance of spectral properties in the rate of convergence.

5.2. Global Linear Convergence

We first present the global linear convergence results. Our analysis starts with the following change of variables to transform the potential function (13):

$$u := \log d^0, \quad v := -\log d^1. \quad (14)$$

This results in the potential function $g(u, v)$ defined as

$$g(u, v) := \sum_{ij} A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i - \sum_{j=1}^m q_j u_j, \quad (15)$$

and we can verify that Sinkhorn's algorithm is equivalent to the alternating minimization algorithm (Bertsekas 1997, Beck and Tetruashvili 2013) for (15), which alternates between minimizing with respect to u and v , holding the other block fixed:

$$u_j^{(t)} \leftarrow \log \frac{q_j}{\sum_i A_{ij} e^{-v_i^{(t-1)}}}, \quad v_i^{(t)} \leftarrow \log \frac{p_i}{\sum_j A_{ij} e^{u_j^{(t)}}}. \quad (16)$$

The Hessian $\nabla^2 g(u, v)$ always has $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}$ in its null space. On the surface, standard linear convergence results for first-order methods, which require strong convexity (or related properties like the Polyak–Lojasiewicz condition) of the objective function, do not apply to $g(u, v)$. However, we show that

under strong existence and uniqueness conditions for the matrix balancing problem, $g(u, v)$ is in fact strongly convex when *restricted* to the subspace

$$\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in \mathbb{R}^n : (u, v)^T \mathbf{1}_{m+n} = 0\}.$$

As a result, Sinkhorn's algorithm converges linearly with a rate that depends on the (restricted) condition number of its Hessian.

Before proceeding, we introduce a slew of useful definitions. Let Sinkhorn's algorithm initialize with $u^{(0)}$, and $v^{(0)}$ given by (16). Define the constant B as

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \sup_{(u,v)} \|(u, v)\|_\infty \\ &\text{subject to } (u, v)^T \mathbf{1}_{m+n} = 0, \\ &g(u, v) \leq g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, B is the *diameter* of the initial normalized sub-level set. We will show that B is finite and that it bounds normalized Sinkhorn iterates by the *coercivity* of $g(u, v)$ under Assumption 3. We similarly define the normalized optimal solution pair

$$(u^*, v^*) := \arg \min_{(u,v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp} g(u, v), \quad (17)$$

and $g^* := g(u^*, v^*)$. Finally, define

$$l_0 := \max_j (A^T \mathbf{1}_n)_j, \quad l_1 := \max_i (A \mathbf{1}_m)_i,$$

which are the Lipschitz constants of the two sub-blocks of $g(u, v)$. Next, define the *Laplacian* matrix \mathcal{L} of the bipartite graph G_b as

$$\mathcal{L} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(A \mathbf{1}_m) & -A \\ -A^T & \mathcal{D}(A^T \mathbf{1}_n) \end{bmatrix},$$

and refer to the second smallest eigenvalue $\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$ as the Fiedler eigenvalue. For details on the graph Laplacian and the Fiedler eigenvalue, see Appendix A.

Using the above notation, we can now state one of our main contributions to the study of Sinkhorn's algorithm.

THEOREM 3 (Global Linear Convergence). *Suppose Assumption 3 and Assumption 4 hold. For all $t > 0$,*

$$g(u^{(t+1)}, v^{(t+1)}) - g^* \leq \left(1 - c_B \frac{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})}{l}\right) (g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g^*), \quad (18)$$

where $c_B = e^{-4B}$ and $l = \min\{l_0, l_1\}$.

As a consequence, we have the following bound:

$$\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1 \leq c'_B e^{-c_B \frac{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})}{\min\{l_0, l_1\}} \cdot t},$$

where $(c'_B)^2 = (8B \sum_i p_i)$.

Algorithm 2 Normalized Sinkhorn's Algorithm

Input: $A, p, q, \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$.

initialize $d^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$

repeat

$d^1 \leftarrow p/(Ad^0)$

normalization $(d^0, d^1) \leftarrow (d^0/c, cd^1), c > 0$

$d^0 \leftarrow q/(A^T d^1)$

normalization $(d^0, d^1) \leftarrow (d^0/c, cd^1), c > 0$

$\epsilon \leftarrow$ update of (d^0, d^1)

until $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$

Theorem 3 immediately implies the following iteration complexity bound.

COROLLARY 2 (Iteration Complexity). *Under Assumption 3 and Assumption 4, $\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ after*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\min\{l_0, l_1\}}{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)\right)$$

iterations of Sinkhorn's algorithm.

Remark. The ability of Sinkhorn's algorithm to exploit the strong convexity of $g(u, v)$ on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ relies critically on the invariance of $g(u, v)$ under *normalization*, which is an intrinsic feature of the problem that has been largely set aside in the convergence analysis so far. Recall that $u = \log d^0$ and $v = -\log d^1$, where d^0, d^1 are the diagonals of the scaling (D^0, D^1) . Scalings are only determined up to multiplication by $(1/c, c)$ for $c > 0$, and the translation $(u, v) \rightarrow (u - \log c, v - \log c)$ does not alter the objective value in (15). We may therefore impose an *auxiliary* normalization $(u, v)^T \mathbf{1}_{m+n} = 0$, or equivalently $\prod_j d_j^0 = \prod_i d_i^1$. This normalization is easily achieved by requiring that after every update of Sinkhorn's algorithm, a normalization $(d^0/c, cd^1)$ is performed using the normalizing constant

$$c = \sqrt{\prod_j d_j^0 / \prod_i d_i^1}. \tag{19}$$

See Algorithm 2. Note, however, that this normalization is only a supplementary construction in our analysis. The final convergence result applies to the original Sinkhorn's algorithm without normalization, since it does not alter the objective value. Normalization of Sinkhorn's algorithm is discussed in Carlier et al. (2023), although they use the asymmetric condition $u_0 = 0$, which does not guarantee that normalized Sinkhorn iterates stay in $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$.

The proof of Theorem 3 then relies crucially on the observation that the Hessian of $g(u, v)$ at $(0, 0)$ is precisely the *Laplacian* \mathcal{L} of the bipartite graph G_b . Therefore, as (u, v) are *bounded* throughout the iterations thanks to the coercivity of g , the Fiedler eigenvalue of \mathcal{L} quantifies the strong convexity on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$. The linear convergence then follows from standard results on block coordinate descent and alternating minimization methods for strongly convex and smooth functions (Beck and Tetruashvili 2013). Typically, the leading eigenvalue of the Hessian quantifies the smoothness (Luenberger et al. 1984). This is given by $2 \max\{l_0, l_1\}$ for \mathcal{L} . However, for alternating minimization methods, the better smoothness constant $\min\{l_0, l_1\}$ is available. Thus the quantity $\min\{l_0, l_1\}/\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$ can be interpreted as a type of “condition number” of the graph Laplacian \mathcal{L} . When A is positive (not just non-negative), then the strong existence and uniqueness conditions are trivially satisfied, and our results continue to hold with the rate quantified by $\min\{l_0, l_1\}/\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$.

Remark. The importance of Assumptions 3 and 4 are clearly reflected in the bound (18). First, note that the Fiedler eigenvalue $\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L}) > 0$ iff Assumption 4 holds (see Appendix A). On the other hand, Assumption 3 guarantees the *coercivity* of g on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$. This property ensures that $B < \infty$, and consequently, that normalized iterates stay bounded by B . That Assumption 3 guarantees $g(u, v)$ is coercive should be compared to the observation by Hunter (2004) that Assumption 1 guarantees the upper compactness (a closely related concept) of the log-likelihood function (4). In contrast, when only the weak existence condition (Assumption 5) holds, finite minimizer of $g(u, v)$ may not exist, in which case the diameter B of the initial sub-level set may become infinite.

Assumption 5 corresponds to the “limit scaling” regime of Sinkhorn’s algorithm, where the scaled matrices $A^{(t)}$ are guaranteed to converge to a finite matrix \hat{A} with the desired marginal distributions that solves (12), and may have additional zeros compared to A . Under Assumption 5, Léger (2021) shows the slower $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ convergence in KL divergence $D_{\text{KL}}(r^{(t)}||p)$. We now show that this rate is tight, which fully characterizes the following convergence behavior of Sinkhorn’s algorithm: whenever a direct scaling exists for the matrix balancing problem, Sinkhorn’s algorithm converges linearly. If only a limit scaling exists, then convergence deteriorates to $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$.

THEOREM 4. *For general non-negative matrices, Sinkhorn’s algorithm converges linearly iff (A, p, q) satisfy Assumption 3 and Assumption 4. The convergence deteriorates to sub-linear iff the weak existence condition Assumption 5 holds but Assumption 3 fails.*

The regime of sub-linear convergence also has an interpretation in the choice modeling framework. The weak existence condition Assumption 5, when applied to (A, p, q) constructed from a choice dataset, allows the case where some subset S of items is always preferred over S^C , which implies, as observed already by the early work of Ford (1957), that the log-likelihood function (4) is only maximized at the *boundary* of the probability simplex, by shrinking s_j for $j \in S^C$ towards 0, i.e., $D_j^0 \rightarrow 0$. Incidentally, Bacharach (1965) also refers to the corresponding regime in matrix balancing as “boundary solutions”.

5.3. Sharp Asymptotic Rate

Having established the global convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm when finite scalings exist, we now turn to the open problem of characterizing its asymptotic linear convergence rate for non-uniform marginals. Our analysis relies on an *intrinsic* orthogonality structure of Sinkhorn's algorithm instead of the auxiliary normalization used to prove the global linear convergence above. Note that unlike the global rate, which depends on A , the asymptotic rate now depends on the associated solution \hat{A} (and p, q), as expected.

THEOREM 5 (Sharp Asymptotic Rate). *Suppose (A, p, q) satisfy Assumption 3 and Assumption 4. Let \hat{A} be the unique scaled matrix with marginals p, q . Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|r^{(t+1)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2}{\|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2} = \lambda_\infty,$$

where the asymptotic linear rate of convergence λ_∞ is

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_\infty &:= \lambda_2(\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^T) = \lambda_2(\tilde{A}^T\tilde{A}) \\ \tilde{A} &:= \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{q}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_2(\cdot)$ denotes the second largest eigenvalue.

Intuitively, the dependence of the linear rate of convergence on the second largest eigenvalue of $\tilde{A}^T\tilde{A}$ (and $\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^T$) is due to the fact that near the optimum \sqrt{p} , $\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^T$ (which is the Jacobian at \sqrt{p}) approximates the first order change in $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}$. Normally, the *leading* eigenvalue quantifies this change. The unique leading eigenvalue of $\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^T$ is equal to 1 with eigenvector \sqrt{p} , which does not imply contraction. Fortunately, using the quantity $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}$ allows us to exploit the following orthogonality structure:

$$(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})^T \sqrt{p} = \sum_i (r_i^{(t)} - p_i) = 0$$

by virtue of Sinkhorn's algorithm preserving the quantities $r^{(t)T}\mathbf{1}_n$ for all t . Thus, the residual $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}$ is always *orthogonal* to \sqrt{p} , which is both the leading eigenvector and the fixed point of the iteration. The convergence is then controlled by the *second* largest eigenvalue of $\tilde{A}\tilde{A}^T$. This proof approach echoes that of the global linear convergence result in Theorem 3, where we also exploit an orthogonality condition to obtain a meaningful bound. In Theorem 3 the bound depends on the second smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian, while in Theorem 5 the bound depends on the second largest eigenvalue of the Jacobian.

In the special case of $m = n$ and $p = q = \mathbf{1}$, the asymptotic rate in Theorem 5 reduces to that in Knight (2008). Note, however, that the convergence metric is different: we use the ℓ^2 norm

$\|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2$ while Knight (2008) uses an *implicit* norm that measures the convergence of D^0 to the solution *line* due to scale invariance. Our analysis exploits the orthogonality structure of Sinkhorn's algorithm and more explicitly reveals the dependence of the convergence rate on the spectral structure of the data.

Our results in this section are relevant in several respects. First, we clarify the gap between the $\mathcal{O}(1/t)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^t)$ convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm: the slowdown happens if and only if Sinkhorn's algorithm converges but the canonical matrix balancing problem does not have a *finite* scaling (D^0, D^1) . This slowdown has been observed in the literature but not systematically studied. Second, we settle open problems and establish the first quantitative global linear convergence result for Sinkhorn's algorithm applied to general non-negative matrices. We also characterize the asymptotic linear rate of convergence, generalizing the result of Knight (2008) but with a novel analysis. Third, our analysis reveals the importance of algebraic connectivity for the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm. Although an important quantity in the choice modeling literature, algebraic connectivity has not been previously used to in the analysis of Sinkhorn's algorithm. The importance of algebraic connectivity for Sinkhorn's algorithm becomes less surprising once we connect it to the distributed optimization literature in Appendix B, where it is well-known that the spectral gap of the *gossip* matrix, which defines the decentralized communication network, governs the rates of convergence.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we develop extensive connections between matrix balancing and the estimation of a broad class of choice models. In particular, many algorithms in choice modeling can be viewed as special cases or analogs of Sinkhorn's algorithm for matrix balancing. These connections benefit both disciplines. For choice modeling, they open the door to tools and insights from a rich research area in optimization and numerical linear algebra, potentially leading to new results on the estimation of choice models. For matrix balancing, the connections inspire us to resolve some long-standing open problems on the linear convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm for non-negative matrices, revealing the importance of algebraic connectivity and related spectral properties. Moreover, we propose regularization methods for Sinkhorn's algorithm inspired by works from choice modeling, in order to address existence and convergence issues for matrix balancing. We believe that the connections we establish in this paper are useful for researchers from both domains and can lead to further interesting results.

7. Acknowledgements

This work is supported in part by NSF CAREER Award #2143176. We are very grateful for insightful comments and suggestions from Serina Chang, Patrick Ding, Wenzhi Gao, Guido Imbens,

Süleyman Kerimov, Yongchan Kwon, Han Hong, Frederic Koehler, Pavel Shibayev, Ruoxuan Xiong, and Yinyu Ye.

References

- Agarwal A, Patil P, Agarwal S (2018) Accelerated spectral ranking. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 70–79.
- Altschuler J, Niles-Weed J, Rigollet P (2017) Near-linear time approximation algorithms for optimal transport via sinkhorn iteration. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30.
- Anderson JE, Van Wincoop E (2003) Gravity with gravitas: A solution to the border puzzle. *American economic review* 93(1):170–192.
- Arjovsky M, Chintala S, Bottou L (2017) Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. *International conference on machine learning*, 214–223 (PMLR).
- Bacharach M (1965) Estimating nonnegative matrices from marginal data. *International Economic Review* 6(3):294–310.
- Bacharach M (1970) *Biproportional matrices and input-output change*, volume 16 (CUP Archive).
- Balakrishnan H, Hwang I, Tomlin CJ (2004) Polynomial approximation algorithms for belief matrix maintenance in identity management. *2004 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)(IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37601)*, volume 5, 4874–4879 (IEEE).
- Balinski M, Pukelsheim F (2006) Matrices and politics .
- Batsell RR, Polking JC (1985) A new class of market share models. *Marketing Science* 4(3):177–198.
- Bauer FL (1963) Optimally scaled matrices. *Numerische Mathematik* 5(1):73–87.
- Beck A, Tetruashvili L (2013) On the convergence of block coordinate descent type methods. *SIAM journal on Optimization* 23(4):2037–2060.
- Berkson J (1944) Application of the logistic function to bio-assay. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 39(227):357–365.
- Berry S, Levinsohn J, Pakes A (1995) Automobile prices in market equilibrium. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 841–890.
- Bertsekas DP (1997) Nonlinear programming. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 48(3):334–334.
- Beurling A (1960) An automorphism of product measures. *Annals of Mathematics* 189–200.
- Birch M (1963) Maximum likelihood in three-way contingency tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 25(1):220–233.
- Bishop CM, Nasrabadi NM (2006) *Pattern recognition and machine learning*, volume 4 (Springer).
- Blanchet J, Gallego G, Goyal V (2016) A markov chain approximation to choice modeling. *Operations Research* 64(4):886–905.

- Blanchet J, Kang Y, Murthy K (2019) Robust wasserstein profile inference and applications to machine learning. *Journal of Applied Probability* 56(3):830–857.
- Bonnet O, Galichon A, Hsieh YW, O'hara K, Shum M (2022) Yogurts choose consumers? estimation of random-utility models via two-sided matching. *The Review of Economic Studies* 89(6):3085–3114.
- Boyd S, El Ghaoui L, Feron E, Balakrishnan V (1994) *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory* (SIAM).
- Boyd S, Ghosh A, Prabhakar B, Shah D (2006) Randomized gossip algorithms. *IEEE transactions on information theory* 52(6):2508–2530.
- Bradley AM (2010) *Algorithms for the equilibration of matrices and their application to limited-memory Quasi-Newton methods*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University Stanford University, CA.
- Bradley RA, Terry ME (1952) Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. the method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika* 39(3/4):324–345.
- Bregman LM (1967a) Proof of the convergence of sheleikhovskii's method for a problem with transportation constraints. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* 7(1):191–204.
- Bregman LM (1967b) The relaxation method of finding the common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming. *USSR computational mathematics and mathematical physics* 7(3):200–217.
- Brualdi RA (1968) Convex sets of non-negative matrices. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 20:144–157.
- Bushell PJ (1973) Hilbert's metric and positive contraction mappings in a banach space. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* 52:330–338.
- Carey M, Hendrickson C, Siddharthan K (1981) A method for direct estimation of origin/destination trip matrices. *Transportation Science* 15(1):32–49.
- Carlier G, Chernozhukov V, Galichon A (2016) Vector quantile regression: An optimal transport approach. *Annals of Statistics* 44(3):1165–1192.
- Carlier G, Dupuy A, Galichon A, Sun Y (2023) Sista: learning optimal transport costs under sparsity constraints. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 76(9):1659–1677.
- Caron F, Doucet A (2012) Efficient bayesian inference for generalized bradley–terry models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 21(1):174–196.
- Chakrabarty D, Khanna S (2021) Better and simpler error analysis of the sinkhorn–knopp algorithm for matrix scaling. *Mathematical Programming* 188(1):395–407.
- Chang S, Pierson E, Koh PW, Gerardin J, Redbird B, Grusky D, Leskovec J (2021) Mobility network models of covid-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature* 589(7840):82–87.
- Cottle RW, Duvall SG, Zikan K (1986) A lagrangean relaxation algorithm for the constrained matrix problem. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly* 33(1):55–76.

- Critchlow DE, Fligner MA, Verducci JS (1991) Probability models on rankings. *Journal of mathematical psychology* 35(3):294–318.
- Cuturi M (2013) Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26.
- Deming WE, Stephan FF (1940) On a least squares adjustment of a sampled frequency table when the expected marginal totals are known. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 11(4):427–444.
- Djoković D (1970) Note on nonnegative matrices. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 25(1):80–82.
- Dvurechensky P, Gasnikov A, Kroshnin A (2018) Computational optimal transport: Complexity by accelerated gradient descent is better than by sinkhorn's algorithm. *International conference on machine learning*, 1367–1376 (PMLR).
- Dwork C, Kumar R, Naor M, Sivakumar D (2001) Rank aggregation methods for the web. *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web*, 613–622 (ACM).
- Dykstra O (1956) A note on the rank analysis of incomplete block designs—applications beyond the scope of existing tables. *Biometrics* 12(3):301–306.
- Elo AE (1978) *The rating of chessplayers, past and present* (Arco Pub.).
- Esfahani PM, Kuhn D (2018) Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming* 171(1-2):115–166.
- Fiedler M (1973) Algebraic connectivity of graphs. *Czechoslovak mathematical journal* 23(2):298–305.
- Fienberg SE (1970) An iterative procedure for estimation in contingency tables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 41(3):907–917.
- Fofana I, Lemelin A, Cockburn J (2002) Balancing a social accounting matrix. *CREFA-Université Laval* .
- Ford LR (1957) Solution of a ranking problem from binary comparisons. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 64(8P2):28–33.
- Ford LR, Fulkerson DR (1956) Maximal flow through a network. *Canadian journal of Mathematics* 8:399–404.
- Ford LR, Fulkerson DR (1957) A simple algorithm for finding maximal network flows and an application to the hitchcock problem. *Canadian journal of Mathematics* 9:210–218.
- Fortet R (1940) Résolution d'un système d'équations de m. schrödinger. *J. Math. Pure Appl. IX* 1:83–105.
- Franklin J, Lorenz J (1989) On the scaling of multidimensional matrices. *Linear Algebra and its applications* 114:717–735.
- Friedland S (2017) On schrödinger's bridge problem. *Sbornik: Mathematics* 208(11):1705.
- Gale D, et al. (1957) A theorem on flows in networks. *Pacific J. Math* 7(2):1073–1082.

- Galichon A (2018) *Optimal transport methods in economics* (Princeton University Press).
- Galichon A (2021) The unreasonable effectiveness of optimal transport in economics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04700* .
- Galichon A, Salanié B (2021) Matching with trade-offs: Revealed preferences over competing characteristics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.12811* .
- Gao W, Ge D, Ye Y (2022) Hdsdp: Software for semidefinite programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.13862* .
- Georgiou TT, Pavon M (2015) Positive contraction mappings for classical and quantum schrödinger systems. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 56(3):033301.
- Good IJ (1963) Maximum entropy for hypothesis formulation, especially for multidimensional contingency tables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 34(3):911–934.
- Gurvits L (2004) Classical complexity and quantum entanglement. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 69(3):448–484.
- Hajek B, Oh S, Xu J (2014) Minimax-optimal inference from partial rankings. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1475–1483.
- Hall P (1935) On representatives of subsets. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 1(1):26–30.
- Hausman JA, Ruud PA (1987) Specifying and testing econometric models for rank-ordered data. *Journal of econometrics* 34(1-2):83–104.
- Hunter DR (2004) Mm algorithms for generalized bradley-terry models. *The annals of statistics* 32(1):384–406.
- Idel M (2016) A review of matrix scaling and sinkhorn's normal form for matrices and positive maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.06349* .
- Ireland CT, Kullback S (1968) Contingency tables with given marginals. *Biometrika* 55(1):179–188.
- Kalantari B, Lari I, Ricca F, Simeone B (2008) On the complexity of general matrix scaling and entropy minimization via the ras algorithm. *Mathematical Programming* 112(2):371–401.
- Kleinberg JM (1999) Authoritative sources in a hyperlinked environment. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* 46(5):604–632.
- Knight PA (2008) The sinkhorn–knopp algorithm: convergence and applications. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* 30(1):261–275.
- Knight PA, Ruiz D (2013) A fast algorithm for matrix balancing. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis* 33(3):1029–1047.
- Kruithof J (1937) Telefoonverkeersrekening. *De Ingenieur* 52:15–25.

- Kuhn D, Esfahani PM, Nguyen VA, Shafieezadeh-Abadeh S (2019) Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Theory and applications in machine learning. *Operations research & management science in the age of analytics*, 130–166 (Informs).
- Kullback S (1997) *Information theory and statistics* (Courier Corporation).
- Kumar R, Tomkins A, Vassilvitskii S, Vee E (2015) Inverting a steady-state. *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 359–368 (ACM).
- Lamond B, Stewart NF (1981) Bregman's balancing method. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 15(4):239–248.
- Landau E (1895) Zur relativen wertbemessung der turnierresultate. *Deutsches Wochensach* 11:366–369.
- Lange K (2016) *MM optimization algorithms* (SIAM).
- Lange K, Hunter DR, Yang I (2000) Optimization transfer using surrogate objective functions. *Journal of computational and graphical statistics* 9(1):1–20.
- Léger F (2021) A gradient descent perspective on sinkhorn. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization* 84(2):1843–1855.
- Leontief WW (1965) The structure of the us economy. *Scientific American* 212(4):25–35.
- Luce RD (1959) *Individual choice behavior: A theoretical analysis* (Wiley).
- Luenberger DG, Ye Y, et al. (1984) *Linear and nonlinear programming*, volume 2 (Springer).
- Luo ZQ, Tseng P (1992) On the convergence of the coordinate descent method for convex differentiable minimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 72(1):7–35.
- Maier S, Zachariassen P, Zachariassen M (2010) Divisor-based biproportional apportionment in electoral systems: A real-life benchmark study. *Management Science* 56(2):373–387.
- Maystre L, Grossglauser M (2015) Fast and accurate inference of plackett–luce models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 172–180.
- Maystre L, Grossglauser M (2017) Choicerank: identifying preferences from node traffic in networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2354–2362 (PMLR).
- McFadden D (1978) Modelling the choice of residential location. *Spatial interaction Theory and Planning Models* .
- McFadden D (1981) Econometric models of probabilistic choice. *Structural analysis of discrete data with econometric applications* 198272.
- McFadden D, Train K (2000) Mixed mnl models for discrete response. *Journal of applied Econometrics* 15(5):447–470.
- McFadden D, et al. (1973) Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior .

- Menon M (1968) Matrix links, an extremization problem, and the reduction of a non-negative matrix to one with prescribed row and column sums. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 20:225–232.
- Negahban S, Oh S, Shah D (2012) Iterative ranking from pair-wise comparisons. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2474–2482.
- Negahban S, Oh S, Shah D (2016) Rank centrality: Ranking from pairwise comparisons. *Operations Research* 65(1):266–287.
- Newman M (2023) Efficient computation of rankings from pairwise comparisons. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24(238):1–25.
- Nguyen S (1984) Estimating origin destination matrices from observed flows. *Publication of: Elsevier Science Publishers BV* .
- Noothigattu R, Peters D, Procaccia AD (2020) Axioms for learning from pairwise comparisons. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33:17745–17754.
- Page L, Brin S, Motwani R, Winograd T (1999) The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical report, Stanford InfoLab.
- Peyré G, Cuturi M, et al. (2019) Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* 11(5-6):355–607.
- Plackett RL (1975) The analysis of permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 24(2):193–202.
- Plane DA (1982) An information theoretic approach to the estimation of migration flows. *Journal of Regional Science* 22(4):441–456.
- Pukelsheim F (2006) Current issues of apportionment methods. *Mathematics and democracy: recent advances in voting systems and collective choice*, 167–176 (Springer).
- Pukelsheim F (2014) Biproportional scaling of matrices and the iterative proportional fitting procedure. *Annals of Operations Research* 215:269–283.
- Pukelsheim F, Simeone B (2009) On the iterative proportional fitting procedure: Structure of accumulation points and l1-error analysis .
- Pyatt G, Round JI (1985) Social accounting matrices: A basis for planning. (*No Title*) .
- Qu Z, Gao W, Hinder O, Ye Y, Zhou Z (2022) Optimal diagonal preconditioning: Theory and practice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00809* .
- Ragain S, Ugander J (2016) Pairwise choice markov chains. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 3198–3206.
- Rajkumar A, Agarwal S (2014) A statistical convergence perspective of algorithms for rank aggregation from pairwise data. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 118–126.

- Ruiz D (2001) A scaling algorithm to equilibrate both rows and columns norms in matrices. Technical report, CM-P00040415.
- Ruschendorf L (1995) Convergence of the iterative proportional fitting procedure. *The Annals of Statistics* 1160–1174.
- Schneider MH, Zenios SA (1990) A comparative study of algorithms for matrix balancing. *Operations research* 38(3):439–455.
- Schrödinger E (1931) Über die umkehrung der naturgesetze. *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, physikalisch-mathematische Klasse* 8(9):144–153.
- Seshadri A, Ragain S, Ugander J (2020) Learning rich rankings. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33:9435–9446.
- Shah N, Balakrishnan S, Bradley J, Parekh A, Ramchandran K, Wainwright M (2015) Estimation from pairwise comparisons: Sharp minimax bounds with topology dependence. *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, 856–865 (PMLR).
- Sheffi Y (1985) *Urban transportation networks*, volume 6 (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).
- Silva JS, Tenreyro S (2006) The log of gravity. *The Review of Economics and statistics* 88(4):641–658.
- Sinkhorn R (1964) A relationship between arbitrary positive matrices and doubly stochastic matrices. *The annals of mathematical statistics* 35(2):876–879.
- Sinkhorn R (1967) Diagonal equivalence to matrices with prescribed row and column sums. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 74(4):402–405.
- Sinkhorn R (1974) Diagonal equivalence to matrices with prescribed row and column sums. ii. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 45(2):195–198.
- Sinkhorn R, Knopp P (1967) Concerning nonnegative matrices and doubly stochastic matrices. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 21(2):343–348.
- Soufiani HA, Chen W, Parkes DC, Xia L (2013) Generalized method-of-moments for rank aggregation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2706–2714.
- Soules GW (1991) The rate of convergence of sinkhorn balancing. *Linear algebra and its applications* 150:3–40.
- Spielman DA (2007) Spectral graph theory and its applications. *48th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'07)*, 29–38 (IEEE).
- Stellato B, Banjac G, Goulart P, Bemporad A, Boyd S (2020) Osqp: An operator splitting solver for quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation* 12(4):637–672.
- Stone R (1962) Multiple classifications in social accounting. *Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique* 39(3):215–233.

- Stone R, Brown A (1971) *A computable model of economic growth*.
- Theil H (1967) *Economics and information theory. (No Title)* .
- Theil H, Rey G (1966) A quadratic programming approach to the estimation of transition probabilities. *Management Science* 12(9):714–721.
- Thionet P (1964) Note sur le remplissage d'un tableau à double entrée. *Journal de la société française de statistique* 105:228–247.
- Thurstone LL (1927) The method of paired comparisons for social values. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 21(4):384.
- Tomlin JA (2003) A new paradigm for ranking pages on the world wide web. *Proceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web*, 350–355.
- Tseng P, Bertsekas DP (1987) Relaxation methods for problems with strictly convex separable costs and linear constraints. *Mathematical Programming* 38(3):303–321.
- Tversky A (1972) Elimination by aspects: A theory of choice. *Psychological review* 79(4):281.
- Uribe P, De Leeuw C, Theil H (1966) The information approach to the prediction of interregional trade flows. *The Review of Economic Studies* 33(3):209–220.
- Villani C, et al. (2009) *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338 (Springer).
- Vojnovic M, Yun S (2016) Parameter estimation for generalized thurstone choice models. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 498–506 (PMLR).
- Vojnovic M, Yun SY, Zhou K (2020) Convergence rates of gradient descent and mm algorithms for bradley-terry models. *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 1254–1264 (PMLR).
- Wilson AG (1969) The use of entropy maximising models, in the theory of trip distribution, mode split and route split. *Journal of transport economics and policy* 108–126.
- Xiao L, Boyd S, Kim SJ (2007) Distributed average consensus with least-mean-square deviation. *Journal of parallel and distributed computing* 67(1):33–46.
- Yule GU (1912) On the methods of measuring association between two attributes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 75(6):579–652.
- Zermelo E (1929) Die berechnung der turnier-ergebnisse als ein maximumproblem der wahrscheinlichkeit-srechnung. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 29(1):436–460.

Appendix A: Graph Laplacians and Algebraic Connectivity

In this section, we introduce the quantities central to our global linear convergence analysis, especially the *graph Laplacian* matrices associated with the graphs defined by a non-negative matrix A and the Fielder eigenvalues.

Given a non-negative matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n \times m}$, we define the associated (weighted) bipartite graph G_b on $V \cup U$ by the adjacency matrix $A^b \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)}$ defined as

$$A^b := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & A \\ A^T & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rows of A correspond to vertices in V with $|V| = n$, while the columns of A correspond to vertices in U with $|U| = m$, and $V \cap U = \emptyset$. The matrix A here is sometimes called the *biadjacency matrix* of the bipartite graph.

The matrix A also defines an *undirected* “comparison” graph G_c on m items. This is most easily understood when A is binary and we can associate it with the participation matrix of a choice dataset, but the definition below is more general. Define the adjacency matrix $A^c \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ by

$$A^c_{jj'} = \begin{cases} 0 & j = j' \\ (A^T A)_{jj'} & j \neq j', \end{cases}$$

If A is a binary participation matrix associated with a choice dataset, then there is a (weighted) edge in G_c between items j and j' if and only the two appear in some choice set together, with the edge weight equal to the number of times of their co-occurrence. This undirected comparison graph G_c is not the same as the directed comparison graph in Assumption 1, since it does not encode the *choice* of each observation. However, it is also an important object in choice modeling. For example, the uniqueness condition in Assumption 2 for choice maximum likelihood estimation has a concise graph-theoretic interpretation as it is a requirement that G_c be connected.

For a (generic) undirected graph G with adjacency matrix M , the graph Laplacian matrix (or simply the Laplacian) is defined as $L(M) := \mathcal{D}(M\mathbf{1}) - M$, where recall \mathcal{D} is the diagonalization of a vector. The graph Laplacian $L(M)$ is always positive semidefinite as a result of the Gershgorin circle theorem, since $L(M)$ is diagonally dominant with positive diagonal and non-positive off-diagonals. Moreover, the Laplacian always has $\mathbf{1}$ in its null space.

For the graphs G_b, G_c , their Laplacians are given respectively by

$$\mathcal{L} := L(A^b) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(A\mathbf{1}_m) & -A \\ -A^T & \mathcal{D}(A^T\mathbf{1}_n) \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

$$L := L(A^c) = A^T A \mathbf{1}_m - A^T A, \quad (21)$$

where we can verify that for the comparison graph G_c , its Laplacian L satisfies

$$L = A^c \mathbf{1}_m - A^c = A^T A \mathbf{1}_m - A^T A.$$

The graph Laplacian \mathcal{L} based on A^b and L based on A^c are closely connected through the identity

$$(A^b)^2 = \begin{bmatrix} AA^T & 0 \\ 0 & A^T A \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that L is the lower right block of the graph Laplacian $\mathcal{D}((A^b)^2 \mathbf{1}_{m+n}) - (A^b)^2$. Moreover, L plays a central role in works on the statistical and computational efficiency in choice modeling (Shah et al. 2015, Seshadri et al. 2020, Vojnovic et al. 2020).

An important concept in spectral graph theory is the *algebraic connectivity* of a graph, quantified by the second smallest eigenvalue λ_{-2} of the graph Laplacian matrix, also called the Fiedler eigenvalue (Fiedler 1973, Spielman 2007). Intuitively, Fiedler eigenvalue quantifies how well-connected a graph is in terms of how many edges need to be removed for the graph to become disconnected. It is well-known that the multiplicity of the smallest eigenvalue of the graph Laplacian, which is 0, describes the number of connected components of a graph. The uniqueness condition for matrix balancing in Assumption 4 therefore guarantees that the Fiedler eigenvalue of G_b is positive: $\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L}) > 0$. This property is important for our results, since $\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$ quantifies the *strong* convexity of the potential function and hence the linear convergence rate of Sinkhorn’s algorithm.

Appendix B: Further Connections to Choice Modeling and Optimization

In this section, we demonstrate that our matrix balancing formulation (10) of the maximum likelihood problem (4) provides a unifying perspective on many existing works on choice modeling, and establishes interesting connections to distributed optimization as well. Throughout, Sinkhorn’s algorithm will serve as the connecting thread. In particular, it reduces algebraically to the algorithms in Zermelo (1929), Dykstra (1956), Ford (1957), Hunter (2004), Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) in their respective choice model settings. This motivates us to provide an interpretation of Sinkhorn’s algorithm as a “minorization-maximization” (MM) algorithm (Lange et al. 2000). Moreover, Sinkhorn’s Algorithm is also related to the ASR algorithm of Agarwal et al. (2018) for choice modeling, as they can both be viewed as message passing algorithms in distributed optimization (Balakrishnan et al. 2004). Last but not least, we establish a connection between Sinkhorn’s algorithm and the well-known BLP algorithm of Berry et al. (1995), widely used in economics to estimate consumer preferences from data on market shares.

B.1. Pairwise Comparisons

The same algorithmic idea in many works on pairwise comparisons appeared as early as Zermelo (1929). For example, Dykstra (1956) gives the following update formula:

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = W_j / \sum_{j \neq k} \frac{C_{jk}}{s_j^{(t)} + s_k^{(t)}}, \quad (22)$$

where again $W_j = |\{i \mid (j, S_i)\}|$ is the number of times item j is chosen (or “wins”), and C_{jk} is the number of comparisons between j and k . Assumption 1 guarantees $C_{jk} > 0$ for any j, k . Zermelo (1929) proved that under this assumption $s^{(1)}, s^{(2)}, \dots$ converge to the unique maximum likelihood estimator, and the sequence of log-likelihoods $\ell(s^{(1)}), \ell(s^{(2)}), \dots$ is monotone increasing. A cyclic version of (22) appeared in Ford (1957) with an independent proof of convergence. One can verify that by aggregating choice sets S_i in (11) over pairs of objects, it reduces to (22). However, (22) as is written does not admit a matrix balancing formulation. A generalization of the algorithm of Zermelo (1929), Ford (1957), Dykstra (1956) for pairwise comparison to ranking data was not achieved until the influential works of Lange et al. (2000) and Hunter (2004).

B.2. MM Algorithm of Hunter (2004) for Ranking Data

Motivated by the observation in Lange et al. (2000) that (22) is an instance of an minorization-maximization (MM) algorithm, the seminal work of Hunter (2004) proposed the general approach of solving ML estimation of choice models via MM algorithms, which relies on the inequality

$$-\log x \geq 1 - \log y - (x/y)$$

to construct a lower bound (minorization) on the log-likelihood that has an explicit maximizer (maximization), and iterates between the two steps. Hunter (2004) develops such an algorithm for the Plackett–Luce model for ranking data and proves its monotonicity and convergence.

Given n partial rankings, where the i -th partial ranking on l_i objects is indexed by $a(i, 1) \rightarrow a(i, 2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a(i, l_i)$, the MM algorithm of Hunter (2004) takes the form

$$s_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{w_k}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i-1} \delta_{ijk} [\sum_{j'=j}^{l_i} s_{a(i,j')}^{(t)}]^{-1}}, \quad (23)$$

where δ_{ijk} is the indicator that item k ranks no better than the j -th ranked item in the i -th ranking, and w_k is the number of rankings in which k appears but is not ranked last.

PROPOSITION 1. *Sinkhorn's algorithm applied to the ML estimation of the Plackett–Luce model is algebraically equivalent to (23).*

Therefore, Sinkhorn's algorithm applied to the ML estimation of the Plackett–Luce model reduces algebraically to the MM algorithm of Hunter (2004). However, Algorithm 1 applies to more general choice models with minimal or no change, while the approach in Hunter (2004) requires deriving the minorization-majorization step for every new optimization objective. This was carried out, for example, in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) for a network choice model. We show in Proposition 2 that their ChoiceR-rank algorithm is also a special case of (regularized) Sinkhorn's algorithm. From a computational perspective, even when algorithms are equivalent algebraically, their empirical performance can vary drastically depending on the particular implementation. Another advantage of Sinkhorn's algorithm is that it computes *all* entries simultaneously through vector and matrix operations, while the analytical formula in (23) is hard to parallelize. This distinction is likely behind the discrepancy in Appendix E between our experiments and those in Maystre and Grossglauser (2015), who conclude that the MM version (23) is slower in terms of wall clock time than their Iterative Luce Spectral Ranking (I-LSR) algorithm for the Plackett–Luce model on k -way partial ranking data.

B.3. Markov Steady State Inversion and Network Choice

Our work is related to the works of Kumar et al. (2015), Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) on Markov chains on graphs, where transition matrices are parameterized by node-dependent scores prescribed by Luce's choice axiom. More precisely, given a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ and $N_j^{\text{out}}, N_j^{\text{in}} \subseteq V$ the neighbors with edges going out from and into $j \in V$, and a target stationary distribution π , the (unweighted) steady state inversion problem of Kumar et al. (2015) seeks scores s_j such that the transition matrix $T_{j,k} = \frac{s_k}{\sum_{k' \in N_j^{\text{out}}} s_{k'}}$ has the desired stationary distribution π . Their Theorem 13 shows that a bipartite version of this problem is

equivalent to solving the ML estimation conditions (6) of the choice model. Furthermore, one can verify that their bipartite inversion problem has the same form as (8) in our paper, with the bipartite graph defined using A . Their existence condition (termed “consistency”) is equivalent to Assumption 5(a) (Menon 1968) for the matrix balancing problem. Despite these connections, the key difference in our work is the reformulation of (6) as one involving diagonal scalings of rows and columns of A , which was absent in Kumar et al. (2015). Consequently, they proposed a different algorithm instead of applying Sinkhorn’s algorithm.

Building on Kumar et al. (2015), Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) consider a similar Markov chain on (V, E) , where now for each edge $(j, k) \in E$ one observes a finite number c_{jk} of transitions along it, and take a maximum likelihood approach to estimate the scores s_j . They show that, as one might expect, the steady state inversion problem of Kumar et al. (2015) is the asymptotic version of the ML estimation problem in their network choice model.

An additional contribution of Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) is the regularization of the inference problem via a Gamma prior on s_j ’s, which eliminates the necessity of any assumptions on the choice dataset such as Assumption 1. They then follow the proposal of Hunter (2004) and develop an MM algorithm for maximum likelihood estimation called ChoiceRank, the unregularized version of which can be written as follows:

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{c_j^{\text{in}}}{\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} \gamma_k^{(t)}}, \gamma_j^{(t)} = \frac{c_j^{\text{out}}}{\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{out}}} s_k^{(t)}}, \quad (24)$$

where $c_j^{\text{in}} = \sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} c_{kj}$ and $c_j^{\text{out}} = \sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{out}}} c_{jk}$ are the total number of observed transitions into and out of $j \in V$.

PROPOSITION 2. *The network choice model of Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) is a special case of the choice model (3), and Sinkhorn’s algorithm applied to this case reduces to an iteration algebraically equivalent to (24).*

We also explore the regularization approach of Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) in Appendix C and demonstrate that Sinkhorn’s algorithm can easily accommodate this extension, resulting in a regularized version of Sinkhorn’s algorithm for matrix balancing that *always* converges. This is given in Algorithm 3. Once again, insights from choice modeling yield useful improvements in matrix balancing.

B.4. Sinkhorn’s Algorithm as an MM Algorithm

That Sinkhorn’s algorithm reduces to MM algorithms when applied to various choice models is not a coincidence. In this section, we establish the connection between choice modeling and matrix balancing through an optimization perspective. This connection provides an interesting interpretation of Sinkhorn’s algorithm as optimizing a dominating function, i.e., an MM algorithm. See Lange et al. (2000), Lange (2016) for a discussion of the general correspondence between block coordinate descent algorithms and MM algorithms.

First, we discuss the connection between the log-likelihood function (4) and the dual potential function (13) when (A, p, q) corresponds to a choice dataset. Consider maximizing the negative dual potential function

$$h(d^0, d^1) := -g(d^0, d^1) = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log d_i^1 - (d^1)^T A d^0.$$

For each fixed d^0 , the function is concave in d^1 , and maximization with respect to d^1 yields first order conditions

$$d^1 = p/(Ad^0).$$

Substituting this back into $h(d^0, d^1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(d^0) &:= h(d^0, p/(Ad^0)) = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log \left(\frac{p_i}{(Ad^0)_i} \right) - \sum_i p_i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log (Ad^0)_i + \sum_i p_i \log p_i - \sum_i p_i. \end{aligned}$$

If A is a valid participation matrix for a choice dataset and p, q are integers, we can identify (A, p, q) with a choice dataset. Each row of the participation matrix A is the indicator vector of choice set S_i , and d_j^0 is the quality score. In this case $(Ad^0)_i = \sum_{k \in S_i} d_k^0$, so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log (Ad^0)_i = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \sum_{k \in S_i} d_k^0 = \ell(d^0).$$

It then follows that

$$\min_{d^0, d^1} g(d^0, d^1) \Leftrightarrow \max_{d^0, d^1} h(d^0, d^1) \Leftrightarrow \max_{d^0} \max_{d^1} h(d^0, d^1) \Leftrightarrow \max_{d^0} f(d^0) \Leftrightarrow \max_{d^0} \ell(d^0),$$

so that minimizing the potential function g is equivalent to maximizing the log-likelihood function ℓ . Moreover, the first order condition of maximizing h with respect to d^1 is $d^0 = q/(A^T d^1)$, which when (A, p, q) is identified with a choice dataset reduces to

$$q_j = \sum_{i|j \in S_i} p_i \frac{d_j^0}{\sum_{k \in S_i} d_k^0},$$

which is the optimality condition (6) of the choice model.

Next, given $d^{0(t)}$ the estimate of d^0 after the t -th iteration, define the function

$$f(d^0 | d^{0(t)}) := h(d^0, p/(Ad^{0(t)})) = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log \frac{p}{Ad^{0(t)}} - \frac{p_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i} (Ad^0)_i.$$

We can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} f(d^{0(t)} | d^{0(t)}) &= f(d^{0(t)}) \\ f(d^0 | d^{0(t)}) &\leq f(d^0), \end{aligned}$$

so that $f(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ is a valid minorizing function of $f(d^0)$ (Lange et al. 2000) that guarantees the ascent property $f(d^{0(t+1)}) \geq f(d^{0(t+1)} | d^{0(t)}) = \max_{d^0} f(d^0 | d^{0(t)}) \geq f(d^{0(t)} | d^{0(t)}) = f(d^{0(t)})$. The update in the maximization step

$$d^{0(t+1)} = \arg \max_{d^0} f(d^0 | d^{0(t)}) = q/A^T \frac{p}{Ad^{0(t)}}$$

is precisely one full iteration of Sinkhorn's algorithm. Note that this interpretation of Sinkhorn's algorithm does not require A to be binary, and p, q to be integers.

On the other hand, using the property $-\ln x \geq 1 - \ln y - (x/y)$, we can *directly* construct a minorizing function of ℓ by

$$\ell(d^0) = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log(Ad^0)_i \geq \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \left(-\frac{(Ad^0)_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i} - \log(Ad^{0(t)})_i + 1 \right) = \ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)}),$$

where $\ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ is a valid minorizing function of ℓ . Maximizing $\ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ with respect to d^0 , the update in the maximization step is

$$d_j^{0(t+1)} = q_j / \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{p_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i}$$

which again is one full iteration of Sinkhorn's algorithm applied to the Luce choice model. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)}) + \sum_i p_i \log p_i - \sum_i p_i &= \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \left(-\frac{(Ad^0)_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i} - \log(Ad^{0(t)})_i + 1 \right) + \sum_i p_i \log p_i - \sum_i p_i \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m q_j \log d_j^0 + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \left(-\frac{(Ad^0)_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i} + \log \frac{p_i}{(Ad^{0(t)})_i} \right) \\ &= f(d^0 | d^{0(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the minorizing function $\ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ constructed using $-\ln x \geq 1 - \ln y - (x/y)$ for the log-likelihood and the minorizing function $f(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ constructed for $\max_{d^1} h(d^0, d^1)$ are identical modulo a constant $\sum_i p_i \log p_i - \sum_i p_i$. Sinkhorn's algorithm is in fact the MM algorithm corresponding to both minorizations. However, the perspective using $f(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ is more general since it applies to general (A, p, q) as long as they satisfy Assumption 3 and Assumption 4, whereas the MM algorithm based on $\ell(d^0 | d^{0(t)})$ is designed for choice dataset, so requires A to be binary.

B.5. Sinkhorn's Algorithm and Distributed Optimization

We now shift our focus to algorithms in distributed optimization, where Sinkhorn's algorithm can be interpreted as a message passing/belief propagation algorithm (Balakrishnan et al. 2004). We start by observing a connection to the ASR algorithm for estimating Luce choice models (Agarwal et al. 2018), which returns the same approximate ML estimators as the RC (Negahban et al. 2012) and LSR (Maystre and Grossglauser 2015) algorithms, but has provably faster convergence.

Consider the bipartite graph G_b defined by A in Appendix A, which consists of choice set nodes V on one hand and item nodes U on the other, where there is an edge between $i \in V$ and $j \in U$ if and only if $j \in S_i$. Agarwal et al. (2018) provide the following message passing interpretation of ASR on the bipartite graph: at every iteration, the item nodes send a "message" to their neighboring choice set nodes consisting of each item node's current estimate of their own s_j ; the choice set nodes then aggregate the messages they receive by summing up these estimates, and then sending back the sums to their neighboring item nodes. The item nodes use these sums to update estimates of their own s_j . Agarwal et al. (2018) show that since the ASR algorithm is an instance of the message passing algorithm, it can be implemented in a distributed manner.

We now explain how Sinkhorn's algorithm is another instance of the message passing algorithm described above. Recall that d^0 is identified with the s_j 's in the Luce choice model, so that $d^1 \leftarrow p/(Ad^0)$ precisely corresponds to item nodes "passing" their current estimates to set nodes, which then sum up the received

estimates and then take the weighted *inverse* of this sum. Similarly, $d^0 \leftarrow q/(A^T d^1)$ corresponds to choice set nodes passing their current estimates of d^1 back to item nodes, which then sum up the received messages and take the weighted inverse as their updated estimates of s_j . The main difference with ASR lies in how each item node j updates its estimate of s_j based on the messages it receives from neighboring set nodes. In Sinkhorn's algorithm, the update to s_j is achieved by dividing p by a weighted average of the *inverse* of summed messages $1/\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}$:

$$s_j^{(t+1)} \leftarrow q_j/(A^T d^1)_j = W_j / \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}},$$

whereas in ASR, the update is an average of the summed messages $\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}$ without taking their inverses first:

$$s_j^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sum_{i|j \in S_i} R_i} \sum_{i|j \in S_i} W_{ji} \sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)},$$

where W_{ji} is the number of times item j is selected from all observations having choice set S_i , with $\sum_i W_{ji} = W_j$.

From another perspective, the two algorithms arise from different *moment* conditions. While Sinkhorn's algorithm is based on the optimality condition (6), ASR is based on the condition

$$\sum_{i|j \in S_i} R_i = \sum_{i|j \in S_i} W_{ji} / \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k},$$

which results in an approximate instead of exact MLE.

The message passing interpretation also provides further insights on the importance of algebraic connectivity to the convergence rate of Sinkhorn's algorithm. Graph theoretic conditions like Assumption 1 are related to network flow and belief propagation, and characterize how fast information can be distributed across the bipartite network with the target distributions p, q . It is well-known that convergence of distributed algorithms on networks depends critically on the network topology through the spectral gap of the associated averaging matrix. We can understand Theorem 5 on the asymptotic convergence rate of Sinkhorn's algorithm as a result of this flavor, although a precise equivalence is left for future works.

B.6. The Berry–Levinsohn–Pakes Algorithm

Last but not least, our work is also closely related to the economics literature that studies consumer behavior based on discrete choices (McFadden et al. 1973, McFadden 1978, 1981, Berry et al. 1995). Here we discuss the particular connection with the work of Berry, Levinsohn, and Pakes Berry et al. (1995), often referred to as BLP. To estimate consumer preferences over automobiles across different markets (e.g., geographical), they propose a random utility (RUM) model indexed by individual i , product j , and market t :

$$U_{ijt} = \beta_i^T X_{jt} + \theta_{jt} + \epsilon_{ijt},$$

where θ_{jt} is an unobserved product characteristic, such as the overall popularity of certain types of cars in different regions, and ϵ_{ijt} are *i.i.d.* double exponential random variables. The individual-specific coefficient β_i is random with

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i &= Z_i^T \Gamma + \eta_i \\ \eta_i | Z_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\beta, \Sigma), \end{aligned}$$

and the observations consist of *market shares* \hat{p}_{jt} of each product j in market t and observable population characteristics Z_i in each market. Given a model with fixed β, Γ, Σ and observations, the task is to estimate θ_{jt} .

For every value of θ_{jt} , we can compute, or simulate if necessary, the *expected* market shares p_{jt} , which is the likelihood of product j being chosen in market t . For example, in the special case that $\beta, \Gamma, \Sigma \equiv 0$ and $\exp(\theta_{jt}) \equiv s_j$ for all j, t , i.e., (perceived) product characteristic does not vary across markets, the expected market share reduces to the familiar formula

$$p_{jt} = \frac{\exp(\theta_{jt})}{\sum_k \exp(\theta_{kt})} = \frac{s_j}{\sum_k s_k}.$$

The generalized method of moments (GMM) approach of Berry et al. (1995) is to find θ_{jt} such that $p_{jt} = \hat{p}_{jt}$, i.e., the implied expected market share equals the observed share. Recall the similarity to the optimality condition (6) of the Luce choice model. BLP propose the iteration

$$\theta_{jt}^{(m+1)} = \theta_{jt}^{(m)} + \log \hat{p}_{jt} - \log p_{jt}(\theta^{(m)}, \beta, \Gamma, \Sigma), \quad (25)$$

and show that it is a *contraction mapping*, whose fixed point is the desired estimates of θ_{jt} .

PROPOSITION 3. *When $\beta, \Gamma, \Sigma \equiv 0$ and $\exp(\theta_{jt}) \equiv s_j$, the GMM condition of BLP on market shares is equivalent to the optimality condition (6) for a Luce choice model where all alternatives are available in every observation. Furthermore, the BLP algorithm is equivalent to Sinkhorn's algorithm in this model.*

For a more detailed correspondence, see Bonnet et al. (2022). Importantly, Proposition 3 does not imply that the Luce choice model and Sinkhorn's algorithm is a strict special case of the BLP framework. The key difference is that BLP, and most discrete choice models in econometrics, implicitly assumes that the entire set of alternatives is always available in each observation. This assumption translates to a participation matrix A in (10) that has 1's in all entries. In this setting, the MLE of s_j is simply the empirical winning frequencies. On the other hand, while the Luce choice model allows different choice sets S_i across observations, they do not include covariate information on the alternatives or decision makers, which is important in discrete choice modeling. One can reconcile this difference by relabeling alternatives with different covariates as *distinct* items, and we leave investigations on further connections in this direction to future works.

Appendix C: Regularization of Luce Choice Models and Matrix Balancing Problems

In practice, many choice and ranking datasets may not satisfy Assumption 1, which is required for the maximum likelihood estimation to be well-posed. Equivalently, for the matrix balancing problem, when a triplet (A, p, q) does not satisfy Assumption 3 and Assumption 4, no finite scalings exist and Sinkhorn's algorithm may diverge. In this section, we discuss some regularization techniques to address these problems. They are easy to implement and require minimal modifications to Sinkhorn's algorithm. Nevertheless, they can be very useful in practice to regularize ill-posed problems. Given the equivalence between the problem of computing the MLE of Luce choice models and the problem of matrix balancing, our proposed regularization methods apply to both.

C.1. Regularization via Gamma Prior

As discussed in Section 3, for a choice dataset to have a well-defined maximum likelihood estimator, it needs to satisfy Assumption 1, which requires the directed comparison graph to be strongly connected. Although this condition is easy to verify, the question remains what one can do in case it does *not* hold. As one possibility, we may introduce a prior on the parameters s_j , which serves as a regularization of the log-likelihood that results in a unique maximizer. Many priors are possible. For example, Maystre and Grossglauser (2017), following Caron and Doucet (2012), use independent Gamma priors on s_j . In view of the fact that the unregularized problem and algorithm in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) is a special case of the Luce choice model and Sinkhorn's algorithm, we can also incorporate the Gamma prior to the Luce choice model (4) to address identification problems.

More precisely, suppose now that each s_j in the Luce choice model are i.i.d. $\text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta) \propto s_j^{\alpha-1} e^{-\beta s_j}$. This leads to the following regularized log-likelihood:

$$\ell^R(s) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log s_{j_i} - \log \sum_{k \in S_i} s_k + (\alpha - 1) \sum_{j=1}^m \log s_j - \beta \sum_{j=1}^m s_j. \quad (26)$$

The corresponding first order condition is given by

$$\frac{W_j + \alpha - 1}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i|j \in S_i} R_i \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k} + \beta s_j \right), \quad (27)$$

which leads to the following modified Sinkhorn's algorithm, which generalizes the ChoiceRank algorithm of Maystre and Grossglauser (2017):

$$d^0 \leftarrow (q + \alpha - 1)/(A^T d^1 + \beta), \quad d^1 \leftarrow p/Ad^0. \quad (28)$$

The choice of β determines the normalization of s_j . With $u_j = \log s_j$, we can show in a similar way as Theorem 2 of Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) that (26) always has a unique maximizer whenever $\alpha > 1$. Regarding the convergence, Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) remarked that since their ChoiceRank algorithm can be viewed as an MM algorithm, it inherits the local linear convergence of MM algorithms (Lange et al. 2000), but "a detailed investigation of convergence behavior is left for future works". With the insights we develop in this paper, we can in fact provide an explanation for the validity of the Gamma priors from an optimization perspective. This perspective allows us to conclude directly that (26) always has a unique solution in the interior of the probability simplex, and that furthermore the iteration in (28) has global linear convergence. Consider now the following regularized potential function

$$g^R(d^0, d^1) := ((d^1)^T A + \beta(\mathbf{1}_m)^T) d^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \log d_i^1 - \sum_{j=1}^m (q_j + \alpha - 1) \log d_j^0. \quad (29)$$

We can verify that by substituting the optimality condition of d^1 into $-g^R$, it reduces to the log posterior (26). Moreover, the iteration (28) is precisely the alternating minimization algorithm for g^R . When $\alpha - 1, \beta > 0$, the reparameterized potential function

$$\sum_{ij} (e^{-v_i} A_{ij} e^{u_j}) + \beta \sum_j e^{u_j} + \sum_i p_i v_i - \sum_j (q_j + \alpha - 1) u_j$$

Algorithm 3 Regularized Sinkhorn's Algorithm

Input: $A, p, q, \alpha > 1, \beta > 0, \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$.

initialize $d^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^m$

repeat

$d^1 \leftarrow p / (A d^0)$

$d^0 \leftarrow (q + \alpha - 1) / (A^T d^1 + \beta)$

$\epsilon \leftarrow \text{update of } (d^0, d^1)$

until $\epsilon < \epsilon_{\text{tol}}$

is always coercive regardless of whether Assumption 3 holds. Therefore, during the iterations (28), (u, v) stay *bounded*. Moreover, the Hessian is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sum_j e^{-v_i} A_{ij} e^{u_j} & -e^{-v_i} A_{ij} e^{u_j} \\ -e^{-v_i} A_{ij} e^{u_j} & \sum_i e^{-v_i} A_{ij} e^{u_j} + \beta e^{u_j} \end{bmatrix} \succ 0,$$

which is now positive definite. As a result, $g^R(u, v)$ is strongly convex and smooth, so that (28) converges linearly. From the perspective of the matrix balancing problem, we have thus obtained a regularized version of Sinkhorn's algorithm, summarized in Algorithm 3, which is guaranteed to converge linearly to a finite solution (D^1, D^0) , even when Assumption 3 does not hold for the triplet (A, p, q) . Moreover, the regularization also improves the convergence of Sinkhorn's algorithm even when it converges, as the regularized Hessian becomes more-behaved. This regularized algorithm could be very useful in practice to deal with real datasets that result in slow, divergent, or oscillating Sinkhorn iterations.

C.2. Regularization via Data Augmentation

The connection between Bayesian methods and *data augmentation* motivates us to also consider direct data augmentation methods. This is best illustrated in the choice modeling setting. Suppose for a choice dataset we construct participation matrix A , p the counts of distinct choice sets, and q the counts of each item being selected. We know that (A, p, q) has a finite scaling solution if and only if Assumption 1 holds, i.e., the directed comparison graph is strongly connected. We now propose the following modification of (A, p, q) such that the resulting problem is always valid.

First, if A does not already contain a row equal to $\mathbf{1}_m^T$, i.e., containing all 1's, add this additional row to A . Call the resulting matrix A' . Then, expanding the dimension of p if necessary, add $m\epsilon$ to the entry corresponding to $\mathbf{1}_m$, where we can assume for now that $\epsilon \geq 1$ is an integer. This procedure effectively adds $m\epsilon$ "observations" that contain all m items. For these additional observations, we let each item be selected exactly ϵ times. Luce's choice axiom guarantees that the exact choice of each artificial observation is irrelevant, and we just need to add $\epsilon \mathbf{1}_m$ to q . This represents augmenting each item with an additional ϵ "wins", resulting in the triplet $(A', p + (m\epsilon)\mathbf{e}, q + \epsilon \mathbf{1}_m)$, where \mathbf{e} is the one-hot indicator of the row $\mathbf{1}_m^T$ in A' . Now by construction, in any partition of $[m]$ into two non-empty subsets, any item from one subset is selected at least ϵ times over any item from the other subset. Therefore, Assumption 1 holds, and the maximum likelihood estimation problem, and equivalently the matrix balancing problem with $(A', p + (m\epsilon)\mathbf{e}, q + \epsilon \mathbf{1}_m)$,

is well-defined. This regularization method applies more generally to any non-negative A , even if it is not a participation matrix, i.e., binary. Although in the above construction based on choice dataset, ϵ is taken to be an integer, for the regularized matrix balancing problem with $(A', p + (m\epsilon)\mathbf{e}, q + \epsilon\mathbf{1}_m)$, we can let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Appendix D: Applications of Matrix Balancing

This section contains a brief survey on the applications of matrix balancing in a diverse range of disciplines.

Traffic and Transportation Networks. These applications are some of the earliest and most popular uses of matrix balancing. Kruithof (1937) considered the problem of estimating new telephone traffic patterns among telephone exchanges given existing traffic volumes and marginal densities of departing and terminating traffic for each exchange when their subscribers are updated. A closely related problem in transportation networks is to use observed *total* traffic flows out of each origin and into each destination to estimate *detailed* traffics between origin-destination pairs (Carey et al. 1981, Nguyen 1984, Sheffi 1985, Chang et al. 2021). The key idea is to find a traffic assignment satisfying the total flow constraints that is “close” to some known reference traffic pattern. The resulting (relative) entropy minimization principle, detailed in (12), is an important optimization perspective on Sinkhorn’s algorithm.

Demography. A problem similar to that in networks arises in demography. Given out-of-date inter-regional migration statistics and up-to-date net migrations from and into each region, the task is to estimate migration flows that are consistent with the marginal statistics (Plane 1982).

Economics. General equilibrium models in economics employ *social accounting matrices*, which record the flow of funds between important (aggregate) agents in an economy at different points in time (Stone 1962, Pyatt and Round 1985). Often accurate data is available on the total expenditure and receipts for each agent, but due to survey error or latency, detailed flows are not always consistent with these marginal statistics. Thus they need to be “adjusted” to satisfy consistency requirements. Other important applications of the matrix balancing problem in economics include the estimation of gravity equations in inter-regional and international trade (Uribe et al. 1966, Wilson 1969, Anderson and Van Wincoop 2003, Silva and Tenreyro 2006) and coefficient matrices in input-output models (Leontief 1965, Stone and Brown 1971, Bacharach 1970). In recent years, optimal transport (Villani et al. 2009) has found great success in economics (Carlier et al. 2016, Galichon 2018, 2021, Galichon and Salanié 2021). As matrix balancing and Sinkhorn’s algorithm are closely connected to optimal transport (Section 5), they are likely to have more applications in economics.

Statistics. A contingency table encodes frequencies of subgroups of populations, where the rows and columns correspond to values of two categorical variables, such as gender and age. Similar to social accounting matrices, a common problem is to adjust out-of-date or inaccurate cell values of a table given accurate marginal frequencies. The problem is first studied by Deming and Stephan (1940), who proposed the classic iterative algorithm. Ireland and Kullback (1968) formalized its underlying entropy optimization principle, and Fienberg (1970) analyzed its convergence.

Optimization and Machine Learning. Matrix balancing plays a different but equally important role in optimization. Given a linear system $Ax = b$ with non-singular A , it is well-known that the convergence of first order solution methods depends on the *condition number* of A , and an important problem is to find diagonal *preconditioners* D^1, D^0 such that D^1AD^0 has smaller condition number. Although it is possible

to find optimal diagonal preconditioners via semidefinite programming (Boyd et al. 1994, Qu et al. 2022), matrix balancing methods remain very attractive heuristics due to their low computational costs, and continue to be an important component of modern workhorse optimization solvers (Ruiz 2001, Bradley 2010, Knight and Ruiz 2013, Stellato et al. 2020, Gao et al. 2022).

In recent years, optimal transport distances have become an important tool in machine learning and optimization for measuring the similarity between probability distributions (Arjovsky et al. 2017, Peyré et al. 2019, Blanchet et al. 2019, Esfahani and Kuhn 2018, Kuhn et al. 2019). Besides appealing theoretical properties, efficient methods to approximate them in practice have also contributed to their wide adoption. This is achieved through an entropic regularization of the OT problem, which is precisely equivalent to the matrix balancing problem and solved via Sinkhorn’s algorithm (Cuturi 2013, Altschuler et al. 2017, Dvurechensky et al. 2018).

Political Representation. The apportionment of representation seats based on election results has found unexpected solution in matrix balancing. A standard example consists of the matrix recording the votes each party received from different regions. The marginal constraints are that each party’s total number of seats be proportional to the number of votes they receive, and similar for each region. A distinct feature of this problem is that the final apportionment matrix must have integer values, and variants of the standard algorithm that incorporate *rounding* have been proposed (Balinski and Pukelsheim 2006, Pukelsheim 2006, Maier et al. 2010). More than just mathematical gadgets, they have found real-world implementations in Swiss cities such as Zurich (Pukelsheim and Simeone 2009).

Markov Chains. Last but not least, Markov chains and related topics offer another rich set of applications for matrix balancing. Schrödinger (1931) considered a continuous version of the following problem. Given a “prior” transition matrix A of a Markov chain and *observed* distributions p^0, p^1 before and after the transition, find the most probable transition matrix (or path) \hat{A} that satisfies $\hat{A}p^0 = p^1$. This is a variant of the matrix balancing problem and has been studied and generalized in a long line of works (Fortet 1940, Beurling 1960, Ruschendorf 1995, Gurvits 2004, Georgiou and Pavon 2015, Friedland 2017). Applications in marketing estimate customers’ transition probabilities between different brands using market share data (Theil and Rey 1966). Coming full circle back to choice modeling, matrix balancing has also been used to rank nodes of a network. Knight (2008) explains how the inverses of left and right scalings of the adjacency matrix with uniform target marginals (stationary distributions) can be naturally interpreted as measures of their ability to attract and emit traffic. This approach is also related to the works of Lamond and Stewart (1981), Kleinberg (1999), Tomlin (2003).

Appendix E: Numerical Experiments

We compare the empirical performance of Sinkhorn’s algorithm with the iterative LSR (I-LSR) algorithm of Maystre and Grossglauser (2015) on real choice datasets. Because the implementation of I-LSR by Maystre and Grossglauser (2015) only accommodates pairwise comparison data and partial ranking data, but does not easily generalize to multi-way choice data, we focus on data with pairwise comparisons.

We use the natural parameters $\log s_j$ (logits) instead of s_j when computing and evaluating the updates, as the probability of j winning over k is proportional to the ratio s_j/s_k , so that s_j are usually logarithmically

dataset	data type	items	observations	k	Sinkhorn		I-LSR	
					iterations	time	iterations	time
NASCAR	k -way ranking	83	36	43	20	0.029	13	0.960
SUSHI-10	k -way ranking	10	5000	10	16	0.025	8	1.708
SUSHI-100	k -way ranking	100	5000	10	21	0.253	9	2.142
Youtube	pairwise comparison	2156	28134	2	89	7.984	33	15.026
GIFGIF	pairwise comparison	2503	6876	2	1656	30.97	315	138.63

Table 2 Performance of iterative ML inference algorithms on five real datasets. Youtube and GIFGIF data were subsampled. Convergence is declared when the maximum entry-wise change of an update is less than 10^{-8} . At convergence, the ML estimates returned by the algorithms have entry-wise difference of at most 10^{-10} .

spaced. To make sure that estimates are normalized, we impose the normalization that $\sum_j s_j = m$, the number of objects, at the end of each iteration, although due to the logarithm scale of the convergence criterion, the choice of normalization does not seem to significantly affect the performances of the algorithms.

We evaluate the algorithms on five real-world datasets consisting of partial ranking or pairwise comparison data. The NASCAR dataset consists of ranking results of the 2002 season NASCAR races. The SUSHI datasets consist of rankings of sushi items. The Youtube dataset consists of pairwise comparisons between videos and which one was considered more entertaining by users. The GIFGIF dataset similarly consists of pairwise comparisons of GIFs that are rated based on which one is closer to describing a specific sentiment, such as happiness and anger. We downsampled the Youtube and GIFGIF datasets due to memory constraints.

In Table 2 we report the running time of the three algorithms on different datasets. Convergence is declared when the maximum entry-wise change of an update to the natural parameters $\log s_i$ is less than 10^{-8} . At convergence, the MLEs returned by the algorithms have entry-wise difference of at most 10^{-10} . We see that Sinkhorn’s algorithm consistently outperforms the I-LSR algorithm in terms of convergence speed. It also has the additional advantage of being parallelized with elementary matrix-vector operations, whereas the iterative I-LSR algorithm needs to repeatedly compute the steady-state of a continuous-time Markov chain, which is prone to problems of ill-conditioning. This also explains why Sinkhorn’s algorithm may take more iterations but has better wall clock time, since each iteration is much less costly. On the other hand, we note that for large datasets, particularly those with a large number of observations or alternatives, the dimension of A used may become too large for the memory of a single machine. If this is still a problem after removing duplicate rows and columns according to Section 4, we can use distributed implementations of Sinkhorn’s algorithm, which in view of its connections to message passing algorithms, is a standard procedure.

Appendix F: Proofs

F.1. Proof of Theorem 1

By construction, any normalized s_j solving the optimality conditions in (6) satisfy the matrix equations in (10). It remains to show that a solution to (10) uniquely determines a solution to (6). Suppose two positive diagonal matrices D^0 and D^1 satisfy Equations (7) and (9), i.e., $D^1 A D^0 \mathbf{1}_m = p$. Since the i -th row of A is the indicator of the choice set S_i , we must have

$$D_j^0 = d_j$$

$$D_i^1 = \frac{p_i}{\sum_{k \in S_i} d_k},$$

for some positive d_j 's. The condition in (8) that $\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_m = q$ then implies

$$\begin{aligned} q_j &= (D^0 A^T D^1 \mathbf{1}_m)_j \\ &= \sum_{i|j \in S_i} p_i \frac{d_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} d_k}, \end{aligned}$$

so that d_j 's, the diagonal entries of D^0 , satisfy the optimality condition (6) of the maximum likelihood estimation problem of Luce choice models. \square

F.2. Proof of Theorem 2

First, we can verify that Assumption 2 is equivalent to the uniqueness condition Assumption 4 of the matrix balancing problem, namely the participation matrix A is not permutation equivalent to a block-diagonal matrix.

Now we prove that for the triplet (A, p, q) constructed from the choice dataset, Assumption 1 on the choice dataset is equivalent to Assumption 3 combined with Assumption 4 when p, q are strictly positive. Consider an arbitrary pair of sets of indices $N \subsetneq [n]$ and $M \subsetneq [m]$ such that $A_{ij} = 0$ for $i \notin N$ and $j \in M$. In the choice problem this condition implies that items in M only appear in choice sets index by N . Then Assumption 1 implies that there is at least one item $k \notin M$ that is chosen over some item $j \in M$, which means items in M are not always selected in observations with choice sets indexed by N , i.e., $\sum_{i \in N} p_i > \sum_{j \in M} q_j$. Moreover, Assumption 1 implies Assumption 2, which is equivalent to Assumption 4, so we have shown that Assumption 1 implies Assumption 3 and Assumption 4.

The converse direction is slightly less obvious. Suppose the (A, p^0, p^1) constructed from a choice dataset satisfies Assumptions 3 and 4. In the choice dataset, consider an arbitrary partition of $[m]$ into M and M^C . There are two cases to consider. First, suppose items in M do not appear in all choice sets, i.e., there exists $N \subsetneq [n]$ such that $A_{ij} = 0$ for $i \notin N$ and $j \in M$. Then Assumption 3 of the matrix balancing problem implies $\sum_{i \in N} p_i^0 > \sum_{j \in M} p_j^1$, i.e., some item $k \in M^C$ is selected over some item $j \in M$, which is what Assumption 1 requires. Second, suppose that every choice set contains least one item in M . Then the fact that $q > 0$ implies that $q_k > 0$ for any $k \in M^C$, i.e., at least some item $k \in M^C$ is selected over some item $j \in M$, which is again the condition in Assumption 1. We have thus shown that there is some $k \in M^C$ that is chosen over some $j \in M$, and similarly vice versa, as required by Assumption 1. \square

F.3. Proof of Theorem 3

Suppose first that Sinkhorn's algorithm is normalized at each iteration as in Algorithm 2. We will prove the linear convergence result first for this normalized version. Since the objective value is *invariant* under normalization, the result automatically carries over to the original Sinkhorn's algorithm.

Outline of Proof. I. We show that $g(u, v)$ is coercive on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ under Assumption 3, which then guarantees that normalized iterates $(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})$ stay bounded. **II.** The next step is to study the Hessian of $g(u, v)$ on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$. The key observation is that the Hessian $\nabla^2 g(0, 0)$ is the Laplacian matrix \mathcal{L} . The boundedness of normalized iterates $(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})$ then allows us to bound $\nabla^2 g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})$. **III.** Given the (restricted) strong convexity and

smoothness of $g(u, v)$, the linear convergence rate of normalized Sinkhorn's algorithm can then be concluded by applying the result of Beck and Tetruashvili (2013) on the linear convergence of alternating minimization methods. **IV.** Lastly, we apply Pinsker's inequality to convert the linear convergence of the optimality gap into a bound on the ℓ^1 distance.

I. Recall the reparameterized potential function, for which Sinkhorn's algorithm is the alternating minimization algorithm:

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m, v \in \mathbb{R}^n} g(u, v) := \sum_{ij} A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} + \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i - \sum_{j=1}^m q_j u_j.$$

First, we show that $g(u, v)$ is coercive on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$, i.e., $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$ if $(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ and $\|(u, v)\| \rightarrow \infty$, whenever Assumption 3 and Assumption 4 are satisfied.¹ There are several cases.

1. If $u_j \rightarrow +\infty$ for some j but all v_i stay bounded from above, then since A does not contain zero columns or rows, the term $\sum_{ij} A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j}$ dominates, so $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$.
2. Similarly, if some $v_i \rightarrow -\infty$ but all u_j stay bounded from below, the term $\sum_{ij} A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j}$ dominates, so $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$.
3. If $u_j \rightarrow -\infty$ for some j but all v_i stay bounded from below, the term $-\sum_{j=1}^m q_j u_j$ dominates, so $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$.
4. Similarly, if $v_i \rightarrow +\infty$ for some i but all u_j stay bounded from above, the term $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i$ dominates, so $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$.
5. Suppose now $v_i, u_j \rightarrow +\infty$ for some i, j . Then the subsets

$$I := \{i : v_i \rightarrow +\infty\}, \quad J := \{j : u_j \rightarrow +\infty\}.$$

are both non-empty. Now either the exponential terms or the linear terms could dominate. If $u_j - v_i \rightarrow +\infty$ for some $i \in I, j \in J$, then one of the exponential terms dominates and $g(u, v) \rightarrow +\infty$. Otherwise, $-\min_{i \in I} v_i + \max_{j \in J} u_j$ stay bounded above, and the sum $\sum_{i \in I, j \in J} A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j}$ over I, J stays bounded. There are now two sub-cases.

- If there exists $i \notin I, j \in J$ such that $A_{ij} > 0$, then $A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} \rightarrow +\infty$, since v_i for $i \notin I$ is bounded from above.
- If $A_{i,j} = 0$ for all $j \in J, i \notin I$. Suppose first $I = [n]$, i.e., all $v_i \rightarrow +\infty$. Now since we require that $(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$, there must exist some j such that $u_j \rightarrow -\infty$, i.e., $J \not\subseteq [m]$. Then we have $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = \sum_{j=1}^m q_j > \sum_{j \in J} q_j$. Thus, the linear terms dominate:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i - \sum_{j=1}^m q_j u_j \geq \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i - \sum_{j \in J} q_j u_j \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Now suppose $I \subsetneq [n]$. If $J = [m]$, i.e., $u_j \rightarrow +\infty$ for all j , then the requirement that $(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ again guarantees that for some $i \notin I, v_i \rightarrow -\infty$. Since A does not contain zero rows, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^m A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} \rightarrow +\infty$. Lastly, if both $I \subsetneq [n], J \subsetneq [m]$, then Assumption 3 applies to I, J , and guarantees that $\sum_{i \in I} p_i > \sum_{j \in J} q_j$, so that

$$\sum_{i \in I} p_i v_i - \sum_{j \in J} q_j u_j \rightarrow +\infty.$$

¹We thank Wenzhi Gao for very helpful discussions.

If, in addition, for all $i \notin I$, v_i is bounded below, then the linear terms dominate

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i - \sum_{j=1}^m q_j u_j \rightarrow +\infty.$$

And if for some $i \notin I$, $v_i \rightarrow -\infty$, then since A does not contain zero rows, the sum $\sum_{j=1}^m A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} \rightarrow +\infty$.

6. The case $v_i, u_j \rightarrow -\infty$ for some i, j is symmetric to the previous case and we omit the detailed reasoning.

Note that coercivity does not hold if we do not restrict to $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$, since $g(u, v) = g(u + c, v + c)$ for any constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$. This is the first reason why *normalization* is essential in our analysis.

Coercivity on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ guarantees that the optimal solution (u^*, v^*) defined in (17) is finite. More importantly, it implies that the sub-level sets

$$S_g^\perp(\alpha) : \{(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp : g(u, v) \leq \alpha\}$$

are *bounded*. In particular, this property holds for $\alpha_0 = g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)})^2$, so that there exists $B < \infty$ such that $\|(u, v)\|_\infty \leq B$ whenever $(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ and $g(u, v) \leq g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)})$. Since Sinkhorn's algorithm is the alternating minimization of $g(u, v)$,

$$g(u^{(t+1)}, v^{(t+1)}) \leq g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) \leq g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)})$$

for all t . It then follows that $(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) \in S_g^\perp(\alpha_0)$, so that $\|(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})\|_\infty \leq B$ for all $t > 0$. In summary, we have shown that Sinkhorn iterations stay bounded by B , which will be important for lower bounding the Hessian of g .

II. Next, we show that g is strongly convex when restricted to $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$. The gradient of $g(u, v)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{u_j} g(u, v) &= \sum_i A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} - q_j \\ \partial_{v_i} g(u, v) &= -\sum_j A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} + p_i, \end{aligned}$$

and the Hessian is given by

$$\nabla^2 g(u, v) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(\sum_j A_{ij} e^{u_j - v_i}) & -\hat{A} \\ -\hat{A}^T & \mathcal{D}(\sum_i A_{ij} e^{u_j - v_i}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(\hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m) & -\hat{A} \\ -\hat{A}^T & \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n) \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\hat{A}_{ij}(u, v) = A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{1}_{n+m}$ is in the null space of the Hessian at any (u, v) , since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(\hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m) & -\hat{A} \\ -\hat{A}^T & \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m - \hat{A} \mathbf{1}_m \\ -\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n + \hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As a result, if we restrict to the subspace $(u, v) \perp \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_m \\ \mathbf{1}_n \end{bmatrix}$, which is achieved with the appropriate normalization in Sinkhorn's algorithm, the Hessian of the potential function $g(u, v)$ is lower bounded by $\lambda_{-2}(\nabla^2 g(u, v)) \cdot I_{m+n}$. This is the second reason why normalization is important for the linear convergence analysis of Sinkhorn's algorithm.

² In practice, we can for example take $(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}) = 0$, so that $\alpha_0 = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}$.

The next key observation is that the Hessian $\nabla^2 g(u, v)$ is precisely the *Laplacian* matrix of the bipartite graph defined by \hat{A} :

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{A}) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(A\mathbf{1}_m) & -\hat{A} \\ -\hat{A}^T & \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n) \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} \right) - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where we recognize

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

as the adjacency matrix of the bipartite graph defined by \hat{A} , and \mathcal{L} defined in (20) is precisely $\nabla^2 g(0, 0)$.

Our next step is then to connect $\mathcal{L}(\hat{A})$ to the Laplacian \mathcal{L} at the origin, so that we can lower bound $\lambda_{-2}(\nabla^2 g(u, v))$. We use the well-known fact that the bipartite graph Laplacian $\nabla^2 g(u, v)$ is *similar* to the following “signless” Laplacian, so they share the same spectrum:

$$\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A}) := \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

so that

$$\lambda_{-2}(\nabla^2 g(u, v)) = \lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A})).$$

We claim that for all $(u, v) \in \mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ with $\|(u, v)\|_\infty \leq B$,

$$\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A}) = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{A} \\ \hat{A}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \succeq e^{-2B} \left(\mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = e^{-2B} \mathcal{L}'(A).$$

Consider first the off-diagonal blocks. We have

$$\hat{A}_{ij} = A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} \geq e^{-2B} A_{ij}.$$

Similarly, for the diagonal blocks, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}\mathbf{1}_m)_i &= \sum_j A_{ij} e^{u_j - v_i} \geq e^{-2B} \sum_j A_{ij} \\ \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}^T \mathbf{1}_n)_j &= \sum_i A_{ij} e^{u_j - v_i} \geq e^{-2B} \sum_i A_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequalities imply that all entries of the following difference

$$\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A}) - e^{-2B} \mathcal{L}'(A)$$

are non-negative. Moreover, since both $\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A})$ and $\mathcal{L}'(A)$ have $[\mathbf{1}_n, -\mathbf{1}_m]$ in their null spaces, so does the difference above. Gershgorin circle theorem then guarantees that the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A}) - e^{-2B} \mathcal{L}'(A)$ are all non-negative. Finally, since the signless Laplacian $\mathcal{L}'(A)$ shares the same spectrum as the Laplacian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{D} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_n \\ \mathbf{1}_m \end{bmatrix} \right) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

we can conclude that

$$\lambda_{-2}(\nabla^2 g(u, v)) \geq e^{-2B} \lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L}).$$

It then follows that $g(u, v)$ is $e^{-2B}\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})$ -strongly convex on the subspace $(u, v) \perp \mathbf{1}_{n+m}, \|(u, v)\|_\infty \leq B$. Recall that coercivity of $g(u, v)$ on $\mathbf{1}_{m+n}^\perp$ precisely guarantees $\|(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})\|_\infty \leq B$ for all $(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)})$ during the iterations of normalized Sinkhorn's algorithm.

Next, we compute the smoothness constants L_0, L_1 of $g(u, v)$ when restricted to one of the two blocks of variables. Recall that the gradient of g is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{u_j} g(u, v) &= \sum_i A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} - q_j \\ \partial_{v_i} g(u, v) &= - \sum_j A_{ij} e^{-v_i + u_j} + p_i,\end{aligned}$$

so that for any i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_{u_j}^2 g(u, v)| &\leq e^{2B} \sum_i A_{ij} \\ |\partial_{v_i}^2 g(u, v)| &\leq e^{2B} \sum_j A_{ij}.\end{aligned}$$

It then follows that the Lipschitz constants of the two blocks are given by

$$\begin{aligned}L_0 &= e^{2B} \max_j \sum_i A_{ij} = e^{2B} l_0 \\ L_1 &= e^{2B} \max_i \sum_j A_{ij} = e^{2B} l_1.\end{aligned}$$

III. Combining the strong convexity and smoothness bounds, we can apply the linear convergence result in Theorem 5.2 of Beck and Tetruashvili (2013) to conclude that for any $t \geq 0$,

$$g(u^{(t+1)}, v^{(t+1)}) - g^* \leq (1 - e^{-4B} \frac{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})}{\min\{l_0, l_1\}}) \cdot (g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g^*).$$

Note that we do not need to compute the smoothness constant L of the entire function $g(u, v)$, since convergence results on alternating minimization algorithms only require the *minimum* of smoothness constants of the function restricted to each block, which is upper bounded by L . Nevertheless, for $g(u, v)$, we compute its L explicitly for completeness. Note that by a similar reasoning used to lower bound $\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A})$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}'(\hat{A}) \preceq e^{2B} \mathcal{L}'(A).$$

Gershgorin circle theorem then bounds the maximal eigenvalue

$$\lambda_1(\mathcal{L}'(A)) = \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}) \leq 2 \max\{\max_i \sum_j A_{ij}, \max_j \sum_i A_{ij}\} = L,$$

which is always strictly larger than $l = \min\{\max_i \sum_j A_{ij}, \max_j \sum_i A_{ij}\}$.

IV. Now we show how the linear convergence result on $g(u, v)$ can be converted to a bound on the ℓ^1 distance $\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1$. Our derivation follows the approach in Altschuler et al. (2017), whose Lemma 2 establishes the following key connection between $g(u, v)$ and the KL divergence $D_{\text{KL}}(p\|r^{(t)})$:

$$g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g(u^{(t+1)}, v^{(t+1)}) = D_{\text{KL}}(p\|r^{(t)}) + D_{\text{KL}}(q\|c^{(t)}),$$

Note that the KL divergence $D_{KL}(p\|r^{(t)})$ above has a different order from that in Léger (2021), which is $D_{KL}(r^{(t)}\|p)$, but this difference does not matter for our analysis, since $D_{KL}(p\|r^{(t)})$ is just an intermediate quantity that is then converted to ℓ^1 distance via Pinsker's inequality:

$$\|p - r^{(t)}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{2D_{KL}(p\|r^{(t)})}.$$

Applying these inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|p - r^{(t)}\|_1^2 &\leq 2(g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g(u^{(t+1)}, v^{(t+1)})) \\ &\leq 2(g(u^{(t)}, v^{(t)}) - g(u^*, v^*)) \\ &\leq 2(1 - e^{-4B \frac{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})}{\min\{l_0, l_1\}}})^t (g(u^{(0)}, v^{(0)}) - g(u^*, v^*)) \\ &\leq (8B \sum_i p_i) e^{-c_B \frac{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})}{\min\{l_0, l_1\}} \cdot t}, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately implies the iteration complexity bound that $\|r^{(t)} - p\|_1 \leq \epsilon$ after

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\min\{l_0, l_1\}}{\lambda_{-2}(\mathcal{L})} \cdot \log(1/\epsilon)\right)$$

iterations of Sinkhorn's algorithm. □

F.4. Proof of Theorem 4

We will show that there exists some row i of the scaled matrix $A^{(t)}$ such that $|\sum_{j=1}^m A_{ij}^{(t)} - p_i|$ vanishes at a rate bounded below by $\Omega(1/t)$. Because Assumption 3 is satisfied but Assumption 5 fails, no finite solution to the matrix balancing problem exists, but Sinkhorn's algorithm converges to \hat{A} . Without loss of generality, we may assume column scalings do not vanish, since we can always multiply and divide the scalings without altering the scaled matrix. Lemma 1 of Pukelsheim (2014) states that there exists $I \subseteq [n]$ and $J \subseteq [m]$ such that, after necessary permutation, A can be written in block form as

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{IJ} & 0 \\ A_{I^c J} & A_{I^c J^c} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in J^c} q_j &= \sum_{i \in I^c} p_i \\ \sum_{j \in J} q_j &= \sum_{i \in I} p_i. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, I is the set of rows with row scalings not vanishing, and J is the set of columns with column scalings not diverging:

$$I = \{i : d_i^{1(t)} \not\rightarrow 0\}, \quad J = \{j : d_j^{0(t)} \not\rightarrow \infty\}.$$

Thus there exists a constant c such that $\sum_{k \in J} d_k^{0(t)} \leq c$ for (a subsequence of) $t = 1, 2, \dots$

For any non-negative matrix inheriting the zeros of A and having marginals p, q , the lower left block indexed by $I^c J$ must be identically 0. This block is referred to as a fading block. Thus the limiting matrix \hat{A} of Sinkhorn's algorithm, which solves the primal KL divergence minimization problem, must have the form

$$\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_{IJ} & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{A}_{I^c J^c} \end{bmatrix},$$

and all entries in the lower left block in $A^{(t)}$ converge to 0 as the number of iterations increases.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\min_{ij:A_{ij}>0} A_{ij} \geq 1$, since we can rescale A by a fixed constant without altering the convergence rate. Define $\bar{A} := \max_{ij} A_{ij}$. We claim that $\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t)} \leq c\bar{A}t$ for all t . We can initialize with $d^{0(1)}$ that satisfies $\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(1)} \leq \bar{A}c$, and prove the general case by induction. Suppose $\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t)} \leq c\bar{A}t$ and we want to show $\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t+1)} \leq c\bar{A}(t+1)$. We have

$$\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t+1)} = \sum_{j \in J^C} q_j / \sum_i A_{ij} \frac{p_i}{\sum_k A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)}} = \sum_{j \in J^C} q_j / \sum_{i \in I^C} A_{ij} \frac{p_i}{\sum_k A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)}},$$

where the last equality follows from the block structure of A . Note that since A cannot have zero columns, for any $j \in J^C$, there is at least one $i \in I^C$ such that $A_{ij} > 0$.

Next, for any $i \in I^C$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)} &= \sum_{k \in J} A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)} + \sum_{k \in J^C} A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)} \\ &\leq \bar{A} \cdot \sum_{k \in J} d_k^{0(t)} + \bar{A} \cdot \sum_{k \in J^C} d_k^{0(t)} \\ &\leq c\bar{A} + c\bar{A}t = c\bar{A}(t+1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the induction assumption and the condition that the column scalings in J stay bounded. Using the inequality above and $\min_{ij:A_{ij}>0} A_{ij} \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t+1)} &= \sum_{j \in J^C} q_j / \sum_{i \in I^C} A_{ij} \frac{p_i}{\sum_k A_{ik} d_k^{0(t)}} \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in J^C} q_j / \left(\sum_{i \in I^C} \frac{p_i}{c\bar{A}(t+1)} \right) \\ &= c\bar{A}(t+1) \cdot \left(\sum_{j \in J^C} q_j / \sum_{i \in I^C} p_i \right) \\ &= c\bar{A}(t+1). \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality precisely follows from the condition $\sum_{j \in J^C} q_j = \sum_{i \in I^C} p_i$ in Assumption 5. We have therefore proved that $\sum_{j \in J^C} d_j^{0(t)} \leq c\bar{A}t$ for all t . The pigeonhole principle implies that there exists a $j \in J^C$ and a subsequence $t_1, t_2, \dots \rightarrow \infty$ such that $d_j^{0(t_l)} \leq \frac{1}{|J^C|} c\bar{A}t_l$ for all $l = 1, 2, \dots$. Since the j -th column of \hat{A} cannot all vanish, there exists $i \in I^C$ such that $d_i^{1(t_l)} A_{ij} d_j^{0(t_l)} \rightarrow \hat{A}_{ij} > 0$, so that, selecting a further subsequence if necessary, we have

$$d_i^{1(t_l)} \geq \hat{A}_{ij} / \left(\frac{1}{|J^C|} c\bar{A}t_l \right).$$

In other words, the row scaling $d_i^{1(t)}$ for row $i \in I^C$ vanishes at a rate bounded below by $\Omega(1/t)$. Recall that by assumption column scalings are non-vanishing, which implies $\sum_{j \in J} A_{ij}^{(t)} \rightarrow 0$ at a rate bounded below by $\Omega(1/t)$. The same reasoning in fact guarantees that $\sum_{j \in J} A_{ij}^{(t)} = \Omega(1/t)$ for all $i \in I^C$, i.e., the fading block vanishes at rate $\Omega(1/t)$, so that $D_{\text{KL}}(r^{(t)} \| p) = \Omega(1/t)$. \square

F.5. Proof of Theorem 5

Outline of Proof. I. We define a novel sequence of data-dependent mappings induced by Sinkhorn's iterations, $f^{(t)}(x) : \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, that map $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}$ to $r^{(t+1)}/\sqrt{p}$, starting from column normalized $A^{(t)}$. For all t , \sqrt{p} is always the fixed point of $f^{(t)}$, and the construction guarantees that the residuals $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}$ are always orthogonal to the fixed point \sqrt{p} . **II.** The Jacobian $J^{(t)}$ at \sqrt{p} is given by

$$J^{(t)} = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)})A^{(t)}\mathcal{D}(1/q)A^{(t)T}\mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$$

which has unique maximal eigenvector \sqrt{p} with eigenvalue 1. Moreover, $J^{(t)} \rightarrow J = \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})\hat{A}\mathcal{D}(1/q)\hat{A}^T\mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and $\tilde{A} = \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \cdot \hat{A} \cdot \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{q})$ also has unique maximal eigenvector \sqrt{p} with eigenvalue 1. **III.** Thus we have a sequence of mappings $f^{(t)}$ with fixed points \sqrt{p} , whose Jacobians $J^{(t)}$ converge to J with maximal eigenvector \sqrt{p} . The orthogonality property $(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})^T \sqrt{p} = 0$ and uniform boundedness of second derivatives of $f^{(t)}$ near \sqrt{p} then allows us to conclude that the asymptotic linear convergence rate is exactly equal to the subdominant eigenvalue of J .

I. Starting with column normalized matrix $A^{(t)}$ at the t -th iteration, we first write down the general formula for the row sums $r^{(t+1)} = A^{(t+1)}\mathbf{1}_m$ after one iteration of Sinkhorn's algorithm:

$$r_i^{(t+1)} = \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)} \cdot p_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_1}{A_{11}^{(t)} \frac{p_1}{r_1^{(t)}} + A_{21}^{(t)} \frac{p_2}{r_2^{(t)}} + \dots + A_{n1}^{(t)} \frac{p_n}{r_n^{(t)}}} + \frac{A_{i2}^{(t)} \cdot p_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_2}{A_{12}^{(t)} \frac{p_1}{r_1^{(t)}} + A_{22}^{(t)} \frac{p_2}{r_2^{(t)}} + \dots + A_{n2}^{(t)} \frac{p_n}{r_n^{(t)}}} + \dots + \frac{A_{im}^{(t)} \cdot p_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_m}{A_{1m}^{(t)} \frac{p_1}{r_1^{(t)}} + A_{2m}^{(t)} \frac{p_2}{r_2^{(t)}} + \dots + A_{nm}^{(t)} \frac{p_n}{r_n^{(t)}}}$$

Although the update formula looks complicated, it can be interpreted in the following manner. Given positive $r_1^{(0)}/p_1, r_2^{(0)}/p_2, \dots, r_n^{(0)}/p_n$, we take the *convex* combination of their *inverses*:

$$c_j^{(t)}/q_j := A_{1j}^{(t)}/q_j \cdot \frac{p_1}{r_1^{(t)}} + A_{2j}^{(t)}/q_j \cdot \frac{p_2}{r_2^{(t)}} + \dots + A_{nj}^{(t)}/q_j \cdot \frac{p_n}{r_n^{(t)}},$$

where $A^{(t)}$ is assumed to be column normalized, hence have column sums equal to q . After we have formed $c_1^{(t)}/q_1, \dots, c_m^{(t)}/q_m$, we simply repeat the process by taking the *convex* combination of their inverses:

$$r_i^{(1)}/p_i := \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)}}{r_i^{(t)}} \cdot \frac{q_1}{c_1^{(t)}} + \frac{A_{i2}^{(t)}}{r_i^{(t)}} \cdot \frac{q_2}{c_2^{(t)}} + \dots + \frac{A_{im}^{(t)}}{r_i^{(t)}} \cdot \frac{q_m}{c_m^{(t)}},$$

where by definition of $r_i^{(t)}$ we always have $\sum_j A_{ij}^{(t)} = r_i^{(t)}$. We will work with this update formula to obtain a sequence of mappings.

Recall that $/$ denotes entry-wise division whenever the quantities are vectors, and similarly for $\sqrt{\cdot}$. Instead of $r^{(t)}$, we will use $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}$ as the natural quantity to measure the progress of convergence and show that $\|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ linearly with rate λ . The reason for using $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}$ is because the residual $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}$ satisfies

$$(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})^T \sqrt{p} = \sum_i (r_i^{(t)} - p_i) = 0$$

by virtue of Sinkhorn's algorithm preserving the quantities $r^{(t)T}\mathbf{1}_n$ for all t , so that the residual is always *orthogonal* to \sqrt{p} . This orthogonality property is crucial in identifying the rate of convergence, as we will show that \sqrt{p} is also the unique maximal eigenvector of the limiting Jacobian with eigenvalue 1.

Now rewrite the update formula as

$$\begin{aligned} (r^{(t+1)}/\sqrt{p})_i &= \\ &= \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_1}{A_{11}^{(t)} p_1 / r_1^{(t)} + A_{21}^{(t)} p_2 / r_2^{(t)} + \dots + A_{n1}^{(t)} p_n / r_n^{(t)}} + \dots + \frac{A_{im}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_m}{A_{1m}^{(t)} p_1 / r_1^{(t)} + A_{2m}^{(t)} p_2 / r_2^{(t)} + \dots + A_{nm}^{(t)} p_n / r_n^{(t)}} \\ &= \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_1}{A_{11}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1} / (r_1^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_1}) + A_{21}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2} / (r_2^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_2}) + \dots + A_{n1}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n} / (r_n^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_n})} + \dots + \\ &= \frac{A_{im}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_m}{A_{1m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1} / (r_1^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_1}) + A_{2m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2} / (r_2^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_2}) + \dots + A_{nm}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n} / (r_n^{(t)} / \sqrt{p_n})}. \end{aligned}$$

And define the mapping $f^{(t)}(x) : \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, given $A^{(t)}$ and $r^{(t)}$, as

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{(t)}(x) &:= \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_1}{A_{11}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1} / x_1 + A_{21}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2} / x_2 + \dots + A_{n1}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n} / x_n} + \dots \\ &+ \frac{A_{im}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p}_i / r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_m}{A_{1m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1} / x_1 + A_{2m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2} / x_2 + \dots + A_{nm}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n} / x_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Written more compactly,

$$f^{(t)}(x) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \mathcal{D}(A^{(t)T}(\sqrt{p}/x))^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m.$$

Our first observation is that $f^{(t)}(x)$ has fixed point \sqrt{p} for all t , since

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(t)}(\sqrt{p}) &= \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \mathcal{D}(A^{(t)T}(\sqrt{p}/\sqrt{p}))^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \mathcal{D}(A^{(t)T} \mathbf{1}_n)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \cdot \mathbf{1}_m / q \\ &= \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathbf{1}_m = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) r^{(t)} = \sqrt{p} \end{aligned}$$

We also define the “limiting” mapping by replacing $r^{(t)}$ with p and $A^{(t)}$ with \hat{A} in $f^{(t)}$:

$$f(x) := \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \hat{A} \mathcal{D}(q) \mathcal{D}(\hat{A}^T(\sqrt{p}/x))^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $f(\sqrt{p}) = \sqrt{p}$ as well. Sinkhorn's iteration can then be represented as the following sequence:

$$\begin{aligned} r^{(0)}/\sqrt{p} &\rightarrow f^{(0)}(r^{(0)}/\sqrt{p}) = r^{(1)}/\sqrt{p} \\ r^{(1)}/\sqrt{p} &\rightarrow f^{(1)}(r^{(1)}/\sqrt{p}) = r^{(2)}/\sqrt{p} \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

We reiterate that $f^{(t)}(x)$ is data-dependent, as it uses $r^{(t)}$ and $A^{(t)}$. Although f is the pointwise limit of $f^{(t)}$, we do not need any uniform convergence, thanks to the orthogonality condition and the fact that \sqrt{p} is the fixed point and unique maximal eigenvector for *every* Jacobian at \sqrt{p} by construction. We only need the uniform boundedness of $r^{(t)}$, $A^{(t)}$, which is guaranteed by coercivity of the potential function.

II. The partial derivatives of $f^{(t)}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_j f_i^{(t)}(x) &= \frac{A_{i1}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p_i}/r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_1}{(A_{11}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1}/x_1 + A_{21}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2}/x_2 + \dots + A_{n1}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n}/x_n)^2} \cdot \frac{A_{j1}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_j}}{x_j^2} + \dots \\ &+ \frac{A_{im}^{(t)} \cdot \sqrt{p_i}/r_i^{(t)} \cdot q_m}{(A_{1m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_1}/x_1 + A_{2m}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_2}/x_2 + \dots + A_{nm}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_n}/x_n)^2} \cdot \frac{A_{jm}^{(t)} \sqrt{p_j}}{x_j^2} \end{aligned}$$

and we can verify that the Jacobian $J^{(t)}(x)$ of $f^{(t)}$ can be written in matrix-vector notation as

$$J^{(t)}(x) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \cdot \mathcal{D}(A^{(t)T}(\sqrt{p}/x))^{-2} \cdot A^{(t)T} \mathcal{D}(1/x^2) \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p})$$

When evaluated at the fixed point $x = \sqrt{p}$ of $f^{(t)}(x)$, we obtain

$$J^{(t)} := J^{(t)}(\sqrt{p}) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) \cdot A^{(t)} \cdot \mathcal{D}(1/q) A^{(t)T} \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$$

Our second observation is that $J^{(t)}$ has \sqrt{p} as the unique maximal eigenvector with eigenvalue equal to 1. Letting $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$J^{(t)} \rightarrow J := \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \hat{A} \mathcal{D}(1/q) \hat{A}^T \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$$

The unique maximal eigenvector with eigenvalue 1 of J is also \sqrt{p} . Moreover, J is the Jacobian matrix of the limiting map f .

III. We have so far obtained a sequence of mappings $f^{(t)}$ all with fixed point \sqrt{p} . The limiting map f has Jacobian equal to $J = \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \hat{A} \mathcal{D}(1/q) \hat{A}^T \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$, which has \sqrt{p} as unique maximal eigenvector. Moreover, the residuals $r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}$ are always orthogonal to \sqrt{p} , so that convergence is eventually governed by the subdominant eigenvalue of J . We formalize this argument next.

For any fixed ϵ , since $J^{(t)} \rightarrow J = \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p}) \hat{A} \mathcal{D}(1/q) \hat{A}^T \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$, there exists T_0 such that for all $t \geq T_0$, $\lambda_2(J^{(t)}) \leq \lambda_2(J) + \epsilon/2$. Moreover, since $r^{(t)} \rightarrow p$, we can find T_1 such that for all $t \geq T_1$, $\|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 \leq \delta$, with δ to be determined later. We use the approximation formula

$$\begin{aligned} r^{(t+1)}/\sqrt{p} &= f^{(t)}(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p}) \\ &= f^{(t)}(\sqrt{p} + r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}) \\ &= \sqrt{p} + J^{(t)} \cdot (r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}) + R_2^{(t)}(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $f^{(t)}(x) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{p}/r^{(t)}) A^{(t)} \mathcal{D}(q) \mathcal{D}(A^{(t)T}(\sqrt{p}/x))^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m$ are continuously differentiable, so Taylor's Theorem implies there exists T_2 such that for all $t \geq T_2$,

$$\|R_2^{(t)}(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})\|_2 \leq C \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2^2$$

for some constant $C \geq 1$. The bound C can be taken independent of t because second derivatives of $f^{(t)}$ have no singularities near \sqrt{p} , and are parameterized by $r^{(t)}, A^{(t)}$ which are both uniformly bounded in t by some C near \sqrt{p} , using the coercivity of the potential function (15), which we showed in the proof of Theorem 3.

Now the key is that $(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}) \perp \sqrt{p}$, which is the unique maximal eigenvalue of $J^{(t)}$, so that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|J^{(t)} \cdot (r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})\|_2 \leq \|J^{(t)}\|_* \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2$$

where $\|J^{(t)}\|_*$ is the operator norm of $J^{(t)}$ restricted to the subspace orthogonal to \sqrt{p} . Since we are using the 2-norm and $J^{(t)}$ has unique maximal eigenvalue 1, $\|J^{(t)}\|_*$ is precisely $\lambda_2(J^{(t)}) < 1$. Now with $\delta \leq \epsilon/2C$, for all $t \geq \max\{T_0, T_1, T_2\}$, we can then bound

$$\begin{aligned} \|r^{(t+1)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 &\leq \|J^{(t)} \cdot (r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})\|_2 + \|R_2^{(t)}(r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p})\|_2 \\ &\leq \lambda_2(J^{(t)}) \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 + C \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2^2 \\ &\leq (\lambda_2(J) + \epsilon/2) \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 + C\delta \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2 \\ &\leq (\lambda_2(J) + \epsilon) \cdot \|r^{(t)}/\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{p}\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

The proof again illustrates the importance of the strong existence and uniqueness conditions in Assumptions 3 and 4. When only the weak existence condition in Assumption 5 is satisfied, the maximal eigenvalue 1 of J has multiplicity greater than 1. To prove this, we can again use Lemma 1 in Pukelsheim (2014), which shows that Assumption 5 holds but Assumption 3 fails if and only if the limit \hat{A} of Sinkhorn's algorithm is equivalent to a block diagonal matrix under permutation. Let $N \subseteq [n], M \subseteq [m]$ be such that $\hat{A}_{ij} = 0$ for all $i \in N^C, j \in M$ or $i \in N, j \in M^C$. Then the vector $\tilde{\sqrt{p}}$ with

$$(\tilde{\sqrt{p}})_i := \begin{cases} \sqrt{p_i} & i \in N \\ -\sqrt{p_i} & i \in N^C \end{cases}$$

is another eigenvector of $J = \mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})\hat{A}\mathcal{D}(1/q)\hat{A}^T\mathcal{D}(1/\sqrt{p})$ not in the span of \sqrt{p} with eigenvalue 1. As a result, the orthogonality condition is not sufficient to guarantee contraction and hence asymptotic linear convergence. \square

F.6. Proof of Proposition 1

We will show that the iteration in (11), which is equivalent to Sinkhorn's algorithm when it is applied to the Luce choice model, is algebraically equivalent to (23). Recall the iteration (23) of the MM algorithm in Hunter (2004):

$$s_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{w_k}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i-1} \delta_{ijk} [\sum_{j'=j}^{l_i} s_{a(i,j')}^{(t)}]^{-1}},$$

where δ_{ijk} is the indicator that item $k \in [m]$ appears in the i -th partial ranking $a(i, 1) \rightarrow a(i, 2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a(i, l_i)$, and is not ranked higher than the j -th ranked item in that partial ranking. Suppose item k is ranked $\kappa(i, k)$ -th in the i -th partial ranking, where $1 \leq \kappa(i, k) \leq l_i - 1$, i.e., it is not ranked last. Note that $s_{a(i, \kappa(i, k))} = s_k$.

We have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l_i-1} \delta_{ijk} [\sum_{j'=j}^{l_i} s_{a(i,j')}^{(t)}]^{-1} = \frac{1}{s_{a(i,1)} + \dots + s_{a(i,l_i)}} + \frac{1}{s_{a(i,2)} + \dots + s_{a(i,l_i)}} + \dots + \frac{1}{s_{a(i, \kappa(i, k))} + \dots + s_{a(i, l_i)}}, \quad (30)$$

and if item k is ranked last in the i -th partial ranking or does not appear in the i -th partial ranking, $\sum_{j=1}^{l_i-1} \delta_{ijk} [\sum_{j'=j}^{l_i} s_{a(i,j')}^{(t)}]^{-1} \equiv 0$. Now if we associate each term in (30) with a "choice" set consisting of the items that appear in the denominator, with the highest ranked item being the "selected" item, item k is selected exactly once, in the choice set consisting of $a(i, \kappa(i, k)), \dots, a(i, a(i, l_i))$, corresponding to the last term in (30). Thus, each partial ranking of l_i items gives rise to $l_i - 1$ observations of choices. Summing

over all partial rankings where item k appears and is not last, we see that $\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{l_i-1} \delta_{ijk} [\sum_{j'=j}^{l_i} s_{a(i,j')}^{(t)}]^{-1}$ is exactly equal to the denominator in (11):

$$s_k^{(t+1)} = \frac{W_k}{\sum_{i|k \in S_i} \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k' \in S_i} s_{k'}^{(t)}}},$$

and w_k , the number of partial rankings in which item k appears and is not ranked last, is exactly the number of times it is “selected”, i.e., W_k . \square

F.7. Proof of Proposition 2

Recall the random walk on G in the network choice model in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017). A user at node j decides to move to node $k \in N_j^{\text{out}}$ with probability proportional to s_k . To interpret the network choice model as an MNL model, we further define a *choice set* parameterized by each node $j \in V$, consisting of all items in N_j^{out} . Thus there are m unique types of choice sets. The number c_j^{out} of transitions out of node j is exactly the number of observations whose choice sets are those in N_j^{out} . Therefore, the choice model in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017) is a special case of the general Luce choice model with m objects as well as m unique types of choice sets, each appearing in c_j^{out} observations, for a total of $m \cdot c_j^{\text{out}}$ choice observations. We index these observations by i as in the Luce choice model. The selected item in an observation at node j corresponds to the node into which the transition occurs. The set of nodes N_j^{in} with edges pointing into node j can then be interpreted as the set of all unique choice sets in which node j appears. The number c_j^{in} of observed transitions into a node j therefore corresponds to the number of observations in which node j is selected, i.e., it is equal to W_j in (11). As observed in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017), the exact winner of each observation does not matter, as the sufficient statistics of their model are the aggregate transition counts at each node, i.e., $c_j^{\text{out}}, c_j^{\text{in}}$. This feature echoes our observation that in the Luce choice model, only the winning frequency p^1 matters for solving the ML estimation problem. In fact, $(c_j^{\text{out}}, c_j^{\text{in}}) = f(A, p^1)$ for some deterministic mapping f .

Now we show that the unregularized version of the ChoiceRank algorithm in Maystre and Grossglauser (2017), given by

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{c_j^{\text{in}}}{\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} \gamma_k^{(t)}}, \gamma_j^{(t)} = \frac{c_j^{\text{out}}}{\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{out}}} s_k^{(t)}}, \quad (31)$$

is equivalent to (11) when it is applied to the equivalent Luce choice model. First, note that $\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{out}}} s_k^{(t)}$ corresponds to the sum of current estimates of s_k over all items in the choice set indexed by node j . Furthermore, the summation in $\sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} \gamma_k^{(t)}$ is over all unique types of choice sets indexed by node j in which item k appears. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} \gamma_k^{(t)} &= \sum_{k \in N_j^{\text{in}}} \frac{c_k^{\text{out}}}{\sum_{k' \in N_k^{\text{out}}} s_{k'}^{(t)}} \\ &= \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{\sum_{k' \in S_i} s_{k'}^{(t)}} \end{aligned}$$

and since $c_j^{\text{in}} = W_j$, we have proved that the iteration in (31) is equal to

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{W_j}{\sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{R_i}{\sum_{k' \in S_i} s_{k'}^{(t)}}},$$

which is equal to (11). \square

F.8. Proof of Proposition 3

In the simplified setting with $\exp(\theta_{jt}) \equiv s_j$, the BLP algorithm in (25) reduces to

$$s_j^{(t+1)} = s_j^{(t)} \cdot \hat{p}_j \cdot \frac{1}{p_j(s^{(t)}, \beta, \Gamma, \Sigma)}$$

where $p_j(\theta^{(m)}, \beta, \Gamma, \Sigma)$ denotes the expected market share of the j -th product as a function of model parameters.

Setting $\beta, \Gamma, \Sigma \equiv 0$, the expected market shares are given by

$$p_j = \frac{s_j}{\sum_k s_k} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s_j}{\sum_k s_k}$$

Now, consider a Luce choice model of n observations, where the choice set in each observation contains all alternatives. The “market share” of product j above is exactly equal to the right hand side in (6) for this model:

$$\sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{n} \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k},$$

while the “observed market share” of product j in the BLP model is the fraction of observations where product j is selected, i.e., $\hat{p}_j = \frac{1}{n} |\{i \mid c(S_i) = j\}|$, which is equal to the left hand side of (5). The condition $p_j = \hat{p}_j$ from BLP is exactly

$$\frac{1}{n} |\{i \mid c(S_i) = j\}| = \sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{n} \frac{s_j}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k}.$$

The BLP iteration takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} s_j^{(t+1)} &= s_j^{(t)} \cdot \frac{1}{n} |\{i \mid c(S_i) = j\}| \cdot \left[\sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{n} \frac{s_j^{(t)}}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}} \right]^{-1} \\ &= W_i \cdot \left[\sum_{i|j \in S_i} \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_i} s_k^{(t)}} \right]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which we recognize to be the algebraic expression (11) of Sinkhorn’s algorithm. \square