

Global optimality under amenable symmetry constraints

Peter Orbanz

Abstract. Consider a convex function that is invariant under an group of transformations. If it has a minimizer, does it also have an invariant minimizer? Variants of this problem appear in nonparametric statistics and in a number of adjacent fields. The answer depends on the choice of function, and on what one may loosely call the geometry of the problem—the interplay between convexity, the group, and the underlying vector space, which is typically infinite-dimensional. We observe that this geometry is completely encoded in the smallest closed convex invariant subsets of the space, and proceed to study these sets, for groups that are amenable but not necessarily compact. We then apply this toolkit to the invariant optimality problem. It yields new results on invariant kernel mean embeddings and risk-optimal invariant couplings, and clarifies relations between seemingly distinct ideas, such as the summation trick used in machine learning to construct equivariant neural networks and the classic Hunt-Stein theorem of statistics.

1 Introduction

We consider the following problem: Given are a group \mathbb{G} of linear bijections of a (topological) vector space X , and a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ that is convex, lower semi-continuous (lsc), and invariant under \mathbb{G} . If f has a minimizer, we ask whether it also has a minimizer that is \mathbb{G} -invariant, i.e. a simultaneous fixed point of all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. That is obviously true if f is strictly convex—since f is invariant, its minimizers form an invariant set, and if the minimizer is unique, it must itself be invariant—but there are a range of problems where X is infinite-dimensional and one cannot assume strict convexity. Examples include the Hunt-Stein theorem in statistics [17, 30], various problems that arise in machine learning applications to science (such as whether certain energies in a crystalline solid have symmetric ground states) [e.g. 40], the existence of invariant optimal transportation plans, and the principle of symmetric criticality in variational analysis [53]. Although these problems seem to differ at first glance, we show in the following that they all share the same underlying structure, and studying this structure in its own right leads to new applications. We use the remainder of this section to summarize our approach and results, and postpone a detailed review of related work to Section 10.

Problem sketch. Our vectors $x \in X$ are typically functions or measures on a suitable space Ω , which we loosely think of as a sample space, and f is a risk, energy, or similar functional on X . The linear transformations $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ often arise as follows: We start with a group \mathbb{G} of measurable or continuous bijections $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$. Given a function $x = h$ or a measure $x = \mu$ on Ω , we define

$$(1) \quad \phi h := h \circ \phi^{-1} \quad \text{or} \quad \phi \mu := \mu \circ \phi^{-1} \quad \text{for } \phi \in \mathbb{G} ,$$

i.e. ϕx is the composition or image measure. In either case, this specifies a bijection $\phi : X \rightarrow X$, which is linear even if the map $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is not. The function f is \mathbb{G} -invariant if $f(\phi x) = f(x)$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ and $x \in X$. Now consider the optimization problem stated at the outset. Even if f is not strictly convex, a simple solution exists if \mathbb{G} is finite: Set

$$(2) \quad \bar{x} = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{G}|} \sum_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} \phi x = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{G}|} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{G}(x)} z \quad \text{for } x \in X ,$$

where $\mathbb{G}(x) := \{\phi(x) | \phi \in \mathbb{G}\}$ is the orbit of x . Then \bar{x} is \mathbb{G} -invariant. This ‘‘summation trick’’ is commonly used to construct invariant objects [e.g. 37, 46, 54]. Clearly, the vector \bar{x} satisfies

$$f(\bar{x}) \leq \sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} f(\phi x) \quad \text{in general and} \quad f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x) \quad \text{if } f \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant.}$$

For invariant functions, we can therefore turn an arbitrary minimizer x of f into a \mathbb{G} -invariant minimizer \bar{x} .

We are interested in problems where \mathbb{G} is not finite or compact. In this case, (2) is not defined. Our strategy is as follows: Suppose for the moment that \mathbb{G} is countable. (The uncountable case requires some additional formalism, but is conceptually similar, see Section 3.) We approximate (2) by partial group averages

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{F}_n(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \sum_{\phi \in \mathbf{A}_n} \phi x ,$$

where $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots$ is a sequence of finite subsets of \mathbb{G} that satisfy

$$(4) \quad \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \cap \phi \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 \quad \text{for each } \phi \in \mathbb{G} .$$

Such a sequence is called a Følner sequence, and a group that contains a Følner sequence is called amenable (Section 3.1). One can show that, if a limit point $\bar{x} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{F}_{i(n)}(x)$ along some subsequence $i(1) < i(2) < \dots$ exists, then \bar{x} is a \mathbb{G} -invariant element of X . We combine this with the fact that, if f is \mathbb{G} -invariant, its sublevel sets $[f \leq t]$ are closed, convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant sets. It follows that

$$\mathbb{G}(x) \subset [f \leq f(x)] \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \bar{x} \in [f \leq f(x)] \quad \text{for each } x \in X ,$$

since \bar{x} is a limit of convex combinations. If $[f \leq f(x)]$ is also compact, we also know that (3) has a convergent subsequence, and our problem is solved: If x is a minimizer, it is in the sublevel set $\arg \min f = [f \leq \min f]$. This sublevel set also contains the invariant element \bar{x} , which is therefore again a minimizer. ¹

¹Some of these ideas go back a long way: Amenability was first applied to optimization problems by G. Hunt and C. Stein, and the compact sublevel set argument is used, at least implicitly, by L. Le Cam. The definition of amenability via Følner sequences is not common in statistics, but is a staple of modern ergodic theory. Section 10 provides details and references.

Approach. We now separate the geometry of the problem from the specific choice of f as follows. Since \bar{x} is a limit of convex combinations, it is always in the set

$$(5) \quad \Pi(x) := \text{closed convex hull of } \mathbb{G}(x) \text{ in } X .$$

We call $\Pi(x)$ the **orbitope** of x .² This is the smallest closed convex \mathbb{G} -invariant set containing x , and also contains the limit \bar{x} if it exists. It therefore satisfies

$$(6) \quad \bar{x} \in \Pi(x) \subset [f \leq f(x)] \quad \text{for each } x \in X ,$$

but does not depend on f . All arguments above can now be applied to $\Pi(x)$ instead of the sublevel sets. That this approach turns out to be useful is largely for two reasons:

- It separates the question of invariant elements from the properties of f —observe that $\Pi(x)$ in (6) does not depend on f . To ensure the a limit \bar{x} exists, we do not need the sublevel sets to be compact; it suffices that $\Pi(x)$ is compact.
- The combination of amenable invariance and convexity endows orbitopes with a lot of structure. These structural properties can then be used to reason about optimization problems.

Additionally adopting the definition of amenability via Følner sequences—which departs from common practice in statistics, see Section 10—clarifies the relationship between amenability and (2), and greatly simplifies a number of arguments.

Result summary. In Section 3, we establish basic properties of orbitopes. One of our main technical tools is Theorem 6: If \mathbb{G} is amenable and f is a convex lsc and \mathbb{G} -invariant function, each compact orbitope $\Pi(x)$ contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant element such that

$$(7) \quad f(\bar{x}) \leq f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_{i(n)}(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x} ,$$

where the convergence holds along a subsequence (in the sense that this subsequence exists, but is not known). For any compact convex \mathbb{G} -invariant set K , we also have

$$(8) \quad \inf \{f(z) \mid z \in K\} = \inf \{f(z) \mid z \in K \text{ and } z \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant}\} ,$$

and if f is linear, the infima are attained at extreme points.

Since X is a vector space, it has a dual space Y . We see in Section 4 that a group acting on X induces a dual action on Y , and that orbitopes of such dual actions have interesting duality properties. A useful consequence of (7) is that, if $E \subset X$ and $F \subset Y$ are suitable invariant sets, if $H(\cdot|E)$ is the support function of E , and if the problem

$$(9) \quad \text{minimize } H(y|E) \quad \text{subject to } y \in F$$

has a minimizer, it also has a \mathbb{G} -invariant solution (Proposition 8). If X is a Banach space whose norm is invariant under \mathbb{G} , and $\Pi(x)$ is weakly compact, Theorem 10 shows that the image $\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi(x))$ contracts around an invariant element \bar{x} ,

$$(10) \quad \|\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi(x))\| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbf{F}_n(\Pi(x)) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} .$$

²The term orbitope is due to Sanyal, Sottile, and Sturmfels [44]. Our definition specializes to theirs if \mathbb{G} is compact and X Euclidean. See Section 10 for references on the Euclidean case.

This makes (7) constructive, as convergence now holds for the entire sequence rather than an (unknown) subsequence.

Some properties of orbitopes become more concrete in specific spaces. In Sections 5 and 6, we study three cases:

- The geometry of orbitopes in Hilbert spaces (Section 5.1) most closely resembled that of the convex hulls of orbits in Euclidean space studied in [44]. All orbitopes are weakly compact, and loosely speaking are contained in closed discs orthogonal to an axis consisting of all \mathbb{G} -invariant elements. The contraction property (10) implies the mean ergodic theorem.
- L_p spaces (Section 5.2) are, in a sense, the simplest spaces with non-trivial duality, i.e. where X and its dual cannot be identified. As an example of (9), we consider the Hunt-Stein theorem, see Section 5.3.
- In Section 6, we consider orbitopes in the set \mathcal{P} of probability measures. There are two natural topologies, convergence in distribution and in total variation. Both require some additional work, since duality is not directly applicable.

Among these, Hilbert spaces and \mathcal{P} are, informally, the most and least similar to Euclidean space, and orbitopes in \mathcal{P} have distinctly non-Euclidean geometry.

Applications. We consider two applications in detail, one in Hilbert space and one in \mathcal{P} . In Section 7, we consider kernel mean embeddings, which are used in machine learning to represent probability distributions [45]. Since the embedding space is Hilbert, mean embeddings satisfy a strong combination of (7), (9) and (10), see Theorem 22. We characterize the convex set of \mathbb{G} -invariant mean embeddings by a property reminiscent of de Finetti's theorem (Theorem 28).

In Section 8, we consider couplings of two \mathbb{G} -invariant probability measures P_1 and P_2 . Such couplings need not be invariant. There is hence a set Λ of all couplings, and a subset $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}} \subsetneq \Lambda$ of \mathbb{G} -invariant ones. Theorem 30 characterizes the extreme points of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$. By the Monge-Kantorovich theorem, the expectation $P(c)$ of a suitable cost function c under a coupling P satisfies

$$\min \{P(c) \mid P \in \Lambda\} = \sup \{P_1(g_1) + P_2(g_2) \mid (g_1, g_2) \in \Gamma\},$$

where Γ is a certain class of minorants of c . Combining Theorem 30 and (8) shows that, if c is \mathbb{G} -invariant, one can restrict Λ to $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ and Γ to invariant minorants without introducing a duality gap (Corollary 31). If one adopts the transportation interpretation of couplings, this means that if supply, demand and transportation cost are invariant, there is an optimal transportation plan that is also invariant, and neither sellers nor buyers have anything to gain by setting price functions that resolve non-invariant details. Example 33 relates this fact to work by McGoff and Nobel [36] on coupled dynamical systems.

Cocycles. All results above consider elements of X that are invariant under \mathbb{G} . In applications, one is often interested in different symmetry properties; equivariance and skew-invariance are common examples. Section 9 introduces a simple trick using an algebraic structure called a cocycle. If a symmetry property can be expressed as a cocycle, it can be expressed as invariance under a surrogate action, which makes our results applicable.

2 Notation and terminology

Throughout, we work with a Polish space Ω , a topological group \mathbb{G} , and a topological vector space X , which is always a locally convex Hausdorff space. The elements of X are often functions or measures on Ω . We write $\mathcal{P}(S)$ for the set of Radon probability measures on a topological space S . If μ is a measure and f a measurable map, $f_*\mu := \mu \circ f^{-1}$ denotes the image measure.

Convention. We call \mathbb{G} **nice** if its topology is locally compact and Polish (equivalently, if it is locally compact, second-countable and Hausdorff). On a nice group, there exists an invariant σ -finite measure, or Haar measure, which we denote $|\cdot|$.

Actions. An action T of \mathbb{G} on Ω is a map $\mathbb{G} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ that satisfies

$$T(\phi\psi, \omega) = T(\phi, T(\psi, \omega)) \quad \text{and} \quad T(\text{identity}, \omega) = \omega \quad \text{for } \phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega.$$

We shorten notation to $\phi(\omega) := T(\phi, \omega)$. The action is **continuous** if T is jointly continuous, **measurable** if T is jointly measurable, and **linear** if the map $T(\phi, \cdot)$ is linear for each ϕ . The action on Ω induces an action on the vector space of real-valued functions f on Ω , and, if it is measurable, on the vector space of signed measures μ on Ω , which we have already defined in (1). These actions cohere with each other: Since a function h is $\phi_*\mu$ -integrable iff $h \circ \phi$ is μ -integrable, and

$$(11) \quad \int h d(\phi_*\mu) = \int (h \circ \phi) d\mu \quad \text{or in short} \quad \phi_*\mu(h) = \mu(h \circ \phi).$$

Function or measures are **\mathbb{G} -invariant** if they satisfy $h \circ \phi = h$ or $\phi_*\mu = \mu$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, that is, if they are invariant under the actions in (1). A function with two arguments is called **diagonally \mathbb{G} -invariant** if $h(\phi v, \phi \omega) = h(v, \omega)$ holds for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ and all $v, \omega \in \Omega$. It is **separately \mathbb{G} -invariant** if $h(\phi v, \psi \omega) = h(v, \omega)$ for all pairs $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G}$. Clearly, separate implies diagonal invariance.

3 The basic objects

All results in the following involve two basic types of objects, a general form of the partial group average $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ in (3), which we define next, and orbitopes. Theorem 6 below relates the two to each other.

3.1. Følner averages

To generalize (3) to uncountable groups, we approximate a possibly non-compact \mathbb{G} from within by compact subsets. A **Følner sequence** is a sequence $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots$ of compact subsets of \mathbb{G} such that

$$(12) \quad |\mathbf{A}_n \cap K \mathbf{A}_n| / |\mathbf{A}_n| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1 \quad \text{for all compact } K \subset \mathbb{G},$$

where $K \mathbf{A}_n$ is the set $\{\phi\psi \mid \phi \in K, \psi \in \mathbf{A}_n\}$. A nice group contains a Følner sequence if and only if it is **amenable** [7, 22]. If \mathbb{G} is countable, compact sets are finite, and a sequence is a Følner sequence if and only if it satisfies (4).

Example 1. (i) Let \mathbb{S}_n be the group of permutations of n elements. Then $\mathbb{S} = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{S}_n$ is the (countable) group of finitely supported permutations of \mathbb{N} , and (\mathbb{S}_n) is a Følner sequence in \mathbb{S} , since every $\phi \in \mathbb{S}$ satisfies $\phi \mathbb{S}_n = \mathbb{S}_n$ for n large enough.

(ii) If \mathbb{G} is a normed vector space with addition as group operation, and \mathbf{A}_n is the closed norm ball of radius n around the origin, (\mathbf{A}_n) is a Følner sequence.

See Appendix A for more examples of amenable groups.

An average in the (possibly infinite-dimensional) space X is an X -valued integral. By the integral of a measurable function $f : S \rightarrow X$ on some measure space (S, μ) , we mean the unique element $\mu(f) = \int f d\mu$ of X that satisfies

$$\ell(\mu(f)) = \int_S (\ell \circ f) d\mu \quad \text{for every continuous linear } \ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where the integral on the right is the real-valued Lebesgue integral. If this integral exists, it is unique.³ Given a Følner sequence, we define the **Følner average**

$$(13) \quad \mathbf{F}_n(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} \phi(x) |d\phi|,$$

provided the integral exists. (In terms of the definition above, this means we choose S as \mathbf{A}_n and $f(\phi) := \phi x$.)

Example 2. (i) Følner averages under finite groups are of the form (2).

(ii) The sample average $n^{-1} \sum_{i \leq n} g(\omega_i)$ of a statistic g over observations $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ is a Følner average in disguise: Define a function x on infinite sequences $\omega = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$ as $x(\omega) := g(\omega_1)$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} g(\omega_i) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_n|} \sum_{\phi \in \mathbb{S}_n} g(\omega_{\phi(1)}) = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}_n|} \int_{\mathbb{S}_n} x(\phi\omega) |d\phi| = (\mathbf{F}_n(x))(\omega)$$

(iii) Window estimators for time series and random fields are Følner averages over shift groups, and subgraph counts in network analysis over permutation groups [4]. In other words, one can generalize the sample average in (ii) by changing the group and the action. These generalized sample averages have a law of large numbers [32] and a central limit theorem [4].

(iv) The \mathbb{G} -invariant solution to an invariant testing problem in the Hunt-Stein theorem is always a limiting Følner average, as we will see in Section 5.3.

3.2. Orbitopes

We define the orbitope of $x \in X$ as in (5). The next result collects some basic properties. Recall that the **barycenter** of a Radon probability measure P on X is the unique element $\langle P \rangle$ of X that satisfies

$$P(\ell) = \ell(\langle P \rangle) \quad \text{for every linear continuous } \ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

³The integral $\mu(f)$ is known as the weak integral, the Pettis integral, or as the Gelfand integral if X has a weak* topology. If X is a Banach space and $\int \|f\| d\mu < \infty$, $\mu(f)$ coincides with the strong (or Bochner) integral. If X is Euclidean, it reduces to the Lebesgue integral. See [2] for more on such integrals.




Figure 1: Finite-dimensional Følner averages in the (trivial) case where \mathbb{G} is compact. Here, the rotation group \mathbb{G} acts on $X = \mathbb{R}^2$. *Left*: A point x and its orbitope (the gray disc). *Middle left/right*: The average $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ is the barycenter of the uniform distribution on the black line segment $\mathbf{A}_n(x)$. It is not an element of the orbit $\mathbb{G}(x)$, but is in $\Pi(x)$. *Right*: If $\mathbf{A}_n = \mathbb{G}$ the barycenter $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant.

provided such an element exists [41]. This is the integral $\langle P \rangle = \int xP(dx)$, if the integral exists. If M is a set of Radon measures, $\langle M \rangle$ denotes its set of barycenters.

Lemma 3. *If \mathbb{G} acts linearly and continuously on X , the following holds:*

(i) *Each orbitope is a \mathbb{G} -invariant set, and so are its interior and boundary. A closed convex \mathbb{G} -invariant set contains x if and only if it contains $\Pi(x)$.*

(ii) *In a Banach space, $\Pi(x)$ is norm compact (resp. weakly compact) if and only if the norm closure (resp. weak closure) of the orbit $\mathbb{G}(x)$ is compact.*

(iii) *If $\Pi(x)$ is compact, its extreme points lie in the closure of $\mathbb{G}(x)$, and*

$$\Pi(x) = \langle \mathcal{P}(\text{closure}(\mathbb{G}x)) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{P}(\Pi(x)) \rangle$$

(iv) *The orbitope of a convex combination $x = \sum c_i x_i$ of vectors $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$ is the set $\Pi(x) = \{ \sum c_i z_i \mid z_i \in \Pi(x_i) \}$.*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

The orbits of \mathbb{G} form a partition of X into disjoint sets, and every \mathbb{G} -invariant set is a disjoint union of orbits. The orbits of \mathbb{G} are therefore the smallest \mathbb{G} -invariant subsets of X . By Lemma 3, orbitopes are similarly the smallest closed convex \mathbb{G} -invariant sets (although they are not generally mutually disjoint). In particular, an element $z \in X$ satisfies $z \in \Pi(x)$ if and only if $\Pi(z) \subset \Pi(x)$. It follows that any two orbitopes Π_1 and Π_2 of the same action in X satisfy

$$\Pi_1 \subset \Pi_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pi_1 \supset \Pi_2 \quad \text{or} \quad \Pi_1 \cap \Pi_2 = \emptyset .$$

Example 4. Figure 2 gives a simple finite-dimensional example of an orbitope, for a compact group. As an infinite-dimensional example, consider the set \mathcal{P} of probability measures on Ω , topologized by convergence in distribution. The vector space X is the span of \mathcal{P} .

(i) If \mathbb{G} acts continuously on Ω , the induced action (1) on \mathcal{P} is continuous. Choose any $P \in \mathcal{P}$. The orbit $\mathbb{G}(P)$ is known in statistics as the **group family** of P . By Lemma 3, $\Pi(P)$ is the set of mixtures of distributions in the closure of $\mathbb{G}(P)$.

(ii) If the group is compact, the orbits are closed, so $\Pi(P)$ consists of the mixtures of orbit elements. For instance, let P_t denote the isotropic Gaussian on \mathbb{R}^d with




Figure 2: Finite-dimensional illustration of some of the sets in Theorem 6. *Left:* A compact set K in which x is extreme. K is invariant under rotations around its middle axis, and $K_{\mathbb{G}}$ is the intersection of this axis and K . *Middle:* The orbitope $\Pi(x)$ is a closed disc that contains a single invariant element \bar{x} . *Right:* A compact set invariant under reflections over the vertical axis. The orbitope of x is the intersection of K with the horizontal line through x . Even though x is an extreme of K , \bar{x} is not.

mean t , and \mathbb{G} the group of rotations around the origin. Then $\mathbb{G}(P_t)$ is the set $\{P_s | s \in C\}$, for the circle C of radius $\|t\|$, and $\Pi(P_t) = \{\int_C P_s \mu(ds) | \mu \in \mathcal{P}(C)\}$.

(iii) Let δ_t be a point mass at $t \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and let $\mathbb{G} \cong \mathbb{R}$ be the group of vertical shifts on the plain. The orbit of t is the straight vertical line L_t through t , which is an affine subspace, and closed. We show in Section 6 that $\Pi(\delta_t) = \mathcal{P}(L_t)$, and that it is a closed face of the convex set of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^2 .

(iv) Here is a finite-dimensional example, which can be found in [3]: Consider a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let \mathbb{G} be the finite group of permutations of the coordinates. One can then show that the orbitope of λ is

$$\Pi(\lambda) = \{\text{diagonal of } A \mid A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ is Hermitian and has eigenvalues } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}.$$

3.3. A variant of Day's theorem

Our next step is to make the relationship between compactness of orbitopes and the existence of \mathbb{G} -invariant elements precise. Compact orbitopes of amenable groups always contain an invariant element. We had already sketched a proof of this fact in the introduction for countable groups. For general amenable groups, it follows from a classic fixed-point theorem of M. M. Day [14]:

Fact 5 (Day). *If a compact convex set K in a locally convex Hausdorff space is invariant under a linear continuous action of a nice amenable group, K has a \mathbb{G} -invariant element.*

The next result refines Day's theorem for the purposes of optimization, and is our main technical tool.

Theorem 6. *Let a nice group \mathbb{G} act linearly and continuously on a locally convex vector space X . Let (\mathbf{A}_n) be a Følner sequence in \mathbb{G} , and x a point in X .*

(i) *If $\Pi(x)$ is compact, it contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant element \bar{x} that satisfies*

$$(14) \quad f(\bar{x}) \leq \sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} f(\phi(x)) \quad \text{for every convex lsc } f : \Pi(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

(ii) *The integral $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ exists for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\Pi(x)$ is compact, a subsequence of $(\mathbf{F}_n(x))$ converges to a \mathbb{G} -invariant element \bar{x} of $\Pi(x)$ that satisfies (14).*

(iii) The set $X_{\mathbb{G}} := \{x \in X \mid x \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant}\}$ is a closed linear subspace of X . Any compact, convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant set $K \subset X$ satisfies

$$\inf_{z \in K} g(z) = \inf_{z \in K \cap X_{\mathbb{G}}} g(z) \quad \text{for every } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant convex lsc } g : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

If g is linear, both infima are attained at extreme points.

Proof. See Appendix B. □

Informally, this implies orbitopes are most useful for optimization if they are compact (so that $\Pi(x)$ contains an invariant element) and small (so that this element is close to x). The size of $\Pi(x)$ depends both on the orbit, and on the choice topology of X . This choice involves a trade-off, since stronger topologies result in smaller orbitopes, whereas weaker topologies have more compact sets.

4 Duality

Let Y be the dual space of X , that is, the set of all continuous maps $y : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We use the customary notation $\langle x, y \rangle := y(x)$ for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. If X is a normed space, the dual norm on Y is $\|y\| := \sup \{\langle x, y \rangle \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$.

Remark. Recall a topology on X (resp. Y) is **consistent** with the dual pair $\langle X, Y \rangle$ if it defines the same linear functionals as the weak (resp. weak*) topology. If X is normed, the norm topology is consistent, whereas the dual norm topology on Y is generally not. It is helpful to keep in mind that all consistent topologies have the same closed convex set and the same convex lsc functionals. See [2, 9].

An orbitope in X or Y is **consistent** if it defined by a consistent topology. Since all consistent topologies have the same closed convex sets, each point has only one consistent orbitope.

4.1. Dual actions

Given a linear continuous action of \mathbb{G} on X , we define the **dual action** as the unique action of \mathbb{G} on Y that satisfies

$$(15) \quad \langle \phi x, \phi y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \quad \text{for each } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } (x, y) \in X \times Y.$$

We then say that \mathbb{G} **acts dually** on X and Y . Since (15) is equivalent to choosing each map $\phi : Y \rightarrow Y$ as the adjoint of the bounded linear operator $\phi^{-1} : X \rightarrow X$, the dual action is linear and weak* continuous. An action on a normed space has **bounded orbits** if $\sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} \|\phi x\| < \infty$ for all $x \in X$. It is **isometric** if it leaves the norm invariant, $\|\phi x\| = \|x\|$ for all ϕ and x . Clearly, isometric actions have bounded orbits.

Lemma 7. Consider a linear continuous action on a normed space X .

- (i) The action has bounded orbits if and only if the dual action had bounded orbits.
- (ii) The action is isometric if and only if the dual action is isometric.
- (iii) If the orbits are bounded, all consistent orbitopes in Y are weak* compact.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

4.2. Support functions

The support function of a set E in X or Y is defined as

$$H(\cdot|E) := \begin{cases} \sup \{ \langle \cdot, y \rangle \mid y \in E \} & \text{if } E \subset Y \\ \sup \{ \langle x, \cdot \rangle \mid x \in E \} & \text{if } E \subset X \end{cases}.$$

This function is convex, and weakly lsc or weak* lsc. It takes values in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, is proper if E is not empty, and is finite if E is compact, see [2, 9]. If \mathbb{G} acts dually, substituting (15) into the definition of H shows that H characterizes invariance of E ,

$$H(\cdot|E) \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad E \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant}.$$

Since a set and its closed convex hull have the same support function [9], we also have

$$(16) \quad H(\cdot|\Pi(y)) = H(\cdot|\mathbb{G}(y)).$$

This implies the duality

$$(17) \quad H(x|\Pi(y)) = H(y|\Pi(x)) \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in X \times Y.$$

Theorem 6 implies a simple but useful optimality principle:

Proposition 8. *Let a nice amenable group \mathbb{G} act dually on a nice space X and its dual Y , with bounded orbits. Let $E \subset X$ be \mathbb{G} -invariant, and $F \subset Y$ closed, convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant. If the optimization problem*

$$\text{minimize } H(x|E) \quad \text{subject to } y \in F$$

has a solution \hat{y} , the orbitope $\Pi(\hat{y})$ contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant solution \bar{y} , and

$$-H(-x|\Pi(\hat{y})) \leq \langle x, \bar{y} \rangle \leq H(x|\Pi(\hat{y})) \quad \text{for each } x \in E.$$

Proof. The orbitope $\Pi(\hat{y})$ is compact, by Lemma 7. It contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant element \bar{y} , by Theorem 6. Since $H(\cdot|E)$ is convex lsc and \mathbb{G} -invariant, $\arg \min H(\cdot|E)$ is a convex, closed, \mathbb{G} -invariant set. Since orbitopes are the smallest such sets, $\hat{y} \in \arg \min H(\cdot|E)$ implies $\bar{y} \in \Pi(\hat{y}) \subset \arg \min H(\cdot|E)$. To obtain the upper bound, observe that

$$\langle x, \bar{y} \rangle \leq \sup_{z \in \Pi(\hat{y})} \langle x, z \rangle \leq \sup_{z \in \Pi(\hat{y})} \langle x, z \rangle = H(\cdot|\Pi(\hat{y})),$$

since $\bar{y} \in \Pi(\hat{y})$ implies $\Pi(\bar{y}) \subset \Pi(\hat{y})$. The lower bound follows analogously. \square

4.3. Orbitopes and annihilators

In the examples in Figures 1 and 2, all orbitopes are orthogonal to the subspace $X_{\mathbb{G}}$ of invariant elements. The next result shows that this is no coincidence. To say that $\Pi(x)$ is orthogonal to $X_{\mathbb{G}}$ is equivalent to saying that the shifted orbitope $\Pi(x) - x$ is in the orthocomplement of $X_{\mathbb{G}}$. In both figures, X is Euclidean and hence a

Hilbert space. In a general locally convex space, there is no notion of orthogonality, and the orthocomplement in X generalizes to the annihilator in the dual space,

$$X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp} := \{y \in Y \mid \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } x \in X_{\mathbb{G}}\}.$$

Observe also that the shifted orbitope is the set

$$\Pi(x) - x = \overline{\text{co}}(\mathbb{G}(x) - x) = \overline{\text{co}}\{\phi x - x \mid \phi \in \mathbb{G}\}.$$

The map $\phi \mapsto \phi(x) - x$ is known as a **coboundary** of x [e.g. 7]. The set $\Pi(x) - x$ is hence the closed convex hull of the image $\mathbb{G}x - x$ of a coboundary.

Lemma 9. *If \mathbb{G} acts dually on X and its dual Y , the vectors $\phi y - y$, for $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ and $y \in Y$, form a dense subset of the annihilator $X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$, and the vectors $\phi x - x$ similarly lie dense in $Y_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$. All orbitopes satisfy*

$$\Pi(x) \subset Y_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(y) \subset X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp} \quad \text{for } x \in X \text{ and } y \in Y.$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

4.4. Contraction under averages

If $\mathbf{F}_n(z)$ is well-defined at each point z in an orbitope Π , we may consider the image set $\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi) = \{\mathbf{F}_n(z) \mid z \in \Pi\}$. If Π has an invariant element \bar{x} , one would expect this image to contract around \bar{x} as n grows. If X has a norm, we can quantify contraction by the width

$$\|\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi)\| := \sup\{\|z - z'\| \mid z, z' \in \mathbf{F}_n(\Pi)\} = \sup\{\|\mathbf{F}_n(x - x')\| \mid x, x' \in \Pi\}.$$

For isometric actions of amenable groups, orbitopes indeed contract if they are compact.

Theorem 10 (Contraction of orbitopes). *Let an amenable group \mathbb{G} act isometrically on a Banach space X .*

(i) *If an orbitope Π in X is weakly compact, the convex function $x \mapsto \|\mathbf{F}_n(x)\|$ is well-defined and weakly lsc on Π , and satisfies $\|\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

(ii) *The function $y \mapsto \|\mathbf{F}_n(y)\|$ on the dual space is convex and norm lsc everywhere on Y . Each point $y \in Y$, and each z in the convex hull of $\mathbb{G}(y)$, satisfy*

$$(18) \quad \|\mathbf{F}_n(z - y)\| \leq \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \Delta \phi_z^{-1} \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \|y\| \quad \text{for some } \phi_z \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Remark. We note how the behavior of \mathbf{F}_n on X differs from that on the dual:

(i) On X , Theorem 10 applies only to points with compact orbitope, but at these, we obtain a strong statement: The entire sequence $(\mathbf{F}_n(z))$ converges, rather than a subsequence as in Theorem 6. This holds for all $z \in \Pi$ uniformly over Π , and the limits coincide for all z . This limit is an invariant element of Π .

(ii) On Y , (18) holds everywhere, but pairwise rather than uniformly, as ϕ_z depends on z . It also does not extend from $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(y)$ to the closure $\Pi(y)$, because $\|\mathbf{F}_n(\cdot)\|$ is not generally weak* lsc.

5 Orbitopes I: Hilbert and Lebesgue spaces

This and the following section study properties of orbitopes in specific spaces. The simplest case are Hilbert spaces, where orbitopes are orthogonal to the subspace of invariant elements, and Theorem 10 becomes the mean ergodic theorem. We also consider L_p spaces (which are not Hilbert unless $p = 2$). Section 5.3 uses the Hunt-Stein theorem to illustrate results of Section 4.

5.1. Orbitopes in Hilbert spaces

If X is a Hilbert space, it can be identified with its dual, and the dual pairing becomes an inner product. If \mathbb{G} acts dually, it therefore leaves the inner product invariant,

$$(19) \quad \langle \phi x, \phi y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|\phi x\| = \sqrt{\langle \phi x, \phi x \rangle} = \|x\| \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G} .$$

Linear actions that satisfy (19) are called **unitary**, since (19) makes each map $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ a unitary linear operator [18]. Since X has an inner product, the annihilator $X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ is the orthocomplement of $X_{\mathbb{G}}$, and each element x of X has a unique decomposition

$$x = \bar{x} + x^{\perp} \quad \text{where } \bar{x} := \text{projection onto } X_{\mathbb{G}} \quad \text{and} \quad x^{\perp} \in X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp} .$$

Since the weak and weak* topology coincide in Hilbert spaces, the norm-, weak- and weak* topologies define the same orbitopes. Orbitopes of unitary actions are contained in closed discs orthogonal to the (possibly infinite-dimensional) axis $X_{\mathbb{G}}$:

Proposition 11. *If X is a Hilbert space and (19) holds, $\Pi(x)$ is weakly compact and orthogonal to $X_{\mathbb{G}}$ for each $x \in X$. All $y \in \Pi(x)$ satisfy $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$ and $\|y\| \leq \|x\|$. If \mathbb{G} is amenable, then $\Pi(x) \cap X_{\mathbb{G}} = \{\bar{x}\}$.*

Proof. See Appendix D. □

Fact 12 (Mean ergodic theorem [e.g. 18, 52]). *Let a nice amenable \mathbb{G} acts unitarily on a Hilbert space X . Then*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}} \phi x |d\phi| - \bar{x} \right\| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{for each } x \in X ,$$

where \bar{x} is the projection of x onto $X_{\mathbb{G}}$.

By Theorem 10, we can interpret this result in terms of orbitopes contracting around $X_{\mathbb{G}}$:

Proof. The orbitope of x is weakly compact and intersects $X_{\mathbb{G}}$ in \bar{x} . Theorem 10 shows that $\|\mathbf{F}_n(x - \bar{x})\| \leq \|\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi(x))\| \rightarrow 0$. □

5.2. Orbitopes in \mathbf{L}_p spaces

For a σ -finite measure μ on Ω and $p \in [1, \infty]$, we denote by $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$ the space of (equivalence classes of) functions f on Ω with finite norm $\|f\|_p := (\int |f|^p d\mu)^{1/p}$. Recall that \mathbf{L}_p is a Banach space with dual $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)' = \mathbf{L}_q(\mu)$ for $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ and $1/p + 1/q = 1$. If μ is \mathbb{G} -invariant, each map $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ takes null sets to null sets, so we can define

$$(20) \quad (\mu\text{-equivalence class of } x) \circ \phi := \mu\text{-equivalence class of } (x \circ \phi) \quad \text{for } \phi \in \mathbb{G} .$$

Since ϕ -invariance of μ implies $\mu(x \circ \phi) = \mu(x)$ for every integrable function x , we have

$$\|x \circ \phi\|_p = \|x\|_p \quad \text{and} \quad \langle x \circ \phi, y \circ \phi \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle .$$

In particular, the orbit of every $x \in \mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$ is again in $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$. It is straightforward to verify that (20) is a linear action on $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$, which is continuous since the norm is invariant. Let $\Pi_p(x)$ be the \mathbf{L}_p -norm orbitope of x . Since the q -norm dominates the p -norm for $p \leq q$, we have $\mathbb{G}(x) \subset \Pi_q(x) \subset \Pi_p(x)$, and taking closures shows

$$\Pi_q(x) = \text{norm-dense subset of } \Pi_p(x) \quad \text{whenever } 1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty .$$

Invariance of the norm also implies the orbits are bounded, so Lemma 7 applies. In summary, we have shown:

Lemma 13. *If \mathbb{G} acts measurable on Ω and leaves μ invariant, (20) defines linear continuous actions on $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$ and $\mathbf{L}_q(\mu)$. If $1/p + 1/q = 1$, the actions are dual, and every weak* orbitope in $\mathbf{L}_q(\mu)$ is compact.*

Let $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ denote the σ -algebra of \mathbb{G} -invariant Borel sets. A measurable function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant if and only if it is $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ -measurable. The \mathbf{L}_p of equivalence classes of $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ -measurable functions is hence

$$\mathbf{L}_p(\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}, \mu) = \{ \text{equivalence class of } f \mid f \text{ } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant and } \|f\|_p < \infty \} ,$$

which is the set of elements of $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$ invariant under the action (20). In other words, if we choose X as $\mathbf{L}_p(\mu)$, then $\mathbf{L}_p(\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}, \mu)$ is the closed linear subspace $X_{\mathbb{G}}$.

5.3. Illustration: The Hunt-Stein theorem

Consider a testing problem, in which a set M of probability measures on Ω is partitioned into two sets H (the hypothesis) and A (the alternative). Recall that a set M of probability measures is **dominated** if there is a σ -finite measure μ such that $M \ll \mu$. If so, we denote the corresponding set of densities

$$dM/d\mu := \{ dP/d\mu \mid P \in M \} \subset \mathbf{L}_1(\mu) .$$

Given an observation $x \in \Omega$, one must decide whether x was generated by an element of H (“accept the hypothesis”) or of A (“reject”). The decision procedure may be randomized, and is represented by a **critical function** w . The value $w(x)$ is read as the probability (under the randomization of the test) that the test rejects when x is observed. A measurable function w is a valid critical function if it takes values

in $[0, 1]$ P -almost surely, for all $P \in M$. If M is dominated by a σ -finite measure μ , the set of such functions is

$$W = \{w \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(\mu) \mid w \geq 0 \text{ } \mu\text{-a.e. and } \|w\|_\infty \leq 1\}.$$

The objective is to find a critical function \hat{w} that maximizes the probability of rejection on A , while upper-bounding it on H by some fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$(21) \quad \hat{w} \in \arg \max_{w \in W} \inf \{P(w) \mid P \in A\} \quad \text{subject to } Q(w) \leq \alpha \quad \text{for all } Q \in H.$$

The Hunt-Stein theorem [e.g. 8, 17, 30] states the following:

Fact 14. *Let \mathbb{G} be amenable, and let both H and A be a \mathbb{G} -invariant and dominated by a \mathbb{G} -invariant, σ -finite measure μ . If there is a critical function \hat{w} that satisfies (21), there is an μ -almost \mathbb{G} -invariant critical function \bar{w} that also satisfies (21), and $\inf_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} \phi P(\hat{w}) \leq P(\bar{w}) \leq \sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} \phi P(\hat{w})$ holds for all $P \in M$.*

In terms of our results, this is the case because the hypothesis implies that (21) minimizes a \mathbb{G} -invariant convex lsc function f (or rather, maximizes $-f$), and the orbitope of \hat{w} is compact since it is a weak* orbitope in \mathbf{L}_∞ . In more detail, we can obtain the result from Proposition 8: Since $dM/d\mu$ is a subset of $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$, and W is in the dual $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)' = \mathbf{L}_\infty(\mu)$, we have $P(w) = \langle dP/d\mu, w \rangle$. Maximizing (21) is then equivalent to minimizing a support function, namely

$$\sup_{P \in A} \langle -dP/d\mu, w \rangle = H(w \mid -dA/d\mu), \quad \text{over } F := \bigcap_{Q \in H} \{w \in W \mid Q(w) \leq \alpha\}.$$

It is easy to check the assumptions of Fact 14 make both f and F convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant, and that F is closed. The existence of \bar{w} hence follows from Proposition 8, and applying (16) to the bound in Proposition 8 shows

$$P(\bar{w}) \leq \langle dP/d\mu, \bar{w} \rangle \leq H(dP/d\mu \mid \Pi(\hat{w})) = \sup_{\phi} \phi_* P(\hat{w}),$$

which is the upper bound in Fact 14. The lower bound follows analogously.

Remark. Observe that, by Theorem 6, the invariant solution \bar{w} is the limit of a subsequence of Følner averages $\mathbf{F}_n(\hat{w})$. In a limiting sense, the Hunt-Stein theorem is therefore an instance of the summation trick (2), although the relevant subsequence is in general not determined. Under suitable additional conditions—if Theorem 10 applies—the solution becomes an actual limit.

6 Orbitopes II: Probability measures

The next class of orbitopes we consider are those of probability measures. These are closed convex subsets of the set $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ of probability measures on a Polish space Ω . To make sense of linearity, we consider the smallest vector space containing \mathcal{P} , which is the space $\mathbf{ca} := \text{span } \mathcal{P}$ of finite signed measures on Ω . We let \mathbb{G} act measurably on Ω , and consider the induced action (1) on (signed) measures, i.e. the linear action $\mu \mapsto \phi_* \mu$ for $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. Since $\phi_* \mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}$, its restriction to \mathcal{P} is again an

action. There are two natural topologies on \mathcal{P} , one defined by the total variation norm $\|\mu\|_{\text{TV}} := |\mu(\Omega)|$ on \mathbf{ca} , and one by convergence in distribution on \mathcal{P} . We denote the corresponding orbitopes

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\text{TV}}(P) &:= \text{closure of } \text{co } \mathbb{G}(P) \text{ in total variation} \\ \text{and } \Pi_{\text{D}}(P) &:= \text{closure of } \text{co } \mathbb{G}(P) \text{ in convergence in distribution.} \end{aligned}$$

We always have $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P) \subset \Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$, but as we show below, these orbitopes can differ significantly.

6.1. Compactness

If Ω is compact, then \mathcal{P} is compact in convergence in distribution, so $\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$ is automatically compact. If Ω is not compact, there is still a sharp criterion for compactness of orbitopes: Say that P is **\mathbb{G} -tight** if

$$P(\phi^{-1}K_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{for each } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ some compact } K_\varepsilon \subset X, \text{ and all } \phi \in \mathbb{G}.$$

For illustration, let P_z be a Gaussian with mean z on \mathbb{R}^2 . Suppose \mathbb{G} consists of rotations around the origin. If z is the origin, P_z is \mathbb{G} -invariant. Otherwise, P_z is not \mathbb{G} -invariant, but it is \mathbb{G} -tight (choose K_ε as a sufficiently large closed ball around the origin). If \mathbb{G} is instead the group of shifts of \mathbb{R} , no Gaussian (and in fact no probability measure on \mathbb{R}^2) is \mathbb{G} -tight.

Proposition 15. *If \mathbb{G} acts continuously on Ω , the orbitope $\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$ is compact if and only if P is \mathbb{G} -tight.*

Proof. See Appendix E. □

Now consider the total variation topology. If we can find a \mathbb{G} -invariant measure μ that dominates P , we can reduce the problem of compactness of $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ to compactness in $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$.

Proposition 16. *Let \mathbb{G} act measurably on Ω , and fix any $P \in \mathcal{P}$.*

(i) *If $P \ll \mu$ holds for a \mathbb{G} -invariant σ -finite measure μ , then*

$$\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P) \ll \mu \quad \text{and} \quad d\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)/d\mu = \Pi_1(dP/d\mu),$$

where Π_1 denotes the norm orbitope in $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$. The orbitope $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ is compact if and only if $\Pi_1(dP/d\mu)$ is norm compact in $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$.

(ii) *If \mathbb{G} is amenable and $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ is compact, every random element ξ with law P can be coupled to a random element Ψ of \mathbb{G} such that $\phi(\Psi\xi) \stackrel{d}{=} \Psi\xi$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$.*

Proof. See Appendix E. □

6.2. Point masses and empirical measures

To understand the geometry of orbitopes in \mathcal{P} we consider the simple case of points masses.




Figure 3: Orbitopes of coin flip pairs. *Left:* The set \mathcal{P} of distributions on $\{0, 1\}^2$ is the convex hull of its four point masses, and can be identified with a subset of \mathbb{R}^3 . *Middle left:* The set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ of permutation-invariant distributions is a convex subset of \mathcal{P} . The orbits of \mathbb{G} in $\{0, 1\}^2$ are the sets $\{00\}$, $\{11\}$, and $\{01, 10\}$, and the extreme points of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ are the uniform distributions on these orbits. *Middle right:* Orbitopes of point masses are faces of \mathcal{P} (cf. Proposition 17), here two singletons and an edge. *Middle right:* The orbitope of a measure P in the interior.

Proposition 17 (Orbitopes of point masses). *Let ω be an element of Ω . The total variation orbitope of δ_{ω} is the set*

$$\Pi_{\text{TV}}(\delta_{\omega}) = \{P = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} p_i \delta_{\phi_i \omega} \mid p_i \geq 0, \sum p_i = 1, \phi_i \in \mathbb{G}(\omega)\}$$

of all purely atomic probability measures on the orbit $\mathbb{G}(\omega)$. The weak orbitope and its extreme points are*

$$\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_{\omega}) = \mathcal{P}(\overline{\mathbb{G}(\omega)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ex}\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_{\omega}) = \{\delta_z \mid z \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(\omega)}\},$$

and $\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_{\omega})$ is a closed face of the convex set $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

Proof. See Appendix E. □

Lemma 3(iv) extends the result to probability measures with finite support, that is, to mixtures of point masses. For example:

Corollary 18. *Let $\hat{P}_n := n^{-1} \sum_{i \leq n} \delta_{\omega_i}$ be the empirical measure of points $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n$ in Ω . Then $\Pi_{\text{D}}(\hat{P}_n) = \{n^{-1} \sum_{i \leq n} Q_i \mid Q_i \in \mathcal{P}(\overline{\mathbb{G}(\omega_i)})\}$.*

Example 19. To illustrate how norm and weak* orbitopes may differ, consider the product space $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ of infinite binary sequences. We let the group \mathbb{S} of finitely supported permutations of \mathbb{N} act on Ω by permuting sequence indices. This is the setting of de Finetti's theorem: A random element of Ω whose law is \mathbb{S} -invariant is an exchangeable sequence. Denote by $\Omega(m, n) \subset \Omega$ the set of sequences containing m zeros n and ones. Thus, each sequence is either in $\Omega(\infty, \infty)$, or in $\Omega(n, \infty)$ or $\Omega(\infty, n)$ for some finite n .

Lemma. The point mass at a sequence ω has TV orbitope $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(\delta_{\omega}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}(\omega))$, whereas $\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_{\omega})$ is $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}(\omega))$ if $\omega \notin \Omega(\infty, \infty)$, and $\mathcal{P}(\Omega(\infty, \infty))$ for $\omega \in \Omega(\infty, \infty)$.

(See Appendix E for the proof.) Since \mathbb{S} is countable, each orbit $\mathbb{S}(\omega)$ is countable, but $\Omega(\infty, \infty)$ is not. Thus, weak* orbitopes for sequences in $\Omega(\infty, \infty)$ are much larger than the total variation orbitopes of the same sequences, and also than the weak* orbitopes of sequences with finitely many 0s or 1s.

Example 20. The set of probability measures on the smaller set $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^2$ is illustrated in Figure 3. That all orbitopes are orthogonal to the subset $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ of invariant measures is due to the fact that Ω is finite and we have identified $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ with a subset of the Hilbert space \mathbb{R}^3 . There is no similar notion of orthogonality if Ω is infinite. Orbitopes of point masses are closed faces of \mathcal{P} , as explained in Proposition 17.

6.3. Duality

We briefly discuss a somewhat technical matter, namely how orbitopes in \mathcal{P} relate to our previous results on duality. The answer is straightforward if the Polish space Ω is also compact—in this case, \mathbf{ca} is the dual space of the space $(\mathbf{C}_b, \|\cdot\|_{\text{sup}})$ of bounded continuous functions on Ω . For a general Polish space, the answer is somewhat more involved. The dual of \mathbf{C}_b is a larger space than \mathbf{ca} , namely

$$\mathbf{C}'_b = \mathbf{ba}_n := \{\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \mu \text{ finitely additive and inner regular}\}$$

where inner regular means $\mu(A) = \sup\{\mu(F) \mid F \subset A \text{ closed}\}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We denote the dual norm by $\|\mu\|' := \sup_f |\langle f, \mu \rangle| / \|f\|_{\text{sup}}$. For details on the dual pair $\langle \mathbf{C}_b, \mathbf{ba}_n \rangle$, see [2]. Those relevant for our purposes are:

- The set \mathbf{ca} is the linear subspace $\mathbf{ca} = \{\mu \in \mathbf{ba}_n \mid \mu \text{ countably additive}\}$ of \mathbf{ba}_n .
- The sets \mathbf{ca} and \mathcal{P} are not weak* closed in \mathbf{ba}_n (unless Ω is compact). The weak* closure of a set $M \subset \mathcal{P}$ may therefore contain elements of \mathbf{ba}_n that are not countably additive.
- The restriction of the weak* topology to \mathcal{P} is the topology of convergence in distribution. In other words, a set $M \subset \mathcal{P}$ is closed iff there is a closed set $M' \in \mathbf{ba}_n$ such that $M = M' \cap \mathcal{P}$.
- In contrast, \mathbf{ca} and \mathcal{P} are closed in the dual norm, and the restriction of $\|\cdot\|'$ to \mathbf{ca} is precisely the total variation norm.
- Every continuous linear functional on \mathbf{C}_b is of the form $f \mapsto \langle f, \mu \rangle$ for some $\mu \in \mathbf{ba}_n$. For $\mu \in \mathbf{ca}$, we have $\langle f, \mu \rangle = \int f d\mu$, by a version of Riesz' theorem.

Now assume again that \mathbb{G} acts continuously on Ω , and consider the induced actions $f \mapsto f \circ \phi^{-1}$ and $\mu \mapsto \mu \circ \phi^{-1}$ on functions and finitely additive measures. By (11),

$$\langle \phi(f), \phi(\mu) \rangle = \int (f \circ \phi^{-1}) d(\phi_* \mu) = \int f d\mu = \langle f, \mu \rangle \quad \text{for each } \mu \in \mathbf{ca},$$

so the restriction of the action to the subspace \mathbf{ca} behaves like a dual action, and we show as part of the next result that duality extends to the entire space \mathbf{ba}_n . For a probability measure P , we can now define orbitopes by taking the closure $\Pi'(P)$ of $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(P)$ in the dual norm topology of \mathbf{ba}_n , or weak* closure $\Pi_*(P)$. All our results on orbitopes in dual spaces now apply to $\Pi_*(P)$ (though not to $\Pi'(P)$, since the weak* topology is consistent with the dual pair, whereas the norm topology is not).

Proposition 21. *Let \mathbb{G} act continuously on a Polish space Ω , and let P be a probability measure. Then $\Pi_*(P)$ is weak* compact, and*

$$\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P) = \Pi'(P) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\text{D}}(P) = \Pi_*(P) \cap \mathcal{P} \quad \text{for each } P \in \mathcal{P} .$$

If $\Pi_(P)$ and $\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$ differ, this difference consists entirely of set functions that are not countably additive. Moreover, $\Pi_*(P)$ and $\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$ have the same support function, and*

$$H(f|\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)) = H(f|\Pi_*(P)) = H(P|\Pi(f)) \quad \text{for each } P \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } f \in \mathbf{C}_b .$$

The compactness of weak* orbitopes is an instance of Lemma 7. Since compactness of $\Pi_*(P)$ implies that $\Pi_*(P) \cap \mathcal{P} = \Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$ is closed, but not that it is compact, this does not contradict Proposition 15.

7 Application I: Kernel mean embeddings

Mean embeddings of probability measures are used in machine learning to represent distributions [e.g. 45, 47]. Like a probability density, a mean embedding represents a probability measure P as a function. Whereas a density is defined relative to a reference measure μ and lives in $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$, a mean embedding is defined relative to a reproducing kernel, and lives in an RKHS.

7.1. Invariant optimal embeddings

A Hilbert space \mathbf{H} of functions $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, or **RKHS**, if there is a positive definite function $\kappa : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$x(\omega) = \langle x, \kappa(\omega, \bullet) \rangle \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{H} \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega .$$

If so, κ is a **reproducing kernel** for \mathbf{H} . For each $\omega \in \Omega$, the function $\kappa(\omega, \bullet)$ is an element of \mathbf{H} , and the map $\Delta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ defined by $\omega \mapsto \kappa(\omega, \bullet)$ is called the **feature map** [48]. Let P be a probability measure on Ω . A function $m(P) \in \mathbf{H}$ is the **mean embedding** of P if it satisfies either of the equivalent properties

$$\int f dP = \langle f, m(P) \rangle \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbf{H} \quad \text{or} \quad m(P) = \int \Delta(\omega) P(d\omega) ,$$

where the integral on the right is again a Bochner integral [45]. We define

$$\mathcal{M} := \{x \in \mathbf{H} \mid x \text{ is mean embedding of a probability measure}\} .$$

A kernel κ is **bounded** if $\sup_{\omega} \kappa(\omega, \omega) < \infty$, and **characteristic** if the map m is injective on its domain in $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.

Convention. Call a reproducing kernel **nice** if it is continuous, bounded, characteristic, and the function $\kappa(\bullet, \omega)$ vanishes at infinity for each $\omega \in \Omega$.

Now suppose a group \mathbb{G} acts on Ω . We consider the induced action $x \mapsto x \circ \phi$ on functions $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Our next result makes the following assumptions.

- (22) Ω is locally compact Polish, \mathbb{G} is nice and acts continuously on Ω ,
and κ is nice and diagonally \mathbb{G} -invariant.

Nice kernels on locally compact spaces are a standard assumption in the mean embedding literature that ensures $m(P)$ exists and is well-behaved [45, 47]. As we will see below, diagonal invariance ensures the natural action $x \mapsto x \circ \phi$ on functions also defines an action on the RKHS, and that this action is unitary. For mean embeddings, our general results can be assembled into the following result; the proof is given at the end of this section.

Theorem 22. *If (22) holds, the maps $x \mapsto x \circ \phi$, for each $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, define a unitary action of \mathbb{G} on \mathbf{H} . If \mathbb{G} is amenable, the following holds:*

(i) *If a convex, weakly lsc and \mathbb{G} -invariant function $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ has a minimizer \hat{x} , it is also minimized by the embedding $m(P)$ of a \mathbb{G} -invariant probability measure \bar{P} on Ω .*

(ii) *Let $E, F \subset \mathcal{M}$ be \mathbb{G} -invariant sets, where F is closed and convex. If*

$$\text{minimize } H(x|E) \quad \text{subject to } y \in F$$

has a solution \hat{x} , it also has a solution $m(\bar{P})$ where \bar{P} is \mathbb{G} -invariant.

In either case, $\mathbf{F}_n(\hat{x}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} m(\bar{P})$ holds pointwise and in the norm of \mathbf{H} , and if \hat{P} is a probability measure with $m(\hat{P}) = \hat{x}$, then $\mathbf{F}_n(\hat{P}) \rightarrow \bar{P}$ in distribution.

7.2. Tools: Results on invariant embeddings

We now establish a few properties of invariance in reproducing spaces, which we then use to prove Theorem 22. The first two results do not require assumption (22). If a group \mathbb{G} acts on Ω , it always induces an action $x \mapsto x \circ \phi$ on functions $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, but the restriction of this action to \mathbf{H} is an action. A sufficient condition for this to be true is a diagonally invariant kernel, which even makes the action unitary:

Lemma 23 (Invariant kernels). *Let a \mathbb{G} act on a set Ω , and let κ be a kernel on Ω . If κ is diagonally invariant, the maps $x \mapsto x \circ \phi$ define an action of \mathbb{G} on \mathbf{H} . This action is unitary and makes the feature map equivariant,*

$$\langle x \circ \phi, y \circ \phi \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \circ \phi = \phi^{-1} \circ \Delta \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G}.$$

If κ is even separately invariant, so is the inner product, i.e. $\langle x \circ \phi, y \circ \psi \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle$ for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G}$, and Δ is \mathbb{G} -invariant.

Proof. See Appendix F. □

We already know, by Fact 12 that Følner averages on Hilbert space are well-behaved. If the space is reproducing, convergence holds even pointwise, and we can obtain a reproducing kernel for the subspace $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ of invariant elements as a limit:

Lemma 24 (Følner averages in reproducing spaces). *Let an amenable group \mathbb{G} act measurably on a measurable space Ω , and let κ be a measurable and diagonally invariant kernel on Ω . For each $x \in \mathbf{H}$,*

$$\mathbf{F}_n(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} x \circ \phi |d\phi| \quad \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \quad \bar{x} \quad \text{pointwise and in the norm of } \mathbf{H},$$

where \bar{x} is the projection of x onto the closed linear subspace $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$. The limit

$$\bar{\kappa}(\omega, v) := \lim_n \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} \kappa(\omega, \psi v) |d\psi| = \mathbf{F}_n(\kappa(\omega, \cdot))(v) \quad \text{for } \omega, v \in \Omega$$

is a reproducing kernel for $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$. It is separately \mathbb{G} -invariant and measurable, and is continuous if κ is continuous.

Proof. See Appendix F. □

Nice kernels are used in the mean embedding literature because they guarantee good properties of embeddings. Here is a summary of such guarantees:

Fact 25 ([45, 47]). *Let Ω be Polish and locally compact, and let κ be a nice kernel. Then every probability measure on Ω has a unique mean embedding, the map $P \mapsto m(P)$ is one-to-one, and the function $\text{MMD}(P, Q) := \|m(P) - m(Q)\|$, called the maximum mean discrepancy, is a metric on \mathcal{P} that metrizes convergence in distribution.*

We note two consequences that will prove useful in the next section:

Lemma 26 (Properties of the embedding map). *If Ω is locally compact Polish and κ is nice, the map $m : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a linear isometry if \mathcal{P} is metrized by MMD. For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$, the image measure under the feature map has barycenter $\langle \Delta_* P \rangle = m(P)$. The embedding map is equivariant, $m(P) \circ \tau^{-1} = m(\tau_* P)$, under every measurable bijection $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ that leaves κ diagonally invariant.*

Proof. See Appendix F. □

7.3. The set of invariant mean embeddings

We now consider mean embeddings of \mathbb{G} -invariant measures, and in particular the geometry of the set

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}} = m(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}) \quad \text{where } \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}} = \{P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \mid P \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant}\} .$$

This set may be empty, since some actions do not have invariant probability measures. If (22) holds, m is equivariant by Lemma 26, and we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}} = \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$. In other words, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ can equivalently be defined as the set of mean embeddings that are \mathbb{G} -invariant as functions on Ω .

Before we describe the geometry of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$, we consider that of the larger set \mathcal{M} . Since \mathcal{M} is an isometric image of \mathcal{P} , it inherits geometric properties of \mathcal{P} (which can be found in [2]):

Corollary 27. *If Ω is locally compact Polish and κ nice, \mathcal{M} is a closed convex subset of \mathbf{H} , and its extreme points are precisely the mean embeddings of point masses. If $F \subset \Omega$ is closed, the set $\mathcal{M}(F) := \{m(P) \mid P(F) = 1\}$ is a closed face of the convex set \mathcal{M} . The map $\omega \mapsto m(\delta_\omega)$ is an isomorphism of Ω and $\text{ex } \mathcal{M}$.*

The smaller $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is again convex, and can also be characterized by its extreme points:

Theorem 28. *If (22) holds, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is a closed convex subset of \mathbf{H} , and its set of extreme points is measurable. For each \mathbb{G} -invariant probability measure P on Ω , the following are equivalent:*

(i) $m(P)$ is an extreme point of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$.

(ii) For each \mathbb{G} -invariant $x \in \mathbf{H}$,

$$\langle m(P), x \rangle = x(\omega) \quad \text{holds for } P\text{-almost all } \omega \in \Omega .$$

(iii) P is an extreme point of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$.

A function $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ if and only if $x = \int_{\text{ex}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}} z \mu_x(dz)$ for some probability measure μ_x on $\text{ex}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$. If so, μ_x uniquely determined by x .

Proof. See Appendix F. □

The final statement of the result says that $m(P)$ is the barycenter $\langle \eta_P \rangle$. Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is closed, convex and metrizable, this is almost a special case of Choquet's theorem, except for the fact that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ need not be compact. The extreme points of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ in (iii) are characterized by the ergodic decomposition theorem (see e.g. A1.3 in [26], 8.20 in [18]), which can be summarized as follows:

Fact 29. *If a nice group \mathbb{G} acts measurably on a Polish space Ω , the set $\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is measurable. A measure $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant if and only if $P = \int_{\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}} Q \mu_P(dQ)$ for some probability measure μ_P on $\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$. This measure is uniquely determined by P . A measure $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ is in $\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ if and only if it is \mathbb{G} -ergodic.*

de Finetti's theorem is an example of Fact 29 where $\Omega = I^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a space of sequences, say on $I = [0, 1]$, and \mathbb{G} is the group of finitely supported permutations acting on the sequence indices. By de Finetti's theorem, P is exchangeable—that is, \mathbb{G} -invariant—if and only if $P = \int_{\mathcal{P}(I)} R^{\infty} \nu_P(dR)$ for some probability measure ν_P on $\mathcal{P}(I)$. In other words, the ergodic measures are precisely the distributions $Q = R^{\otimes \infty}$ of i.i.d. sequences. The proof of Theorem 28 shows that m maps $\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ isometrically to $\text{ex}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$, and η_P is the image measure $m_*\mu_P$. We therefore have

$$P \text{ is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad m(P) = \int_{\text{ex}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}} z \eta_P(dz) = \langle m_*\mu_P \rangle .$$

With the properties of mean embeddings established above, Theorem 22 becomes an example of our general results:

Proof of Theorem 22. We collect a few facts we have already established:

- By (23), the action is well-defined and unitary. In particular, it has bounded orbits, and all orbitopes are weakly compact, by Proposition 11.
- The invariant element of each orbitope $\Pi(x)$ is the projection \bar{x} of x onto $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$, again by Proposition 11.
- The set \mathcal{M} is norm-closed and convex by (27), and therefore weakly closed, since the norm and weak topology have the same closed convex sets. It is \mathbb{G} -invariant, since \mathcal{P} is \mathbb{G} -invariant.

If \hat{x} is the minimizer of f in (i), $\Pi(\hat{x})$ contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant minimizer \bar{x} by Theorem 6. (ii) has a \mathbb{G} -invariant minimizer $\bar{x} \in \Pi(\hat{x})$ by Proposition 8. By Lemma 24, $\mathbf{F}_n(\hat{x}) \rightarrow \bar{x}$ holds pointwise and in norm. Since \mathcal{M} is closed convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant, and since \bar{x} is the projection of \hat{x} , we have

$$\bar{x} \in \Pi(\hat{x}) \subset \mathcal{M} \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \bar{x} \in \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}},$$

so \bar{x} is the embedding of a \mathbb{G} -invariant distribution \bar{P} . Since m is an isometry, it commutes with the Bochner integral, which shows

$$m\left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} \phi_* P |d\phi|\right) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} m(P) \circ \phi |d\phi| \quad \text{or in short} \quad m \circ \mathbf{F}_n = \mathbf{F}_n \circ m.$$

By Fact 25, convergence in norm implies $\mathbf{F}_n(\hat{P}) \rightarrow \bar{P}$ in distribution. \square

Remark. Although the vector space $\text{span } \mathcal{P}$ has not inner product structure, and therefore no notion of orthogonal projection, the identity $m \circ \mathbf{F}_n = \mathbf{F}_n \circ m$ in the proof above shows that

$$\lim \mathbf{F}_n(P) = (m^{-1} \circ (\text{projection onto } \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}) \circ m)(P).$$

We can hence read the limit on the left as a form of projection onto $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$.

8 Application II: Invariant couplings

Let P_1 and P_2 be probability measures on Polish spaces Ω_1 and Ω_2 . A **coupling** of these measures is a joint distributions P on $\Omega := \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ with marginals P_1 and P_2 . Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(P_1, P_2)$ be the set of all such couplings. A **cost** is a lsc function $c : \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, and the **risk** of a coupling P is the expectation $P(c)$. Regarded as a functional $P \mapsto P(c)$, the risk is linear and lsc on Λ .

8.1. Invariance

Suppose a group \mathbb{G} acts measurably on Ω_1 and on Ω_2 , and leaves P_1 and P_2 invariant. The actions define an action on the product space,

$$\phi(\omega_1, \omega_2) := (\phi \otimes \phi)(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (\phi\omega_1, \phi\omega_2) \quad \text{for } (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega \text{ and } \phi \in \mathbb{G}.$$

The set of couplings of P_1 and P_2 invariant under this action is then

$$\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}} := \Lambda \cap \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}} := \{P \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \mid (\phi \otimes \phi)_* P = P \text{ for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G}\}$$

Since invariance of the marginals does not imply couplings are invariant (see Example 33(ii)), the set $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ is in general a proper subset of Λ . It is non-empty, since the product measure $P_1 \otimes P_2$ is always invariant. Elements of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ are known as **joinings** in ergodic theory, and various aspects of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ are well-studied [21].

8.2. The set of invariant couplings

In light of Theorem 6, we are interested in how a linear lsc functionals, such as the risk, behave on the extreme points of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$. Denote by $\Sigma = \Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ the σ -algebra of \mathbb{G} -invariant Borel sets in Ω , and by Σ_i the \mathbb{G} -invariant σ -algebra on Ω_i . Recall from Section 5.2 that $\mathbf{L}_p(\Sigma, P)$ is the subspace of \mathbb{G} -invariant elements of $\mathbf{L}_p(P)$.

Theorem 30 (Extremal invariant couplings). *Let a nice group \mathbb{G} act measurably on Ω_1 and on Ω_2 , let P_1 and P_2 be \mathbb{G} -invariant, and let $P \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) P is an extreme point of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$.
- (ii) The set $\{g_1 + g_2 \mid g_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma_i, P_i)\}$ is norm-dense in $\mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma, P)$.
- (iii) There is no non-zero $f \in \mathbf{L}_{\infty}(\Sigma, P)$ such that

$$\int (g_1 + g_2) f dP = 0 \quad \text{for all } g_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma_i, P_i) .$$

- (iv) There is no non-zero $f \in \mathbf{L}_{\infty}(\Sigma, P)$ such that, for $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \sim P$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \xi_2) \mid \xi_1] = 0 = \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1, \xi_2) \mid \xi_2] \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

Proof. See Appendix G. The result generalizes results of J. Lindenstrauss and K. R. Parthasarthy; see Section 10 for a comparison and references. \square

8.3. Invariant optimal couplings

As an application of Theorems 6 and 30, we recall the Monge-Kantorovich theorem [e.g. 42]: There is a coupling P^* that minimizes the risk over Λ and satisfies

$$(23) \quad \inf \{P(c) \mid P \in \Lambda\} = P^*(c) = \sup \{P_1(f_1) + P_2(f_2) \mid (f_1, f_2) \in \Gamma(c)\} ,$$

where the supremum is taken over the set of minorants

$$\Gamma(c) := \{f_1 + f_2 \leq c \text{ holds } P_1 \otimes P_2\text{-a.s.} \mid f_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(P_i) \text{ for } i = 1, 2\} .$$

Suppose we restrict Λ to the subset $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$, and $\Gamma(c)$ similarly to the subset of \mathbb{G} -invariant minorants

$$\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c) := \{(f_1, f_2) \in \Gamma(c) \mid f_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma_i, P_i)\} .$$

This may turn the equality (23) into an inequality $\inf_{\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}} > \sup_{\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}}$. For risks invariant under an amenable group, there is no such duality gap:

Corollary 31 (Invariant optimal couplings). *Let a nice amenable group \mathbb{G} act continuously on Ω_1 and Ω_2 . If P_1 and P_2 are \mathbb{G} -invariant and a cost c satisfies*

$$(24) \quad (\phi \otimes \phi_* P)(c) = P(c) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } P \in \Lambda ,$$

the risk $P \mapsto P(c)$ is minimized over Λ by a \mathbb{G} -invariant coupling \bar{P} that satisfies

$$\inf \{P(c) \mid P \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}\} = \bar{P}(c) = \sup \{P_1(f_1) + P_2(f_2) \mid (f_1, f_2) \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c)\} .$$

This coupling can always be chosen as an extreme point of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$.

Proof. The convex set Λ is compact in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ [42, 2.2.1]. It is also \mathbb{G} -invariant, since P_1 and P_2 are. The linear lsc functional $g(P) := P(c)$ on Λ is \mathbb{G} -invariant by (24). By Theorem 6, the subset $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ is compact and convex, and $\min_{\text{ex}\Lambda} g = \min_{\text{ex}\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}} g$. If \bar{P} is an extreme point of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ at which the minimum is attained, then

$$\bar{P}(c) = \sup_{\Gamma(c)} P_1 \otimes P_2 = \sup_{\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c)} P_1 \otimes P_2$$

where the first identity holds by the Monge-Kantorovich theorem, and the second because $\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c)$ is dense in $\Gamma(c)$ by Theorem 30. \square

We may also trade off invariance of the marginals against invariance of c . The next result considers marginals that are not invariant, but close enough to being so that their total variation orbitopes contain invariant elements.

Corollary 32. *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two probability measures that are not invariant, but have compact total variation orbitopes. Suppose the risk is even separately invariant,*

$$Q(c \circ \phi \otimes \psi) = Q(c) \quad \text{for all } \phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } Q \in \Lambda(Q_1, Q_2).$$

If \mathbb{G} is amenable, restricting $\Gamma(c)$ to $\Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c)$ does not introduce a duality gap,

$$\inf \{Q(c) \mid Q \in \Lambda(Q_1, Q_2)\} = \sup \{Q_1(f_1) + Q_2(f_2) \mid (f_1, f_2) \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c)\}.$$

Proof. See Appendix G. \square

Example 33. (i) Let P be the law of a coupling (ξ_1, ξ_2) , where ξ_1 and ξ_2 are real-valued stochastic processes indexed by \mathbb{Z} , i.e. random elements of $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Let $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{Z}$ act on the index set by addition. The coupling P is then in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ if it is jointly stationary,

$$(25) \quad (\xi_1(s), \xi_2(s)) \stackrel{d}{=} (\xi_1(s+t), \xi_2(s+t)) \quad \text{for all } s, t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

A cost that satisfies (24) can be defined, for example, as

$$(26) \quad c(\xi_1, \xi_2) = h(\xi_1(1), \xi_2(1)) \quad \text{for some lsc } h : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty).$$

Since the coordinate functions on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are continuous, c is lsc on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$.

(ii) To see that couplings of invariant marginals need not be invariant, choose stationary processes ξ_1 and ξ_2 in above, independently with i.i.d. entries. Couple them by setting $\xi_2(0) := \xi_1(0)$. That does not change the marginal distributions, and both marginals are stationary, but (ξ_1, ξ_2) is not.

(iii) McGoff and Nobel [36] study optimality of coupled dynamical systems, indexed by \mathbb{N} rather than \mathbb{Z} , that can be represented in terms of our definitions as follows: Choose ξ_1 and ξ_2 as in (i), and let P^+ be the law of the restriction $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) := (\xi_1(s), \xi_2(s))_{s>0}$ to positive indices. If (ξ_1, ξ_2) satisfies (25), then P^+ is also stationary, in the sense that (25) holds for $t \geq 0$. It is well known that, given stationarity, P and P^+ determine each other uniquely [26]. Phrased in this terminology, McGoff and Nobel [36] optimize the risk

$$R(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) := \mathbb{E}[h(\zeta_1(0), \zeta_2(0))] \quad \text{for some measurable } h : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

over all stationary laws P^+ . If h is lsc, this matches (26), and we observe that

$$P^+(c) = P(c) \quad \text{and} \quad \inf \{P^+(c) \mid P^+ \text{ stationary}\} = \inf \{P(c) \mid P \in \Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}\} .$$

Corollary 31 shows that R is optimized by a jointly stationary coupling P^+ , which is the restriction to positive indices of an extreme point P of $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$.

9 Cocycles

In machine learning problems, the summation trick is often used to obtain equivariant (rather than invariant) functions. Using a simple device from algebra, called a cocycle, we can transform equivariance and other symmetry properties into invariance under a surrogate action, which then makes our other results applicable.

9.1. Surrogate actions

Let \mathbb{G} and \mathbb{H} be groups, and \mathcal{S} a set. A map $\theta : \mathbb{G} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ that satisfies

$$\theta(\psi\phi, s) = \theta(\psi, \phi s) \circ \theta(\phi, s) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(\text{identity element of } \mathbb{G}, s) = s \quad \text{for } s \in \mathcal{S}$$

is called a **cocycle** [55]. We use this definition as follows: Let \mathcal{T} be another set, and \mathcal{F} the set of all functions $x : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. We let \mathbb{G} act on \mathcal{S} and \mathbb{H} on \mathcal{T} , and consider properties of functions x that can be formulated as

$$(27) \quad \theta(\phi, s) \circ x(s) = x \circ \phi^{-1}(s) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } s \in \mathcal{S} .$$

We rewrite (27) as invariance under a surrogate action, by defining a map

$$(28) \quad \Theta : \mathbb{G} \times \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \quad \text{as} \quad \Theta(\phi, x)(s) := \theta(\phi, s) \circ x \circ \phi(s) .$$

If and only if θ is a cocycle, Θ is a valid action of \mathbb{G} on the function set \mathcal{F} [55]. Clearly, x satisfies (27) if and only if it is invariant under the action Θ . The orbitope and Følner average of x under this action are

$$\Pi^\theta(x) := \overline{\text{co}} \{ \Theta(\phi, x) \mid \phi \in \mathbb{G} \} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{F}_n^\theta(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} \Theta(\phi, x) |d\phi| .$$

We can therefore apply Theorem 6 to find functions that satisfy (27) as follows.

Corollary 34. *Let a nice amenable group \mathbb{G} act on a locally convex space X whose elements are functions $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Let θ be a cocycle such that $\Theta(\phi, \cdot)$ is linear and continuous for each $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. If $\Pi^\theta(x)$ is compact, $\mathbf{F}_n^\theta(x)$ exists for each n , and the sequence $(\mathbf{F}_n^\theta(x))_n$ has a convergent subsequence whose limit \bar{x} is in $\Pi^\theta(x)$ and satisfies (27).*

A way to ensure linearity of Θ is as follows: A cocycle is **simple** if $\theta(\phi, s) = \theta(\phi)$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. If \mathcal{T} is a vector space, \mathbb{H} acts linearly on \mathcal{T} , and θ is simple, then Θ is always linear.

- Example 35.** (i) If $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{H}$ and θ is the identity, (27) is \mathbb{G} -invariance x .
- (ii) For $\theta(\phi, s) = \theta$, we obtain equivariance. Suppose \mathbb{G} is amenable, and the action on \mathcal{T} is linear. If the closed convex hull $\Pi^\theta(x)$ of the functions $\phi^{-1} \circ x \circ \phi$ is compact, it contains an equivariant function.
- (iii) Let x be a function with multiple arguments, \mathbb{G} the group of permutations of these arguments, and \mathbb{H} the multiplicative group $\{-1, 1\}$. Set $\theta(\phi, s) = \text{sign}(\phi)$. Then x is skew-symmetric iff it satisfies (27).
- (iv) As an example of a cocycle that is not simple, let \mathcal{S} is a σ -algebra and $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}$. All probability measure on \mathcal{S} are then elements of \mathcal{F} . A probability measure P is **quasi-invariant** under \mathbb{G} if $\phi_*P \ll P$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, or in other words, if the image measure ϕ_*P has a density under P . This density, regarded as a function $\theta(\phi, s) := d(\phi_*^{-1}P)/dP(s)$ of $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ and $s \in \mathcal{S}$, is a cocycle [55].

We can now apply all results derived for invariance to the surrogate action Θ . For example, the mean ergodic theorem (Fact 12) becomes:

Corollary 36. *Let X be a Hilbert space of functions from a measurable space \mathcal{S} into a vector space \mathcal{T} . Let a nice amenable group \mathbb{G} act measurably on \mathcal{S} , and let a group \mathbb{H} act linearly on \mathcal{T} . If $\theta : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is a simple cocycle that satisfies*

$$\langle x \circ \phi^{-1}, y \circ \phi^{-1} \rangle = \langle \theta(\phi) \circ x, \theta(\phi) \circ y \rangle \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X \text{ and } \phi \in \mathbb{G},$$

then $X_\theta = \{x \in X \mid x \text{ satisfies (27)}\}$ is a closed linear subspace of X , and

$$\| \mathbf{F}_n^\theta(z) - \bar{x} \| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{holds for each } x \in X \text{ and all } z \in \Pi^\theta(x),$$

where \bar{x} is the orthogonal projection of x onto X_θ . In particular, each orbitope $\Pi^\theta(x)$ contains an element that satisfies (27).

We can hence regard \mathbf{F}_n^θ as an approximate projector onto X_θ that becomes exact asymptotically. If \mathbb{G} is compact, we can choose $\mathbf{A}_n = \mathbb{G}$ for all n , and the projector is exact. If \mathbb{G} is compact and $\theta(\phi, s) = \text{identity}$, so that $X_\theta = X_{\mathbb{G}}$, this projector is also known as a Reynolds operator [49].

9.2. Illustration: Equivariant conditional probabilities

As a more detailed example of the use of surrogate actions, we consider the existence of equivariant conditional distributions. Suppose \mathbb{G} acts measurably on Ω , let P be a probability measure on Ω , and let η be a probability kernel, i.e. a measurable map $\eta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$. For each $t \in \Omega$, the value $\eta(t)$ is a probability measure, and we write $\eta(A, t) := \eta(t)(A)$ for a Borel set A . The kernel is P -almost \mathbb{G} -equivariant if

$$(29) \quad \eta(\phi^{-1} \cdot, t) = \eta(\cdot, \phi t) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } P\text{-almost all } t,$$

or if $\phi_*\eta = \eta \circ \phi$ in short. If ξ and ζ are two random elements of Ω , where $\zeta \sim P$ and $\eta(\cdot, t)$ is the conditional distribution of ξ given $\zeta = t$, almost equivariance of η means

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \cdot \mid \zeta = \phi t) = \mathbb{P}(\phi \xi \in \cdot \mid \zeta = t) \quad \text{for each } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and almost all } t \in \Omega.$$

Given a kernel η , an equivariant $\bar{\eta}$ can be constructed as follows:

1. Choose the cocycle $\theta(\phi, \eta) := \phi^{-1}$, which defines $\Theta(\phi, \eta) = \phi_*^{-1}\eta \circ \phi$. A kernel is \mathbb{G} -equivariant if and only if it is invariant under Θ .
2. Equip the set of probability kernels with its natural topology—this is the “weak topology” that arises, for example, in the context of stable convergence and central limit theorems for dependent variables [24]. We show that this makes the orbitope of η under the action Θ compact.
3. Verify Θ is linear and continuous. By Corollary 34, the orbitope contains a probability kernel $\bar{\eta}$ that satisfies $\Theta(\phi, \bar{\eta}) = \bar{\eta}$ for all ϕ , and is hence \mathbb{G} -equivariant.

Filling in the technical details (see the proof in Appendix H) shows the following:

Proposition 37. *Let \mathbb{G} be a amenable, and let P be a \mathbb{G} -invariant probability measures on Ω . If η is a probability kernel whose marginal distribution $\int \eta(\cdot, t)P(dt)$ on Ω is \mathbb{G} -tight, there exists a \mathbb{G} -equivariant kernel $\bar{\eta}$ that satisfies*

$$\int h(s, t)\bar{\eta}(ds, t)P(dt) \leq \sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} \int h(\phi s, \phi t)\eta(ds, t)P(dt)$$

whenever $h : \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and $s \mapsto h(s, t)$ is lsc for all $t \in \Omega$.

10 Related work

The summation formula (2) has been used for a long time, see e.g. Minsky and Papert [37]. The term summation trick is used by Diaconis [15]. Early applications to equivariant neural networks are due to Shawe-Taylor [46] and Wood and Shawe-Taylor [54]. More recent examples include [12, 29].

Orbitopes. The study of convex hulls of orbits of compact matrix groups in \mathbb{R}^d has, at least in certain special cases, a long history, see for example Atiyah [3]. More recent work includes [19, 34, 44]. The term *orbitope* is introduced by Sanyal, Sottile, and Sturmfels [44], who study the convex geometry of such objects in \mathbb{R}^n .

Amenability was introduced by von Neumann to generalize certain properties of compact groups, see e.g. [7, 22]. The Hunt-Stein theorem is among the earliest applications, and led to a period of intense interest in amenability in statistics, in particular in the context of Wald’s decision theory [8, 17, 30, 51]. This literature uses von Neumann’s definition, which is as follows: Given a nice group \mathbb{G} , define $\mathbf{L}_\infty(\mathbb{G})$ with respect to Haar measure. A **mean** is a linear functional $\chi : \mathbf{L}_\infty(\mathbb{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies $\chi(1) = 1$ and $\chi(x) \geq 0$ for all non-negative $x \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(\mathbb{G})$. Call \mathbb{G} amenable if has an invariant mean, i.e. one that satisfies $\chi(x \circ \phi) = \chi(x)$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. Følner showed that a nice group is amenable if and only if it contains a Følner sequence [22]. We follow common practice in modern ergodic theory and use this characterization as a definition [e.g. 18, 28, 52]. It has not been adopted in statistics, possibly because the Hunt-Stein theorem predates Følner’s work.

Day’s theorem (Fact 5) seems to be known mostly to specialists, but an equivalent fact is more widely appreciated, namely that every continuous action of an amenable group on a compact set has an invariant probability measure [e.g. 7, 18]. (Combining

this with Choquet’s theorem and the fact that invariant measures have invariant barycenters is one way to prove Fact 5.) Le Cam [30] uses Day’s theorem—though without attribution to Day—to prove the Hunt-Stein theorem. The proof constructs a convex \mathbb{G} -invariant risk with compact sublevel sets, and applies Day’s theorem to these sublevel sets. This is precisely the idea described in the introduction, minus the use of Følner sequences. (In our terminology, each of Le Cam’s sublevel sets contains the orbitope of the minimax solution \hat{w} in the Hunt-Stein theorem.) Another variant of the general idea appears in variational analysis:

Fact 38 (Symmetric criticality principle, Palais [38]). *Let \mathbb{G} be a group of isometries of a Riemannian manifold M and let $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a \mathbf{C}^1 function invariant under \mathbb{G} . Then the set $M_{\mathbb{G}}$ of \mathbb{G} -invariant elements of M is a totally geodesic smooth submanifold of M , and if $\bar{x} \in M_{\mathbb{G}}$ is a critical point (a point at which the differential vanishes) of the restricted function $f|_{M_{\mathbb{G}}}$, then \bar{x} is in fact a critical point of f .*

This statement is weaker than those we use, as it does not guarantee existence of \bar{x} . Accordingly, compactness or amenability of \mathbb{G} is not required, and convexity is not used since the critical point is not required to be a minimizer. Various generalizations exist in physics a variational analysis, see e.g. [53].

Dual actions. Linear actions, also called representations, are predominantly studied in the case where X is a Hilbert space or Euclidean. Some work on representations on Banach spaces exists [e.g. 35], but overall, much less seems to be known than in the Hilbert case. Dual actions are also known as dual representations, or contra-gradient representations [23]. For more on unitary actions, see [18, 28].

Lemma 9 and Theorem 10. Both proofs adapt arguments used to prove the mean ergodic theorem for countable amenable groups in Hilbert spaces [e.g. 18, 28]. See in particular the elegant proof of Weiss [52, Theorem 2.1].

Invariant mean embeddings for compact groups are described in [43]. The fact that \mathbb{G} -ergodic probability measures are the extreme points of the set of \mathbb{G} -invariant distributions is of fundamental importance to ergodic theory, and goes back to R. H. Farrell and V. S. Varadarajan, see [18, 26].

Theorem 30 generalizes results by J. Lindenstrauss [33] and by K. R. Parthasarathy [39]. Lindenstrauss proves equivalence of (i)–(iii) for doubly-stochastic measures without group invariance—in our terminology, for the special case $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 = [0, 1]^2$ with uniform marginals and $\mathbb{G} = \{\text{identity}\}$. Doubly-stochastic measures are known as **copulas** in statistics, and as **permutons** in combinatorics. Parthasarathy establishes the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv), using methods of quantum stochastic calculus. (Our proof does not require quantum probability.) For $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \{1, \dots, n\}$, couplings with uniform marginals are doubly-stochastic matrices, and Λ is the Birkhoff polytope. Parthasarathy shows that the Birkhoff characterization of double-stochastic matrices can be deduced from (iv).

Corollary 31 (invariant couplings). Other results on invariant couplings include those in [20, 31] on invariant optimal martingale couplings (which have much more structure than our couplings) for two specific compact groups, those of rotations and cyclic permutations.

Cocycles are fundamental tool of ergodic theory [e.g. 5, 11, 28, 55]. Versions of the definition have appeared in statistics under different names—Torgersen [51, §6.5],

for example, formulates a “generalized equivariance” of decisions (a special case of (27) where θ is simple and x a decision function), and deduces a decision consistency requirement that is a special case of (9.1). Recent work of Dance and Bloem-Reddy shows that the mechanism by which certain interventions propagate through a causal model is a cocycle, and specifying only this cocycle can be more robust than specifying the model [13]. The idea of a pushing an ergodic theorem through a cocycle in Corollary 36 is adapted from a similar (but much more sophisticated) one of Bowen and Nevo [11], who do so for a pointwise ergodic theorem.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation.

References

- [1] R. P. Adams and P. Orbanz. Representing and learning functions invariant under crystallographic groups. *arxiv 2306.05261*, 2023.
- [2] C. D. Aliprantis and K. C. Border. *Infinite-dimensional analysis*. Springer, 2006.
- [3] M. F. Atiyah. Convexity and commuting Hamiltonians. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 14:1–15, 1982.
- [4] M. Austern and P. Orbanz. Limit theorems for distributions invariant under groups of transformations. *Ann. Statist.*, 50:1960–1991, 2022.
- [5] A. Avila, J. Santamaria, M. Viana, and A. Wilkinson. Cocycles over partially hyperbolic maps. *Asterisque*, 358, 2013.
- [6] H. Becker and A. S. Kechris. *The descriptive set theory of Polish group actions*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- [7] B. Bekka, P. de la Harpe, and A. Valette. *Kazhdan’s property T*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008.
- [8] J. Bondar and P. Milnes. Amenability: a survey for statistical applications of Hunt-Stein and related conditions on groups. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 57(1):103–128, 1981.
- [9] J. M. Borwein and J. D. Vanderwerff. *Convex Functions: Constructions, Characterizations and Counterexamples*. Springer, 2010.
- [10] P. Bourgade, J. Najnudel, and A. Nikeghbali. A unitary extension of virtual permutations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2013:4101–4134, 2013.
- [11] L. Bowen and A. Nevo. Amenable equivalence relations and the construction of ergodic averages for group actions. *J. Anal. Math.*, 126, 2015.
- [12] T. S. Cohen and M. Welling. Group equivariant convolutional networks. In *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. (ICML)*, pages 2990–2999, 2016.
- [13] H. Dance and B. Bloem-Reddy. Causal inference with cocycles. *arxiv 2405.13844*, 2024.
- [14] M. M. Day. Fixed-point theorems for compact convex sets. *Illinois J. Math.*, 5:585–590, 1961.
- [15] P. Diaconis. *Group Representations in Probability and Statistics*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 1988.
- [16] M. L. Eaton. Group invariance applications in statistics. *Regional Conference Series in Probability and Statistics*, 1:i–133, 1989.
- [17] M. L. Eaton and E. I. George. Charles Stein and invariance: Beginning with the Hunt–Stein theorem. *Ann. Statist.*, 49(4):1815–1822, 2021.
- [18] M. Einsiedler and T. Ward. *Ergodic theory*. Springer, 2011.
- [19] H. R. Farran and S. A. Robertson. Regular convex bodies. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 2:371–384, 1994.
- [20] N. Ghoussoub and A. Moameni. Symmetric Monge-Kantorovich problems and polar decompositions of vector fields. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 24:1129–1166, 2014.
- [21] E. Glasner. *Ergodic Theory via Joinings*. Amer. Math. Soc., 2003.

- [22] R. Grigorchuk and P. de la Harpe. Amenability and ergodic properties of topological groups: From Bogolyubov onwards. In *Groups, Graphs and Random Walks*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2017.
- [23] B. C. Hall. *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations*, 2003.
- [24] E. Häusler and H. Luschgy. *Stable Convergence and Stable Limit Theorems*. Springer, 2015.
- [25] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2001.
- [26] O. Kallenberg. *Probabilistic Symmetries and Invariance Principles*. Springer, 2005.
- [27] A. S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*. Springer, 1995.
- [28] D. Kerr and H. Li. *Ergodic theory*. Springer, 2016.
- [29] R. Kondor and S. Trivedi. On the generalization of equivariance and convolution in neural networks to the action of compact groups. In *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. (ICML)*, 2018.
- [30] L. Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. Springer, 1986.
- [31] T. Lim. Optimal martingale transport between radially symmetric marginals in general dimensions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130:1897–1912, 2020.
- [32] E. Lindenstrauss. Pointwise theorems for amenable groups. *Invent. Math.*, 146(2):259–295, 2001.
- [33] J. Lindenstrauss. A note on doubly stochastic measures. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 72:379–382, 1965.
- [34] M. Longinetti, L. Sgheri, and F. Sottile. Convex hulls of orbits and orientations of a moving protein domain. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 43:54–77, 2010.
- [35] Y. I. Lyubich. *Introduction to the Theory of Banach Representations of Groups*. Birkhäuser, 1988.
- [36] K. McGoff and A. B. Nobel. Empirical risk minimization and complexity of dynamical models. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(4):2031–2054, 2020.
- [37] M. Minsky and S. A. Papert. *Perceptrons*. MIT Press, 1969.
- [38] R. S. Palais. The principle of symmetric criticality. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 69:19–30, 1979.
- [39] K. R. Parthasarathy. Extreme points of the convex set of joint probability distributions with fixed marginals. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.)*, 117(4):505–515, 2007.
- [40] D. Pfau, J. S. Spencer, A. G. D. G. Matthews, and W. M. C. Foulkes. Ab initio solution of the many-electron Schrödinger equation with deep neural networks. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 2:033429, 2020.
- [41] R. R. Phelps. *Lectures on Choquet’s theorem*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2001.
- [42] S. T. Rachev and L. Rüschendorf. *Mass Transportation Problems, Volume I*. Springer, 1998.
- [43] A. Raj, A. Kumar, Y. Mroueh, P. T. Fletcher, and B. Schölkopf. Local group invariant representations via orbit embeddings. In *JMLR W&CP*, volume 54, 2017.
- [44] R. Sanyal, F. Sottile, and B. Sturmfels. Orbitopes. *Mathematika*, 57(2):275–314, 2011.
- [45] D. Sejdinovic, B. Sriperumbudur, A. Gretton, and K. Fukumizu. Equivalence of distance-based and RKHS-based statistics in hypothesis testing. *Ann. Statist.*, 41(5):2263–2291, 2013.
- [46] J. Shawe-Taylor. Building symmetries into feedforward networks. In *Proc. 1st IEE Conf. Artif. Neural Netw.*, pages 158–162, 1989.
- [47] C.-J. Simon-Gabriel, A. Barp, B. Schölkopf, and L. Mackey. Metrizing weak convergence with maximum mean discrepancies. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:1–20, 2023.
- [48] I. Steinwart and A. Christmann. *Support Vector Machines*. Springer, 2008.
- [49] B. Sturmfels. *Algorithms in Invariant Theory*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2008.
- [50] H. Thorisson. Transforming random elements and shifting random fields. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(4):2057–2064, 1996.
- [51] E. N. Torgersen. *Comparison of statistical experiments*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991.
- [52] B. Weiss. Actions of amenable groups. In *Topics in Dynamics and Ergodic Theory*, volume 310 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- [53] M. Willem. *Minimax theorems*. Birkhäuser, 1996.
- [54] J. Wood and J. Shawe-Taylor. Representation theory and invariant neural networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 69:33–60, 1996.
- [55] R. J. Zimmer. *Ergodic theory of semi-simple Lie groups*. Birkhäuser, 1984.

A Examples of amenable groups and cocycles

A.1. Amenable groups

Many groups used in statistics and machine learning are amenable, and this section lists some examples. For more on the mathematical implications of amenability, see [7, 22, 52]. See [4] on how the averages \mathbf{F}_n can be interpreted as estimators, and for a range of examples in statistics.

1) All finite and compact groups are amenable (since we can choose all sets in the Følner sequence as the group itself). All results throughout therefore hold for compact groups (though many become trivial). Compact groups relevant to statistics include the **symmetric groups** \mathbb{S}_n , which consists of all permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and the **orthogonal group** \mathbb{O}_d of rotations of \mathbb{R}^d .

2) The **finitary symmetric group** $\mathbb{S} = \cup_n \mathbb{S}_n$, which consists of all finitely supported permutations of \mathbb{N} . The subgroups \mathbb{S}_n form a Følner sequence.

3) The **discrete shifts groups** $(\mathbb{Z}^d, +)$. The sets $\{-n, \dots, n\}^d$ and $\{0, \dots, n\}^d$ both form Følner sequences.

4) The **continuous shift groups** $(\mathbb{R}^d, +)$, with Følner sequences $[-n, n]^d$ or $[0, n]^d$.

5) The **Euclidean groups** of all isometries of \mathbb{R}^d , which can be identified with $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{O}_d$. The sets $[0, n]^d \times \mathbb{O}_d$ form a Følner sequence.

6) The **scale group** $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \cdot)$, with the sets $[1, e^n]$ as approximating sequence. This group is homomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ via the group homomorphism $x \mapsto \exp(x)$.

5) The **finitary special orthogonal group** \mathbb{SO}_∞ , which can be identified with $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{SO}_n$, and has Følner sequence $(\mathbb{SO}_n)_n$. Invariance under this group is called rotatability and characterizes certain Gaussian processes [26].

6) A **finitary unitary group** can be defined similarly [10].

7) All **abelian**, all **nilpotent**, and all **solvable** groups are amenable [22].

8) The group of non-singular, upper-triangular matrices is amenable (as it is solvable).

9) Any multiplicative group of upper triangular matrices whose diagonal entries are all 1 is amenable (since it is nilpotent).

10) A special case is the **Heisenberg group** over an algebraic field \mathbb{K} [55],

$$\{M[a, b, c] \mid a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}\} \quad \text{where} \quad M[a, b, c] := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ 0 & 1 & c \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The sets $\mathbf{A}_n := \{M(a, b, c) \mid |a|, |b|, |c| \leq n\}$ form a Følner sequence if \mathbb{K} is \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{R} .

11) The **crystallographic groups**. A group \mathbb{G} of isometries of \mathbb{R}^k is crystallographic if it tiles \mathbb{R}^k with a convex polytope $M \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, that is, the polytopes ϕM for $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ cover \mathbb{R}^k entirely and only their boundaries overlap. There are 17 such groups for $k = 2$, 230 for $k = 3$, and a finite number for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Those on \mathbb{R}^3 describe the possible geometries of crystals, and are fundamental to materials science. See [1] for applications in machine learning and for references.

12) The **lamplighter group** [e.g. 32]. Each group element is a pair $\phi = (I_\phi, j_\phi)$ of

a finite set $I_\phi \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and a number $j_\phi \in \mathbb{Z}$. The operation is $\psi\phi := (I_\psi \Delta I_\phi, j_\psi + j_\phi)$, with unit element $e = (\emptyset, 0)$. The lamplighter metaphor imagines an infinite row of street lights indexed by \mathbb{Z} . Each element ϕ specifies all lamps indexed by I_ϕ as on, and a lamplighter stands at lamp j_ϕ . An element ψ acts on ϕ by toggling the state of all lamps in I_ψ , and moving the lamplighter by j_ψ steps.

A.2. Examples of cocycles

We have already seen in Example 35 that equivariance, and skew-symmetry can be represented as cocycles. We mention a few more case, but the list is far from exhaustive.

1) *Quasi-invariance.* A function is quasi-invariant under \mathbb{G} if it is invariant up to positive scaling. Thus, x is quasi-invariant iff it is Θ -invariant for any map $\theta(\phi, s) = \theta(\theta)$ into the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \cdot)$.

2) *Characters.* Choose \mathbb{H} as the complex circle $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$ with multiplication as operation. A continuous function $\theta : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ with $\theta(e_{\mathbb{G}}) = 1$ is a **character** of \mathbb{G} . This implies (9.1), so the characters of \mathbb{G} are precisely the continuous simple cocycles into \mathbb{H} . For $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{R}, +)$, every character is of the form $\phi \mapsto e^{i\psi\phi}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$, which is, of course, the Fourier kernel.

3) *The modulus.* On every nice group exists a unique function $\theta : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, called the **modulus** of \mathbb{G} , that satisfies

$$\int f(\phi\psi^{-1})|d\phi| = \theta(\psi) \int f(\phi)|d\phi| \quad \text{for all } \phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G}$$

for every compactly supported continuous $f : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, see [16]. The definition implies $\theta(\phi\psi) = \theta(\phi)\theta(\psi)$, so the modulus is a simple cocycle.

4) The *coboundary* $(\phi x - x)(s) =: \theta(\phi, s)$ of a function x (Section 4.3) is a cocycle.

5) *Gradient fields.* An isometry of \mathbb{R}^n is a map $\phi(\omega) = A_\phi\omega + b_\phi$, where A_ϕ is an orthogonal matrix and $b_\phi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let \mathbb{G} be a group of isometries. If a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant, its gradient vector field $F(\omega) = (\nabla x)(\omega)$ satisfies $A_\phi F = F \circ \phi$ for all $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. This is Θ -invariance for the simple cocycle $\theta(\phi, \omega) := A_\phi^t$. See [1] for more on such Θ -invariant fields.

B Proofs for Section 3

In this section, we prove Lemma 3 and Theorem 6. Both proofs use basic facts from Choquet theory:

Fact 39 (e.g. [41, 1.2 and 1.5]). *Let K be a compact set in a locally convex Hausdorff space. A point is in the closed convex hull $\overline{\text{co}} K$ if and only if it is the barycenter of a Radon probability measure on K . If $\overline{\text{co}} K$ is also compact, every Radon probability on K has a barycenter, and all extreme points of $\overline{\text{co}} K$ are in K .*

Proof of Lemma 3. 1° The orbit $\mathbb{G}(x)$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant. Since each $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ is linear continuous, it commutes with convex combinations and limits, so $\Pi(x) = \overline{\text{co}} \mathbb{G}(x)$ is \mathbb{G} -invariant. A set $A \subset X$ is hence an open subset of $\Pi(x)$ iff ϕA is. Since the interior is the union of all open subsets, it is \mathbb{G} -invariant. Consequently, $\partial \Pi(x) = \Pi(x) \setminus \Pi(x)^\circ$ is invariant.

2° If A is \mathbb{G} -invariant, it is a disjoint union of orbits, so $x \in A$ iff $\mathbb{G}(x) \subset A$. If A is also closed and convex, then $\mathbb{G}(x) \subset A$ iff $\overline{\text{co}} \mathbb{G}(x) \subset A$. This shows (i).

3° The two statements in (ii) follow respectively from the fact that a Banach norm topology is completely metrizable, which implies that closed convex hulls of compact sets are compact [2, 5.35], and from the Krein-Smulian theorem [2, 6.35].

4° If $\Pi(x)$ is compact, it is a compact convex set in a locally convex Hausdorff space, and (iii) follows from Fact 39.

5° For (iv), note that linearity of the action implies $\mathbb{G}(ax_1 + bx_2) = a\mathbb{G}(x_1) + b\mathbb{G}(x_2)$ for any linear combination of vectors x_1 and x_2 . (Here, $a\mathbb{G}(x_1)$ is the scaled set $\{az \mid z \in \mathbb{G}(x_1)\}$, and $+$ on the right denotes the Minkowski sum.) It follows that

$$\text{co } \mathbb{G}(x) = \text{co } \mathbb{G}\left(\sum c_i x_i\right) = \sum c_i \text{co } \mathbb{G}(x_i),$$

and since the action, sum and scaling are continuous, $\overline{\text{co}} \mathbb{G}(x) = \sum c_i \overline{\text{co}} \mathbb{G}(x_i)$. \square

To prove Theorem 6, we need a few auxiliary results. The first is a variant of Jensen's inequality for barycenters.

Lemma 40. *Let P be a Radon probability measure on a locally convex Hausdorff space X whose barycenter exists. Then $f(\langle P \rangle) \leq P(f)$ holds for every proper convex lsc function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If the closed convex hull of a set $M \subset X$ is compact, we also have $f(\langle P \rangle) \leq \sup \{f(x) \mid x \in M\}$ for every probability measure P on \overline{M} .*

Proof. 1° A proper convex lsc function is the pointwise supremum $f(x) = \sup a(x)$, taken over all affine continuous functions $a : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy $a < f$ [2, 7.6]. Since $P(a) = a(\langle P \rangle)$ holds by the definition of barycenters whenever a is linear, it also holds if a is affine. We hence have $f(\langle P \rangle) = \sup_{a < f} a(\langle P \rangle) = \sup_{a < f} P(a) \leq P(f)$.

2° By Bauer's maximum principle, each a attains its maximum on the compact convex set $K := \overline{\text{co}} M$ at an extreme point, so

$$f(\langle P \rangle) = \sup_{a < f} P(a) \leq \sup_{a < f} \sup_{x \in K} a(x) \leq \sup_{a < f} \sup_{x \in \text{ex} K} a(x) = \sup_{x \in \text{ex} K} \sup_{a < f} a(x) = \sup_{x \in \text{ex} K} f(x).$$

All extreme points of K are in the closure of M [41, 1.5], so $\sup_{\text{ex} K} f = \sup_{\overline{M}} f$, and since f is lsc, $\sup_{\overline{M}} f = \sup_M f$. \square

Our strategy for the proof of Theorem 6 is to represent the Følner average \mathbf{F}_n as the barycenter of a probability measure supported on the orbitope. The next result provides such a measure:

Lemma 41. *Let a nice group \mathbb{G} act continuously on a Hausdorff space X . Let $A \subset \mathbb{G}$ be compact. Then for each $x \in X$,*

$$(30) \quad \eta_A(B) := \frac{|\{\phi \in A \mid \phi(x) \in B\}|}{|A|} \quad \text{for } B \subset X \text{ Borel}$$

defines a Radon probability measure on X that satisfies

$$|\eta_A(f - f \circ \psi)| \leq \frac{|A \Delta \psi A|}{|A|} \sup_{\phi \in A} |f(\phi(x))|$$

for every continuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and every $\psi \in \mathbb{G}$.

Proof. The measure $U_A(\cdot) := |\cdot \cap A|/|A|$ is the uniform distribution on A , and is Radon since \mathbb{G} is Polish. We can write η_A as the image measure $\eta_A = U_A \circ t_x^{-1}$ of under the map $t_x(\phi) := \phi(x)$. Since \mathbb{G} acts continuously, $t_x : \mathbb{G} \rightarrow X$ is continuous. Since A is compact, a set $C \subset A$ is compact if and only if $t_x(C)$ is. It follows that

$$\sup \{\eta_A(D) \mid D \subset B \text{ compact}\} = \sup \{U_A(C) \mid C \subset t_x^{-1}B \text{ compact}\} = U_A(t_x^{-1}B)$$

for any Borel set $B \subset X$, so η_A is Radon. If $\psi \in \mathbb{G}$, substituting into the definition shows

$$\eta_A(\psi^{-1}B) = \frac{|\{\phi \in A \mid \psi\phi(x) \in B\}|}{|A|} = \frac{|\{\phi \in \psi^{-1}A \mid \phi(x) \in B\}|}{|\psi^{-1}A|} = \eta_{\psi^{-1}A}(B)$$

If $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $\phi \mapsto f(\phi(x))$ is continuous and hence bounded on A , which shows f is η_A -integrable. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_A(f - f \circ \psi)| &= |\eta_A(f) - \psi_*\eta_A(f)| \\ &= |\eta_A(f) - \eta_{\psi^{-1}A}(f)| \\ &= \frac{1}{|A|} \left| \int_{A \Delta \psi^{-1}A} f(\phi(x)) |d\phi| \right| \leq \frac{|A \Delta \psi^{-1}A|}{|A|} \sup_{\phi \in A} |f(\phi(x))| \end{aligned}$$

for each $\psi \in \mathbb{G}$. □

Lemma 42. *Let a nice group \mathbb{G} act linearly and continuously on a locally convex Hausdorff space X , and let $\Pi(x)$ be compact. Then the integral $|A|^{-1} \int_A \phi x |d\phi|$ exists for each compact $A \subset \mathbb{G}$, is the barycenter of η_A , and is contained in $\Pi(x)$.*

Proof. Define the continuous map t_x as above. Since $t_x(A)$ is compact, every Radon measure concentrated on $t_x(A)$ has a barycenter in the closed convex hull of $t_x(A)$ [41]. Since η_A is such a Radon measure, its barycenter $\langle \eta_A \rangle$ exists and is in $\overline{\text{co}} t_x(A) \subset \Pi(x)$. For any continuous linear $\ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, substituting into the barycenter definition shows

$$\ell(\langle \eta_A \rangle) = \int \ell(z) \eta_A(dz) = \int_A \ell(t_x(\phi)) \frac{|d\phi|}{|A|} = \frac{1}{|A|} \int_A \ell(\phi(x)) |d\phi|,$$

which is just the definition of the integral. □

Proof of Theorem 6. Since x is fixed, we abbreviate $\Pi = \Pi(x)$, and denote by M the closure of the orbit $\mathbb{G}(x)$. For each n , denote by $\eta_n := \eta_A$ the measure defined in (30) for the Følner set $A = \mathbf{A}_n$.

1° By Lemma 42, we have $\mathbf{F}_n(x) = \langle \eta_n \rangle$. In particular, $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ exists and is in Π .

2° Let $\mathcal{P}(M)$ be the set of Radon probability measures on M . Since Π is compact Hausdorff, so is the closed subset M , which makes $\mathcal{P}(M)$ compact Hausdorff in vague convergence [41]. Since $\eta_n(M) = 1$ for each n , the sequence (η_n) is in $\mathcal{P}(M)$. By compactness, it has a subsequence $(\eta_{i(n)})$ that converges to a limit $\bar{\eta} \in \mathcal{P}(M)$. By Fact 39, its barycenter $\bar{x} := \langle \bar{\eta} \rangle$ exists and is in $\overline{\text{co}} M = \Pi$.

3° Since M is compact, vague convergence on M means $\eta_n(f) \rightarrow \bar{\eta}(f)$ for every continuous $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Consider any $\psi \in \mathbb{G}$. Lemma 41 and the Følner property (12) then show

$$|\bar{\eta}(f - f \circ \psi)| = \lim_n |\eta_n(f - f \circ \psi)| \leq \lim_n \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \Delta \psi^{-1} \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \sup |f| = 0.$$

We hence have $\psi_* \bar{\eta}(f) = \bar{\eta}(f)$ for every continuous f . Since the vague topology separates points in $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)$, it follows that $\psi_* \bar{\eta} = \bar{\eta}$, so the limit $\bar{\eta}$ is a \mathbb{G} -invariant measure. For any linear continuous $\ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the map $\ell \circ \psi$ is again linear continuous, since the action is linear and continuous.

$\ell(\psi(\langle \bar{\eta} \rangle)) = \bar{\eta}(\ell \circ \psi) = \psi_* \bar{\eta}(\ell) = \bar{\eta}(\ell) = \ell(\bar{\eta})$ for $\ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ linear continuous since ψ , and hence $\ell \circ \psi$, is linear and continuous. As the linear continuous maps separate points in X , that implies $\psi \bar{\eta} = \bar{\eta}$. Thus, the barycenter \bar{x} is \mathbb{G} -invariant.

4° Consider the convex lsc function f in (14). If $f = \infty$ everywhere on Π , (14) is trivially true. If $f < \infty$ somewhere, f is proper. Since $\bar{\eta} \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ and hence $\bar{\eta}(M) = 1$, Lemma 40 shows

$$f(\bar{x}) \leq \sup_{z \in \mathbb{G}(x)} f(z) = \sup_{\phi \in \mathbb{G}} f(\phi z).$$

In summary, we have shown that (i) and (ii) hold.

5° Since K is closed convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant, the orbitopes of all $x \in K$ are in K , and hence compact. It follows by (ii) that $K_{\mathbb{G}}$ is not empty. Since the action is linear and continuous, the set $X_{\mathbb{G}}$ of all invariant elements of X is a closed linear subspace, and $K_{\mathbb{G}} = K \cap X_{\mathbb{G}}$ is hence a compact convex set. By Bauer's extremum principle [2], g attains its infimum at an extreme point z_g of K . Let \bar{z} be an invariant element of $\Pi(z_g)$. The sublevel sets $[g \leq r]$ of g are convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant (since g is), and closed (since g is lsc). It follows that

$$\bar{z} \in \Pi(z_g) \subset K \cap [g \leq g(z_g)] = \arg \min_K g \quad \text{and hence} \quad \min_K g = \min_{K_{\mathbb{G}}} g.$$

Since the set of minimizers of a convex function on a convex set is either extreme or empty, the minimum is attained at an extreme point of $K_{\mathbb{G}}$. \square

C Proofs for Section 4

Proof of Lemma 7. 1° The action has bounded orbits iff $\sup_{\phi} \|\phi(x)\| < \infty$ for each x , and hence iff the set $\mathcal{T} := \{\phi : X \rightarrow X \mid \phi \in \mathbb{G}\}$ of bounded linear operators is

bounded pointwise on X . That is the case iff \mathcal{T} has bounded operator norm [2, 6.14]. Similarly, the dual action defines a set \mathcal{T}' , and has bounded orbits iff \mathcal{T}' is norm-bounded. Since \mathcal{T}' consists of the adjoints of maps in \mathcal{T} , and a linear operator and its adjoint have the same norm, an action has bounded orbits if and only if its dual action does. This shows (i).

2° Substituting the definition of dual actions into that of the dual norm shows (ii).

3° Fix any $y \in Y$. If the orbits are bounded, the convex hull $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(y)$ is contained in a closed norm ball B . Since the weak* closure $\Pi(y)$ is also norm-closed, it is likewise in B . By Alaoglu's theorem, B is weak* compact, and the same hence holds for $\Pi(y)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 9. The set $\Pi(x) - x$ is the closed convex hull of all vectors $\phi(x) - x$. Since the actions are dual, such vectors satisfy

$$\langle \phi(x) - x, y \rangle = \langle x, \phi^{-1}y - y \rangle \quad \text{for all } y \in Y .$$

The vectors $\phi y - y$, for all ϕ and $y \in Y$, clearly form a vector space, say V . Observe that x is \mathbb{G} -invariant if and only if $\phi(x) - x = 0$ for all ϕ , or equivalently, iff

$$\langle \phi(x) - x, y \rangle = 0 \quad \text{for all } \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } y \in Y .$$

It follows that V is a subspace of the annihilator $X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ of $X_{\mathbb{G}}$. Since x is only invariant if it annihilates all elements of V , we also have $V^{\perp} = X_{\mathbb{G}}$. Since $V^{\perp\perp}$ is the closure of V [2, 5.107], this shows $X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ is the closure of $\{\phi y - y \mid \phi \in \mathbb{G} \text{ and } y \in Y\}$. This implies in particular $X_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ contains $\Pi(y)$. Similarly, $Y_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ is the weak* closure of all functions $\phi(x) - x$ in X , and $Y_{\mathbb{G}}^{\perp}$ contains $\Pi(x)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 10. 1° We first use the weak topology. Let Π be a weakly compact orbitope in X . Then each $x \in \Pi$ has a compact orbitope, since $\Pi(x) \subset \Pi$. By Lemma 42, that implies that $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ exists and is a barycenter, and Lemma 40 shows

$$f(\mathbf{F}_n(x)) \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} f(x \circ \phi) |d\phi| \quad \text{for } f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ proper convex lsc.}$$

The norm function is proper, convex, and weakly lsc [2, 6.22]. It is also \mathbb{G} -invariant, since the action is isometric. It follows that

$$(31) \quad \|\mathbf{F}_n(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \int_{\mathbf{A}_n} \|x \circ \phi\| |d\phi| = \|x\| \quad \text{for each } x \in \Pi .$$

2° Now consider the norm topology. Let x be a point in Π . If a sequence (x_i) in Π converges in norm to x , then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{F}_n x\| &= \|\mathbf{F}_n(x - x_i + x_i)\| \\ &= \|\mathbf{F}_n(x - x_i) + \mathbf{F}_n x_i\| && \text{since } z \mapsto \mathbf{F}_n(z) \text{ linear} \\ &= \liminf_i \|\mathbf{F}_n(x - x_i) + \mathbf{F}_n x_i\| && \text{independent of } i \\ &\leq \liminf_i \|\mathbf{F}_n(x - x_i)\| + \|\mathbf{F}_n x_i\| && \text{the norm is subadditive} \\ &\leq \liminf_i \|x - x_i\| + \|\mathbf{F}_n x_i\| && \text{by (31)} \\ &\leq \liminf_i \|\mathbf{F}_n x_i\| && \text{since } \|x - x_i\| \rightarrow 0 . \end{aligned}$$

(This does not assume norm continuity of the integral, since \mathbf{F}_n is eliminated before the limit is applied.) We have therefore shown that $\|\mathbf{F}_n(\cdot)\|$ is norm lsc on Π .

3° For elements of $\mathbb{G}(x) - x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{F}_n(\phi(x) - x)\| &= \left\| \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}} \psi(\phi(x) - x) |d\psi| \right\| && \text{definition of } \mathbf{F}_n \\
&= \left\| \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}\phi} \psi x |d\psi| - \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}} \psi x |d\psi| \right\| \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}\Delta\phi\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}} \|\psi(x)\| |d\psi| && \text{triangle inequality} \\
&= \int_{\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}\Delta\phi\mathbf{A}_n^{-1}} \|x\| |d\psi| && \text{norm is } \mathbb{G}\text{-invariant} \\
&= \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \Delta \phi^{-1} \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \|x\| && \text{since } |A| = |A^{-1}| \text{ for } A \subset \mathbb{G}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since each point $z \in \text{co } \mathbb{G}(x)$ is a finite convex combination $z = \sum_{i \leq k} c_k \phi_k x$,

$$(32) \quad \|\mathbf{F}_n(z - x)\| = \left\| \sum_{i \leq k} c_k \mathbf{F}_n(\phi_k x - x) \right\| \leq \max_{i \leq k} \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \Delta \phi_i^{-1} \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \|x\|.$$

4° All arguments in step 1 and 2 apply analogously on the dual space Y , since the dual norm is weak* lsc [2, 6.22]. It follows that the function $y \mapsto \|\mathbf{F}_n(y)\|$ is lsc in the dual norm at every point y whose orbitope is weak* compact. Since the action is isometric, that is true for all y by Lemma 7, so norm lower semicontinuity holds everywhere on Y . Moreover, (32) holds for each $y \in Y$ and each z in the convex hull of $\mathbb{G}(y)$. We have therefore established (ii).

5° On the primal space X , the function $\|\mathbf{F}_n(\cdot)\|$ is also weakly lsc, since the norm and weak topology have the same convex lsc functions [2, 5.99].

6° It remains to verify the contraction $\|\mathbf{F}_n(\Pi)\| \rightarrow 0$ in (i). Let x be a point in X with $\Pi(x) = \Pi$. Since the convex hull $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(x)$ is dense in $\Pi(x)$, it hence suffices to show $\|\mathbf{F}_n(z_1 - z_2)\| \rightarrow 0$ for all $z_1, z_2 \in \text{co } \mathbb{G}(x)$. By (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{F}_n(z_1 - z_2)\| &= \|\mathbf{F}_n(z_1 - x + x - z_2)\| \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{F}_n(z_1 - x)\| + \|\mathbf{F}_n(z_2 - x)\| \leq \frac{|\mathbf{A}_n \Delta \phi^{-1} \mathbf{A}_n|}{|\mathbf{A}_n|} \|x\|
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$. □

D Proofs for Section 5

Proof of Proposition 11. The action is isometric by (19). By Lemma 7, $\Pi(x)$ is weakly compact. Since $\phi(x) = \bar{x} + \phi(x)^\perp$, and $\langle \phi(x)^\perp, \bar{y} \rangle = \langle x^\perp, \bar{y} \rangle = 0$ for $\bar{y} \in X_{\mathbb{G}}$, we have

$$\Pi(x) \subset \bar{x} + \text{closure}(\text{span } \mathbb{G}(x^\perp)) \perp X_{\mathbb{G}}.$$

Orthogonality implies all $y \in \Pi(x)$ have the same projection onto $X_{\mathbb{G}}$, so $\bar{y} = \bar{x}$. Consider a convex combination of two points ψx and ϕx on the orbit. Since \mathbb{G}

is a group, we can choose ψ as identity without loss of generality. Minkowski's inequality shows

$$\|\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)\phi x\| \leq \lambda\|x\| + (1 - \lambda)\|\phi x\| = \|x\| ,$$

so all y in the convex hull of $\mathbb{G}(x)$ satisfy $\|y\| \leq \|x\|$. Since the norm function is continuous, the same extends to all y in the closure of the convex hull. If \mathbb{G} is amenable, $\Pi(x) \cap X_{\mathbb{G}}$ has at least one element, by Theorem 6. By orthogonality, there can be only one such element, and this element is \bar{x} . \square

E Proofs for Section 6

Proof of Proposition 15. P is \mathbb{G} -tight if and only if $Q(K_\varepsilon) > 1 - \varepsilon$ holds for some compact K_ε and all $Q \in \mathbb{G}(P)$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$. If and only if that is true, the same holds for all convex combinations of such Q . The convex hull of $\mathbb{G}(P)$ is hence a tight family of measures in the sense of Prokhorov's theorem iff P is \mathbb{G} -tight, so its closure is compact iff P is \mathbb{G} -tight. \square

For the proof of Proposition 16(i), we note that, for two measures $\nu \ll \mu$,

$$(33) \quad \frac{d(\phi_*\nu)}{d(\phi_*\mu)} = \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \circ \phi^{-1} \quad \mu\text{-a.e. for each } \phi \in \mathbb{G}$$

holds by (11). The proof of (ii) uses the orbit coupling theorem of H. Thorisson:

Fact 43 (Thorisson [50]). *Let a locally compact Polish group \mathbb{G} act measurably on a Polish space Ω , and let $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ be the σ -algebra of \mathbb{G} -invariant Borel sets. Two probability measures P and Q coincide on $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ if and only if, for every $\zeta \sim P$, there is a random element Ψ of \mathbb{G} such that $\Psi\zeta \sim Q$.*

Proof of Proposition 16. Let \mathcal{P}_μ be the set of all probability measures absolutely continuous with respect to μ .

1° Since μ is \mathbb{G} -invariant, (33) implies that \mathcal{P}_μ is \mathbb{G} -invariant, so $P \in \mathcal{P}_\mu$ implies $\mathbb{G}(P) \subset \mathcal{P}_\mu$. Moreover, \mathcal{P}_μ is clearly convex, and since convergence in total variation preserves absolute continuity, it is closed. The closed convex hull $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ is hence again in \mathcal{P}_μ , so μ dominates $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$.

2° Let $r : \mathcal{P}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$ be the map $Q \mapsto dQ/d\mu$ from a measure to its density. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem, r is a linear bijection of \mathcal{P}_μ and $\mathbf{L}_1(\mu)$, and both r and its inverse are norm-norm continuous [2, §13.6]. By (33), we also have $r(\phi_*Q) = r(Q) \circ \phi$, since μ is \mathbb{G} -invariant. In other words, r commutes with norm-closures, convex combinations, and elements of \mathbb{G} . It follows that

$$d\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)/d\mu = r(\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)) = \Pi_1(r(P)) = \Pi_1(dP/d\mu) .$$

3° It remains to show (ii). Let $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ be the σ -algebra of \mathbb{G} -invariant Borel sets. Then P and ϕ_*P coincide on $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$ for every $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, since $P(\phi^{-1}A) = P(A)$ if $A \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$. If measures P_1, P_2, \dots coincide with P on $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$, the same holds for any convex combination of these measure, and for their limit in total variation (since total variation

implies convergence on each Borel set). Thus, all measures in $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ have the same restriction to $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$. By Theorem 6, $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P)$ contains a \mathbb{G} -invariant measure \bar{P} , and we can apply Fact 43 to couple P and \bar{P} . \square

Proof of Proposition 17. Since $\phi\delta_x = \delta_{\phi(x)}$ for $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, the orbit of δ_x is

$$\mathbb{G}(\delta_x) = \{\delta_z \mid z \in \mathbb{G}(x)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{co } \mathbb{G}(\delta_x) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{G}(x)).$$

1° Since convergence in total variation implies setwise convergence, $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{G}(x))$ is closed in total variation, which shows (i).

2° Since Ω is Polish, every closed subset is a G_δ set, and hence again Polish [27]. The orbit closure $\overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}$ of every point x is hence separable and metrizable.

3° Let x_1, x_2, \dots be points in X . By the definition of convergence in distribution,

$$\delta_{x_n} \xrightarrow{d} \delta_x \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x) \text{ all bounded continuous } f \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x_n \rightarrow x \text{ in } X.$$

That shows $\delta_z \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(\delta_x)} \Leftrightarrow z \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}$ and hence

$$\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_x) = \overline{\text{co } \mathbb{G}(\delta_x)} = \overline{\text{co } \{\delta_z \mid z \in \mathbb{G}(x)\}}.$$

The convex hull of $\{\delta_z \mid z \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}\}$ are the finitely supported probability measures on $\overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}$. Since the orbit closure is metrizable, the finitely supported probabilities are weak* dense in all probability measures [2, 15.10], so

$$\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_x) = \overline{\text{co } \{\delta_z \mid z \in \overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}\}} = \mathcal{P}(\overline{\mathbb{G}(x)}).$$

Since the extreme points of the set of probability measures on a metrizable space are the point masses [2, 15.9], the extreme points of $\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_x)$ are the point masses on the orbit closure. That shows (ii).

4° Since Ω is separable and metrizable, the set of probability measures on a closed subset is a closed face of $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ [2, 15.19]. In particular, $\mathcal{P}(\overline{\mathbb{G}(x)})$ is such a closed face. \square

Proof of the Lemma in Example 19. By Proposition 17, we can determine the orbitopes $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(\delta_x)$ and $\Pi_{\text{D}}(\delta_x)$ by determining the orbit $\mathbb{S}(x)$ and its closure $\overline{\mathbb{S}(x)}$. The closure is taken in the product topology on Ω , and hence in element-wise convergence of sequences. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$ be the set of injections $\tau : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$z = \lim_k \phi_k x \text{ for some } \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots \in \mathbb{S} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad z = \tau x \text{ for some } \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$$

To see this, note that any bijection τ can be represented in this way, and that an infinite sequence of permutations can delete entries of x in the limit by “swapping them out to infinity”. Thus, $\overline{\mathbb{S}(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}x$. If $x \in \Omega(n, \infty)$, we have

$$\mathbb{S}(x) = \Omega(m, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathbb{S}(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}x = \cup_{k \leq m} \Omega(k, \infty)$$

and analogous statements hold for $\Omega(\infty, n)$. For every $x \in \Omega(\infty, \infty)$, there is some bijection $\tau_x \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\tau_x x = (0, 1, 0, 1, \dots)$, so

$$\mathbb{S}(x) \subset \Omega(\infty, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathbb{S}(x)} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}x = \Omega(\infty, \infty). \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 21. 1° Since Ω is Polish, it is a normal Hausdorff space [2, 3.21]. That implies the norm dual of $(\mathbf{C}_b, \|\cdot\|_{\text{sup}})$ is $(\mathbf{ba}_n, \|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}})$, and that \mathbf{ca} is a norm-closed in \mathbf{ba}_n [2, 14.10]. The dual norm is $\|\mu\|' = |\mu(\Omega)|$ [2], so its restriction to \mathbf{ca} is $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$.

2° Since convergence in total variation preserves non-negativity and total mass, \mathcal{P} is norm-closed convex subset of \mathbf{ca} , and therefore also of \mathbf{ba}_n . It follows that $\Pi_{\text{TV}}(P) = \Pi'(P)$.

3° Since each $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$ defines a bijection of Ω , we have $\|f \circ \phi\|_{\text{sup}} = \|f\|_{\text{sup}}$, so the action is isometric. By Lemma 7, this implies $\Pi_*(P)$ is compact.

4° Let τ denote the topology of convergence in measure on \mathbf{ca} . Then the restriction of the weak* topology to \mathbf{ca} is τ , and \mathcal{P} is closed in τ [2]. A set $A \subset \mathcal{P}$ is therefore τ -closed iff it is the restriction $A = A' \cap \mathcal{P}$ of a weak*-closed set $A' \subset \mathbf{ba}_n$. Since closures of convex sets are convex, $\Pi_*(P)$ is the smallest weak*-closed set that contains $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(P)$. Its restriction $\Pi_*(P) \cap \mathcal{P}$ is then the smallest τ -closed set that contains $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(P) \cap \mathcal{P} = \text{co } \mathbb{G}(P)$, which is just the definition of $\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)$.

5° As \mathcal{P} is τ -closed, we have $\Pi_*(P) \cap \mathcal{P} = \Pi_*(P) \cap \mathbf{ca}$, so $\Pi_*(P) \setminus \Pi_{\text{D}}(P) \subset \mathbf{ba}_n \setminus \mathbf{ca}$.

6° Since a set and its closure have the same support function, we have

$$H(f|\Pi_{\text{D}}(P)) = H(f|\text{co } \mathbb{G}(P)) = H(f|\Pi_*(P)) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbf{C}_b .$$

The identity $H(f|\Pi_*(P)) = H(P|\Pi(f))$ follows by substituting into (17). \square

F Proofs for Section 7

We first prove the three general lemmas in Section 7.2.

Proof of Lemma 23. 1° The linear maps $T_\phi : x \mapsto x \circ \phi$ define an action of \mathbb{G} on the vector space of all functions $x : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Define the set $\mathbf{H}_0 := \text{span}\{\kappa(\omega, \cdot) | \omega \in \Omega\}$. This is a norm-dense linear subspace of \mathbf{H} [48]. Since κ is diagonally invariant,

$$T_\phi(\kappa(\omega, \cdot)) = \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \circ \phi = \kappa(\phi^{-1}\omega, \cdot) \in \mathbf{H}_0 .$$

This extends to the span \mathbf{H}_0 by linearity of T_ϕ , so $T_\phi(\mathbf{H}_0) \subset \mathbf{H}_0$. The restrictions of the maps T_ϕ to \mathbf{H}_0 hence define a linear action of \mathbb{G} on \mathbf{H}_0 .

2° The reproducing property $x(\omega) = \langle x, \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \rangle$ and diagonal invariance of κ imply

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \kappa(v, \cdot) \circ \phi, \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \circ \phi \rangle &= \langle \kappa(\phi^{-1}v, \cdot), \kappa(\phi^{-1}\omega, \cdot) \rangle \\ &= \kappa(\phi^{-1}v, \phi^{-1}\omega) = \kappa(v, \omega) = \langle \kappa(v, \cdot), \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

Since the inner product is bilinear and continuous on \mathbf{H} , this again extends to \mathbf{H}_0 by linearity, and to \mathbf{H} by continuity, which shows

$$\langle x \circ \phi, y \circ \phi \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \quad \text{and hence} \quad \|x \circ \phi\| = \|x\| \quad \text{for } x, y \in \mathbf{H} .$$

The restrictions of the maps T_ϕ to \mathbf{H} are hence a unitary action of \mathbb{G} on \mathbf{H} .

3° Since the feature map is $\Delta(\omega) = \kappa(\omega, \cdot)$, we have

$$\Delta(\phi\omega) = \kappa(\phi\omega, \cdot) = \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \circ \phi^{-1} = (T_{\phi^{-1}}\Delta)(\omega)$$

for each $\phi \in \mathbb{G}$, so Δ is \mathbb{G} -equivariant.

4° If κ is separately invariant, an analogous argument yields $\langle x \circ \phi, y \circ \psi \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle$ for all $\phi, \psi \in \mathbb{G}$, and \mathbb{G} -invariance of Δ . \square

Proof of Lemma 24. 1° Since the inner product is diagonally invariant by Lemma 23, the mean ergodic theorem (Corollary 36) implies norm convergence of $\mathbf{F}_n(x)$ to \bar{x} . For pointwise convergence, let $\delta_\omega(x) := x(\omega)$ be the evaluation functional. Since \mathbf{H} is an RKHS, δ_ω is norm-continuous as a map $\mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ [48, 4.18]. It follows that

$$(\mathbf{F}_n(x))(\omega) = \delta_\omega(\mathbf{F}_n(x)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_\omega(\text{norm lim } \mathbf{F}_n(x)) = \bar{x}(\omega).$$

2° Now consider the function $\bar{\kappa}$. By diagonal invariance of κ , we have

$$\kappa(\phi\omega, \psi\nu) = \kappa(\omega, \phi^{-1}\psi\nu) = \kappa(\omega, \cdot) \circ \phi^{-1}\psi(\nu)$$

Since \mathbf{F}_n averages over group elements, $\lim_n \mathbf{F}_n(x \circ \phi) = \lim_n \mathbf{F}_n(x)$, and hence

$$\bar{\kappa}(\phi\omega, \psi \cdot) = \lim \mathbf{F}_n(\kappa(\omega, \cdot) \circ \phi^{-1}\psi) = \lim \mathbf{F}_n(\kappa(\omega, \cdot)) = \bar{\kappa}(\omega, \cdot),$$

so $\bar{\kappa}$ is separately \mathbb{G} -invariant.

3° Since $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is a closed subspace of \mathbf{H} , the restriction of the continuous functional δ_ω to $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is again continuous, so $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is an RKHS. To show $\bar{\kappa}$ is a reproducing kernel for $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$, we must show it has the reproducing property for elements of $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$. Recall that any $z \in \mathbf{H}$ has a unique decomposition $z = \bar{z} + z^\perp$, where $\bar{z} \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$ and z^\perp is orthogonal. Since $\kappa_\omega := \kappa(\omega, \cdot)$ is in \mathbf{H} , it decomposes as $\kappa_\omega = \bar{\kappa}_\omega + \kappa_\omega^\perp$. As we have just shown above, the limit $\bar{\kappa}$ is the projection $\bar{\kappa}(\omega, \cdot) = \bar{\kappa}_\omega$. For any $x \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$, we hence have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \bar{\kappa}(\omega, \cdot) \rangle &= \langle \bar{x} + x^\perp, \bar{\kappa}_\omega \rangle && \text{since } \bar{\kappa}(\omega, \cdot) = \bar{\kappa}_\omega \\ &= \langle \bar{x}, \bar{\kappa}_\omega \rangle + \langle x^\perp, \bar{\kappa}_\omega \rangle && \text{since } x^\perp = 0 \\ &= \langle x, \kappa \rangle = x(\omega) && \text{since } \kappa \text{ has the reproducing property,} \end{aligned}$$

so $\bar{\kappa}$ has the reproducing property for $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$.

4° A kernel is measurable (resp. separately continuous and bounded) if and only if all functions in \mathbf{H} are measurable (resp. separately continuous and bounded) [48, 4.24 and 4.28]. It follow that if κ has either property, it is inherited by the kernel of a subspace. \square

Proof of Lemma 26. Linearity of m follows from linearity of the Bochner integral,

$$m(aP + bQ) = \int \Delta(\omega)(aP(d\omega) + bQ(d\omega)) = am(P) + bm(Q) \quad \text{for all } a, b \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M} = m(\mathcal{P})$ by definition, and since κ is a nice kernel, it is a bijection $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. By Fact 25, it is an isomorphism, and an isometry if \mathcal{P} is metrized by MMD. If $h : \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is linear and continuous, it commutes with the integral [2, 11.45], so

$$\Delta_*P(h) = \int h(x)\Delta_*P(d\omega) = \int h \circ \Delta(\omega)P(d\omega) = h\left(\int \Delta(\omega)P(d\omega)\right) = h(m(P)),$$

which shows $m(P)$ is the barycenter of Δ_*P . If τ leaves κ diagonally invariant, the map $x \mapsto x \circ \tau^{-1}$ leaves the inner product of \mathbf{H} diagonally invariant by Lemma 23. For each $x \in \mathbf{H}$, we therefore have

$$\langle m(P) \circ \tau^{-1}, x \rangle = \langle m(P), x \circ \tau \rangle = \int x \circ \tau dP = \int x d(\tau_*P) = \langle m(\tau_*P), x \rangle .$$

It follows that $m(P) \circ \tau^{-1} = m(\tau_*P)$. \square

To establish Theorem 28—specifically, the characterization (ii) of the extreme points—we need an auxiliary result, which we establish in two steps in the following lemmas.

Lemma 44. *Let Ω be locally compact Polish, and let \mathbf{C}_b be the Banach space of bounded continuous functions on Ω , equipped with the supremum norm. If κ is a bounded and continuous characteristic kernel, then \mathbf{H} is dense in \mathbf{C}_b . If P is a probability measure on Ω , then \mathbf{H} is also dense in $\mathbf{L}_1(P)$.*

Proof. 1° Let \mathbf{ca} be the set of finite signed measures on Ω . Recall that every such measure has a unique decomposition $\mu = \alpha\mu_+ - \beta\mu_-$, where $\alpha, \beta \in [0, \infty)$ and $\mu_+, \mu_- \in \mathcal{P}$. Since the map $m : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ is linear, continuous, and injective, we can hence extend it to a map

$$m : \mathbf{ca} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \quad \text{as} \quad m(\mu) := \alpha m(\mu_+) - \beta m(\mu_-)$$

which is again linear, continuous and injective. By linearity of the integral, the mean embedding property $\int x dP = \langle x, m(P) \rangle$ extends to

$$(34) \quad \int x d\mu = \langle x, m(\mu) \rangle \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathbf{ca} \text{ and } x \in \mathbf{H} .$$

2° Since $m(\mathbf{ca}) \subset \mathbf{H} \subset \mathbf{C}_b$, it suffices to show $m(\mathbf{ca})$ is dense in \mathbf{C}_b . Since m is linear, $m(\mathbf{ca})$ is vector subspace of the Banach space \mathbf{C}_b . It is hence dense if the only continuous linear functional $\ell : \mathbf{C}_b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that vanishes on $m(\mathbf{ca})$ is the constant function 0 [2, 5.81].

3° As Ω is locally compact Polish, the dual space of \mathbf{C}_b is \mathbf{ca} , and each ℓ is of the form $\ell(f) = \mu_\ell(f)$ for some $\mu_\ell \in \mathbf{ca}$ [2, 14.]. If we choose $f = m(\mu_\ell)$, (34) shows

$$\ell(m(\mu_\ell)) = \int m(\mu_\ell) d\mu_\ell = \langle m(\mu_\ell), m(\mu_\ell) \rangle = \|m(\mu_\ell)\|^2 .$$

If ℓ vanishes on $m(\mathbf{ca})$, we hence have $\|m(\mu_\ell)\| = 0$ and therefore $m(\mu_\ell) = 0$. Since m is injective, that is only true if $\mu_\ell = 0$, and hence if $\ell = 0$. Thus, $m(\mathbf{ca})$, and hence \mathbf{H} , is dense in \mathbf{C}_b .

4° If P is a probability measure on Ω , then \mathbf{C}_b is dense in $\mathbf{L}_1(P)$ [25, 1.35]. Since \mathbf{H} is dense in \mathbf{C}_b , and convergence in the supremum norm on \mathbf{C}_b implies convergence in the \mathbf{L}_1 -norm, \mathbf{H} is dense in $\mathbf{L}_1(P)$. \square

Lemma 45. *Let a nice group \mathbb{G} act continuously on Ω . A \mathbb{G} -invariant probability measure P is \mathbb{G} -ergodic if and only if $P(f) = \int f$ holds P -a.e. for every \mathbb{G} -invariant function $f \in \mathbf{H}$.*

Proof. Since P is invariant, the \mathbf{L}_1 -norm is \mathbb{G} -invariant, which makes the induced action of \mathbb{G} on \mathbf{L}_1 linear and continuous. It follows that the subset $(\mathbf{L}_1(P))_{\mathbb{G}}$ of \mathbb{G} -invariant elements is a closed linear subspace. Since \mathbf{C}_b is dense in $\mathbf{L}_1(P)$ and the subspace is closed, it follows that $\mathbf{C}_b \cap (\mathbf{L}_1(P))_{\mathbb{G}}$ is dense in $(\mathbf{L}_1(P))_{\mathbb{G}}$. The elements of $(\mathbf{L}_1(P))_{\mathbb{G}}$ are the equivalence classes of \mathbb{G} -invariant functions. The dense subset $\mathbf{C}_b \cap (\mathbf{L}_1(P))_{\mathbb{G}}$ are the those equivalence classes that contain a continuous and a \mathbb{G} -invariant function. Since the action is continuous, that is the case if and only if the class contains a continuous invariant function. \square

Proof of Theorem 28. Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is the intersection of the set \mathcal{M} , which is closed and convex by Corollary 27, and the closed linear space $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}}$, it is closed and convex. It is also the isometric image $m(\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}})$, by Lemma 26, which implies $m(P)$ is extreme in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{G}}$ if and only if P is extreme in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$. By Fact 29, the set of extreme points of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ is measurable, and an invariant measure P is extreme if and only if it is ergodic. It follows that $\text{ex}\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{G}} = m(\text{ex}\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}})$ is measurable, and that (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii). Since also (iii) \Leftrightarrow (i) by Lemma 45, that proves the theorem. \square

G Proofs for Section 8

Fact 46 (Becker and Kechris [6, 5.2.1]). *If a Polish group \mathbb{G} acts measurably on a Polish space Ω , there exist Polish topologies on \mathbb{G} and Ω that generate the same Borel sets as the original topologies and make the action continuous.*

Proof of Theorem 30. Equip the set $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2)$ with the topology of convergence in distribution, and let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ be the subset of \mathbb{G} -invariant distributions. We proceed as follows: We first prove (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) for continuous actions. We next generalize this equivalence to measurable actions, and then prove (ii) and (iv).

1° Assume the action on Ω is continuous. As we have noted in the previous proof, that makes $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}} = \Lambda \cap \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{G}}$ compact, convex and \mathbb{G} -invariant. Since Ω is Polish, \mathcal{P} is Polish [2, 15.15], so the closed subset $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ is metrizable.

2° The next two steps adapt Lindenstrauss' elegant proof for uniform marginals in [33]: By Choquet's theorem, there is a probability measure μ_P on the extreme points $\text{ex}\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ such that $P = \int e\mu_P(de)$. If and only if P is not extreme, μ_P is supported on more than one point [41, 1.4]. There is hence some $C \subset \text{ex}\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$ such that $\lambda := \mu_P(C)$ satisfies $0 < \lambda < 1$. Set

$$\nu_1 := \int_C e\mu_P(de) \quad \nu_2 := \int_{\text{ex}\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}} \setminus C} e\mu_P(de) \quad \nu := \lambda\nu_1 - \lambda\nu_2 .$$

For Borel sets $A \subset \Omega$ and $B_i \subset \Omega_i$, we hence have

$$|\nu(A)| \leq |\lambda\nu_1(A) - \lambda\nu_2(A) + \nu_2(A)| = P(A) ,$$

and also $\nu(B_1 \times \Omega_2) = \lambda P(B_1) - \lambda P(B_1) = 0$ since ν_1 and ν_2 have the same marginals. In short, P is not extreme iff there is a signed measure ν with

$$(35) \quad |\nu(A)| \leq P(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(B_1 \times \Omega_2) = 0 = \nu(\Omega_1 \times B_2) .$$

3° Suppose such a ν exists. By the Radon-Nikodym theorem, ν_1 and ν_2 have densities $f_j = \nu_j/dP$, so ν has density $f = \lambda f_1 - \lambda f_2$. As $|\nu| \leq P$, the density satisfies $|f| \leq 1$, and hence $f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(P)$. Since ν_1 and ν_2 have positive mass and disjoint support, $f \neq 0$. Since ν_1 and ν_2 are in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$, the measure ν is \mathbb{G} -invariant. By (33),

$$f \circ \phi = \frac{d\nu}{dP} \circ \phi = \frac{d\nu}{dP} = f \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

so f is P -almost surely \mathbb{G} -invariant. That shows $f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(\Sigma, P) \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, if a ν satisfying (35) exists, (iii) does not hold. Conversely, suppose f is a function that violates (iii), and set $h := f/\|f\|_\infty$. Then $\nu := fP$ satisfies (35). Thus, P is not extreme iff (iii) does not hold.

In summary, (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) holds if the action is continuous.

4° Suppose the action is measurable. We change topologies using the Becker-Kechrin theorem (Fact 46) to make it continuous. That does not change the quantities in (i)—the spaces $\mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma_i, P_i)$ and $\mathbf{L}_\infty(\Sigma, P)$, the set $\Lambda_{\mathbb{G}}$, and the measures P and ν —since all depend on the topology of Ω only through its Borel sets. The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) for measurable actions hence follows from that for continuous ones.

5° We show (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii): Consider the set $M = \{g_1 + g_2 | g_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma_i, P_i)\}$. Since $M \subset \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma, P)$, and since the norm dual of \mathbf{L}_1 is \mathbf{L}_∞ , the annihilator of M is the set

$$M^\perp = \{f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(P) | \langle g_1 + g_2, f \rangle = \int (g_1 + g_2) f dP = 0\}.$$

Recall that the annihilator $(M^\perp)^\perp$ of the annihilator is the closure \overline{M} [2, 5.107]. By (iii), P is extreme iff $M^\perp = \{0\}$, and hence iff $\overline{M} = \{0\}^\perp = \mathbf{L}_1(\Sigma, P)$.

6° It remains to show (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv). For any $f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(\Sigma, P)$, or indeed any $f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(P)$, the definition of conditional expectation shows

$$(36) \quad \int g_i f dP = \int g_i \mathbb{E}[f | \xi_i] dP_i \quad \text{for } g_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(P_i) \text{ and } \xi_i \sim P_i.$$

Suppose (iii) is violated: $\int (g_1 + g_2) f dP = 0$ holds for some $f \in \mathbf{L}_\infty(P, \Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}) \setminus \{0\}$ and all g_i . By (36), that is the case if and only if

$$\int g_1 \mathbb{E}[f | \xi_1] dP_1 + \int g_2 \mathbb{E}[f | \xi_2] dP_2 = 0.$$

Since we can set either g_i to 0, this is in turn equivalent to

$$(37) \quad \int g_i \mathbb{E}[f | \xi_i] dP_i = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \text{ and } g_i \in \mathbf{L}_1(P_i).$$

Since this holds for all g_i , it implies $\mathbb{E}[f | \xi_i] = 0$ almost surely, so (iv) is violated. Conversely, $\mathbb{E}[f | \xi_i] = 0$ implies (37), so (iii) is violated if (iv) is. \square

H Proofs for Section 9

The proof of Proposition 37 becomes a straightforward application of Theorem 6 once we choose a suitable topology on probability kernels. To this end, denote by

\mathcal{K}_P the set of all probability kernels on Ω , equipped with the smallest topology that makes all functions

$$\eta \mapsto \iint f(s)g(t)\eta(ds, t)P(dt) \quad \text{for } f \in \mathbf{C}_b \text{ and } g \in \mathbf{L}_1(P)$$

continuous. Some authors call this the weak topology defined by P , see [24, Ch. 2]. Let $p(\eta) := \int \eta(\cdot, t)P(dt)$ be the marginal of a kernel η under P . We need the following properties of the topology, which can be found in [24, 2.6 and 2.7]:

Fact 47. *Equip $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ with the topology of convergence in distribution.*

(i) *The map $p : \mathcal{K}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ is continuous, and a set $K \subset \mathcal{K}_P$ is relatively compact if and only if its image $p(K)$ is relatively compact in $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$.*

(ii) *If $l : \Omega^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable, bounded below, and $s \mapsto l(s, t)$ is lsc for each $t \in \Omega$, the map $I_l : \mathcal{K}_P \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined by $I_l(\eta) := \int l(s, t)\eta(ds, t)P(dt)$ is linear and lsc.*

Proof of Proposition 37. The map p is linear, in the sense that

$$(38) \quad p(\lambda\eta_1 + (1 - \lambda)\eta_2) = \lambda p(\eta_1) + (1 - \lambda)p(\eta_2) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in [0, 1],$$

for any kernels η_1 and η_2 . Denote by $\Theta(\mathbb{G}, \eta) = \{\phi_*^{-1}\eta \circ \phi \mid \phi \in \mathbb{G}\}$ the orbit of η under the surrogate action Θ .

1° If P is \mathbb{G} -invariant, (29) implies

$$p(\eta \circ \phi) = p(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad p(\phi\eta) = \phi_*p(\eta) \quad \text{hence} \quad p(\Theta_\phi\eta) = \phi_*^{-1}p(\eta).$$

It follows, with (38), that $p(\text{co } \Theta(\mathbb{G}, \eta)) = \text{co } \mathbb{G}(p(\eta))$.

2° Since $p(\eta)$ is \mathbb{G} -tight, its orbitope $\Pi_{\mathbb{D}}(p(\eta))$ is compact by Proposition 15, so

$$p(\text{co } \Theta(\mathbb{G}, \eta)) = \text{co } \mathbb{G}(p(\eta)) \subset \Pi_{\mathbb{D}}(p(\eta)).$$

Thus, $\text{co } \mathbb{G}(\eta)$ is relatively compact. It follows, by Fact 47, that the orbitope $\Pi(\eta)$ in \mathcal{K}_P is compact. By Theorem 6, a Θ -invariant kernel $\bar{\eta}$ exists that satisfies (14).

3° By Fact 47, the map I_h is linear and lsc. We can hence apply (14), which shows

$$\begin{aligned} I_h(\bar{\eta}) &\leq \sup_{\phi} I_h(\Theta_\phi\eta) = \sup_{\phi} \int h(\phi s, \phi t)\eta(ds, t)\phi_*P(dt) \\ &= \sup_{\phi} \int h(s, t)\eta(\phi ds, \phi t)P(dt) \end{aligned}$$

where the last identity uses the fact that P is \mathbb{G} -invariant. \square

Proof of Corollary 32. By Theorem 6, the orbitopes respectively contain \mathbb{G} -invariant measures P_1 and P_2 . For each $Q \in \Lambda(Q_1, Q_2)$, we can construct a \mathbb{G} -invariant coupling $P \in \Lambda(Q_1, Q_2)$ with the same risk: Start with $(\xi_1, \xi_2) \sim Q$. Use Proposition 16 to choose random elements Φ_1 and Φ_2 of \mathbb{G} such that $\Phi_i\xi_i \sim P_i$, and choose P as the joint law of $(\Phi_1\xi_1, \Phi_2\xi_2)$. Then

$$P(c) = Q(c) \quad \text{and} \quad P_i(f_i) = Q_i(f_i) \quad \text{for } (f_1, f_2) \in \Gamma_{\mathbb{G}}(c).$$

We can hence substitute (P_1, P_2) for (Q_1, Q_2) without changing the infimum or supremum. Since P is \mathbb{G} -invariant, it has \mathbb{G} -invariant marginals, and we can apply Corollary 31. \square