

# Combinatorial Characterization of Exponential Families of Lumpable Stochastic Matrices

Shun Watanabe <sup>†1</sup> and Geoffrey Wolfer <sup>‡2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Tokyo

<sup>2</sup>Waseda University, Center for Data Science, Tokyo

December 12, 2024

## Abstract

It is known that the set of lumpable Markov chains over a finite state space, with respect to a fixed lumping function, generally does not form an exponential family of stochastic matrices. In this work, we explore efficiently verifiable necessary and sufficient combinatorial conditions for families of lumpable transition matrices to form exponential families.

*Keywords*— Information geometry; irreducible Markov chains; lumpability; exponential families

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Notation	3
2.2	Lumpability [Kemeny and Snell, 1983]	4
2.3	Exponential families of stochastic matrices [Nagaoka, 2005]	4
2.4	Foliation on the $\kappa$ -lumpable family.	5
<b>3</b>	<b>The lumpable cone</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Classification for small state spaces</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Characterizing of e-families of lumpable stochastic matrices</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	Sufficient conditions	10
5.1.1	No multi-row merging block criterion	10
5.1.2	Lazy-cycle criterion	10
5.2	Necessary conditions	11
5.2.1	Redundant merging block criterion	12
5.2.2	Dimensional criterion	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Monotonicity and stability</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Algorithmics</b>	<b>22</b>
7.1	Deterministic classification	22

---

<sup>†</sup>email: shunwata@cc.tuat.ac.jp.

<sup>‡</sup>email: geo.wolfer@aoni.waseda.jp.

# 1 Introduction

Exponential families (e-families) of distributions are of established importance in statistics due to their distinctive properties for inference problems. For instance, they uniquely provide sufficient statistics capable of condensing any amount of independent and identically distributed data into a fixed number of values [Pitman, 1936, Koopman, 1936, Darmois, 1935]. What is more, it is known that the maximum likelihood estimator achieves the Cramér-Rao lower bound only<sup>1</sup> when the family of distributions forms an exponential family [Wijsman, 1973, Joshi, 1976, Fabian and Hannan, 1977, Muller-Funk et al., 1989]. In the language of information geometry [Amari and Nagaoka, 2007], positive probability distributions are endowed with the structure of a smooth manifold with a pair of dual affine connections—the e-connection and m-connection—and statistical models are regarded as submanifolds. In this framework, being an e-family geometrically corresponds to being autoparallel with respect to the e-connection. Furthermore, deviation from being an e-family—and the subsequent breakdown of the statistical properties—can be measured in terms of curvature; this characterizes second order efficiency of estimators [Efron, 1975]. Recently, e-families have also been put under the spotlight in optimization since they allow for efficient natural-gradient computation [Amari, 1998], which finds application in machine learning.

It is possible to similarly construct a dually flat geometry on the space of irreducible stochastic matrices [Nagaoka, 2005] defined over a fixed strongly connected transition digraph. Independently and identically distributed (iid) processes, which can be regarded as memoryless Markov chains, are known to form an e-family in the larger family of irreducible stochastic matrices [Ito and Amari, 1988]. The Markovian framework is consistent with the divergence rate of the corresponding Markov processes, and information projections [Boza, 1971, Csiszár et al., 1987] which arise naturally from the study of large deviations [Moulinos and Anantharam, 2019] and hypothesis testing [Nakagawa and Kanaya, 1993, Watanabe and Hayashi, 2017]. In this regard the Markovian framework strictly encompasses the vanilla framework for distributions, while accommodating for processes with time dependencies.

However, Markov processes exhibit a significantly richer structure than their iid counterparts, with numerous properties—such as irreducibility, aperiodicity or time-reversibility—that are not pertinent to iid processes but are well-established for Markov chains. A recently initiated research program seeks to analyze how Markov-centric properties translate into geometric features of the corresponding families of stochastic matrices. For instance, a Markov chain having a uniform stationary distribution is equivalent to being represented by a doubly stochastic transition matrix; it is well-established that the set of doubly stochastic matrices forms a mixture family [Hayashi and Watanabe, 2016]. Similarly, verifying the detailed-balance equation—indicating the time-reversibility of the stochastic process—means that the transition matrix is self-adjoint in a certain Hilbert space; the set of reversible stochastic matrices is known to form both a mixture family and an exponential family [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2021]. For context trees, it is known that a tree model forms an e-family if and only if it is an FSMX model [Takeuchi and Kawabata, 2007, Takeuchi and Nagaoka, 2017]. More recently, Wolfer and Watanabe [2024] began analyzing lumpability of Markov chains [Kemeny and Snell, 1983]. Lumpable Markov chains allow for the reduction of the state space by merging symbols without losing Markovianity, making them highly practical. Specifically, they showed that although the lumpable set with respect to a fixed lumping map typically forms neither a mixture family nor an e-family, it is still possible to endow the family with the structure of a mutually dual foliated manifold, leading to a mixed coordinate system [Amari and Nagaoka, 2007, Chapter 3.7]. Their construction is centered around the concept of a Markov embedding, defined as a right inverse of the lumping operation, and which is argued to serve a similar role to Čencov’s statistical morphisms [Čencov, 1983] in the context of Markov chains.

The problem of selecting a good statistical model involves choosing one that enjoys favorable analytical properties. In this regard, both e-families and lumpable families are highly sought-after models, and practitioners may be interested in enjoying the best of both worlds. However, as previously mentioned, lumpable families do not generally form e-families. Indeed, they may or may not be e-families depending on their connection graph and the lumping map. This phenomenon contrasts with many previously analyzed classes; for instance, the set of reversible stochastic matrices, which forms an e-family for any symmetric connection graph. In this paper, we initiate the problem of characterizing the conditions under which lumpable stochastic matrices do form e-families. Since Markov embeddings demonstrably preserve e-families of stochastic matrices, they naturally generate one class of lumpable e-families. However, this approach proves to be quite restrictive. Perhaps surprisingly, it is possible to construct families that are not directly derived from the embedding of an e-family. In this work we explore some necessary and sufficient conditions for the lumpable set to form an e-family.

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that this fact only holds when imposing additional regularity conditions on the family.

**Major contributions**— We summarize our main results below.

**Necessary and sufficient criteria with multi-row merging blocks.** We obtain sufficient and necessary conditions on the lumpable family  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  for being an e-family in terms of so-called multi-row merging blocks (refer to Definition 3.1). Namely, a sufficient condition (Corollary 5.1) for  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  to be an e-family is that it exhibits no multi-row merging block, while if it exhibits a multi-row merging block which is redundant (Definition 5.2), this precludes the lumpable family from being exponential (Theorem 5.1). However, neither of the above conditions fully characterizes the property of being an e-family. We also provide an alternative sufficient criteria (Proposition 5.1), which shows in particular that there could be an arbitrarily large number of multi-row merging blocks while still yielding an e-family.

**Dimensional criterion.** We show that when the lumpable family is exponential, the log-affine hull of lumpable functions modulo anti-shift functions<sup>2</sup> (refer to Definition 2.2) has a well-understood dimension (refer to Theorem 5.2). As a consequence, a mismatch in dimension necessarily implies that the family is not exponential, and this can be verified using a polynomial-time algorithm. We also specialize the above result into Corollary 5.4 to obtain a necessary condition purely based on elementary combinatorial properties of the connection graph and the lumping map.

**Monotonicity and stability.** We examine the property of e-families through basic operations on the edge set  $\mathcal{E}$ . In particular, we exhibit a monotonicity property of e-families of lumpable stochastic matrices. Namely, we show in Theorem 6.1 that it is generally the case that when  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$  if  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  forms an e-family, then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  also forms an e-family. Additionally, we exhibit an operation on loops under which the property of being an e-family is stable (refer to Proposition 6.1).

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notation

We let  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be a directed graph (digraph) with finite vertex set  $\mathcal{Y}$  and edge set  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$ . We assume that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected, that is every vertex is reachable from every other vertex by traversing edges in their proper direction. For  $\{Y_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  a time-homogeneous discrete time Markov chain (DTMC) over the space space  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we collect the transition probabilities into a row-stochastic matrix  $P$ . In other words, we write<sup>3</sup>

$$P(y, y') = \mathbb{P}(Y_{t+1} = y' | Y_t = y).$$

When  $P(y, y') > 0$  iff  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ , we say that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is a connection graph for  $P$ . We denote  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  the set of all irreducible row-stochastic matrices pertaining to the connection graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . We additionally define  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$  the set of all real functions on the set of edges and  $\mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  its positive subset. As it allows us to conveniently write a function  $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  in the form of a square matrix, we will routinely identify

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\cong \left\{ F \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{Y}^2} : \forall (y, y') \notin \mathcal{E} \implies F(y, y') = 0 \right\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\cong \left\{ F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) : \forall (y, y') \in \mathcal{E} \implies F(y, y') > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The Hadamard product of  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is denoted  $A \odot B$  and for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $A^{\odot t}$  is defined as the function such that for any  $y, y' \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $A^{\odot t}(y, y') = A(y, y')^t$ . We overload exp and log as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp: \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}), \\ \log: \mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}), \end{aligned}$$

where for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $\exp(F)(y, y') = \exp(F(y, y'))$ , and for any  $F \in \mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $\log(F)(y, y') = \log(F(y, y'))$ .

<sup>2</sup>The term modulo here is understood in the context of direct sums and quotient spaces.

<sup>3</sup>Our notation follows the applied probability literature. In the information theory literature,  $P(y'|y)$  is sometimes used in lieu of  $P(y, y')$ .

## 2.2 Lumpability [Kemeny and Snell, 1983]

One classical operation on Markov processes is lumping, which means merging symbols together and recording the observations on the reduced space. It is well known that this operation typically disrupts the Markov property [Burke and Rosenblatt, 1958, Rogers and Pitman, 1981]. Chains for which the Markov property is preserved are called lumpable. More formally, for a surjective symbol merging map  $\kappa: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ , we say that the Markov chain  $\{Y_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  with transition matrix  $P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is  $\kappa$ -lumpable whenever the stochastic process  $\{\kappa(Y_t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$  also forms a DTMC with transition matrix  $P^\flat \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ , where the set

$$\mathcal{D} \triangleq \kappa(\mathcal{E}) \triangleq \{(\kappa(y), \kappa(y')) : (y, y') \in \mathcal{E}\} \subset \mathcal{X}^2$$

is called the lumped edge set. Denoting  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  the  $\kappa$ -lumpable subset of  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , observe that  $\kappa$  induces a push-forward  $\kappa_*$  on stochastic matrices,

$$\kappa_*: \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$$

as well as a partition of the space  $\mathcal{Y}$ , which we denote by

$$\mathcal{Y} = \bigsqcup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathcal{S}_x,$$

where for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we wrote  $\mathcal{S}_x \triangleq \kappa^{-1}(x)$ . The following characterization of  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  was provided by Kemeny and Snell [1983]. It holds that  $P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  if and only if for any  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$  and any  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{S}_x$ ,

$$\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} P(y_1, y') = \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} P(y_2, y').$$

We will use the notation of Levin et al. [2009]<sup>4</sup> to often—albeit not always—disambiguate objects which pertain to the larger space using the superscript  $\sharp$  and which pertain to the reduced space using the superscript  $\flat$ . Two lumpable families of stochastic matrices are said to be equivalent if they coincide upon relabeling of the state space and lumped state space. Namely, for  $\kappa_1: \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1, \kappa_2: \mathcal{Y}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_2$  two lumping maps, the lumpable families  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa_1}(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa_2}(\mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{E}_2)$  are equivalent, which we denote

$$\mathcal{W}_{\kappa_1}(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \cong \mathcal{W}_{\kappa_2}(\mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{E}_2),$$

whenever there exist two bijections  $\phi^\sharp: \mathcal{Y}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_2$  and  $\phi^\flat: \mathcal{X}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_2$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2, (\phi^\sharp(y), \phi^\sharp(y')) \in \mathcal{E}_2 &\iff (y, y') \in \mathcal{E}_1, \\ \forall (x, x') \in \mathcal{X}^2, (\phi^\flat(x), \phi^\flat(x')) \in \mathcal{D}_2 = \kappa(\mathcal{E}_2), &\iff (x, x') \in \mathcal{D}_1 = \kappa(\mathcal{E}_1), \\ \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_1, \phi^\flat(\kappa_1(y)) = \kappa_2(\phi^\sharp(y)). & \end{aligned}$$

## 2.3 Exponential families of stochastic matrices [Nagaoka, 2005]

**Definition 2.1** ( $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization). *When  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected we define the mapping*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}: \mathcal{F}_+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \\ F \mapsto P: \mathcal{E} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, (y, y') \mapsto P(y, y') = \frac{F(y, y') v_F(y')}{\rho_F v_F(y)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_F$  and  $v_F$  are respectively the Perron–Frobenius (PF) root and associated right eigenvector of  $F$ . Henceforth,  $(\rho_F, v_F)$  will be called the right PF eigen-pair of  $F$ .

The above-defined  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization plays the role of the partition function in the distribution setting, in order to normalize an arbitrary non-negative irreducible matrix into a stochastic matrix [Miller, 1961].

**Definition 2.2** (Anti-shift functions [Nagaoka, 2005, Section 3]). *It will be convenient to define*

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \triangleq \left\{ N \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) : \exists (c, f) \in (\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{Y}}), \forall (y, y') \in \mathcal{E}, N(y, y') = f(y') - f(y) + c \right\}.$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms a  $|\mathcal{Y}|$ -dimensional vector subspace.

<sup>4</sup>We note that in differential geometry  $\sharp$  and  $\flat$  commonly denote the musical isomorphism. However, in this paper, we use these symbols differently.

**Definition 2.3** (e-family of stochastic matrices [Nagaoka, 2005]). We say that the parametric family of irreducible stochastic matrices

$$\mathcal{V}_e = \left\{ P_\theta : \theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\} \subset \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}),$$

is an exponential family (e-family) of stochastic matrices with natural parameter  $\theta$  and dimension  $d$ , when there exist a function  $K \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $d$  linearly independent functions  $G_1, \dots, G_d \in \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , such that

$$P_\theta = \mathfrak{s} \circ \exp \left( K + \sum_{i=1}^d \theta^i G_i \right),$$

where  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is the quotient space

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \triangleq \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) / \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}),$$

with  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is introduced in Definition 2.2 and  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization follows from Definition 2.1.

In other words, there exists a one-to-one correspondence between linear subspaces of  $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and e-families [Nagaoka, 2005, Theorem 2] through the diffeomorphism

$$\mathfrak{s} \circ \exp : \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

Similarly, a mixture family (m-family) of stochastic matrices is induced from the affine hull of a collection of irreducible edge measures [Nagaoka, 2005] (refer also to Hayashi and Watanabe [2016, Section 4.2]). An m-family which is also an e-family is called an em-family. For instance, the set of all irreducible stochastic matrices  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is known to form an em-family [Nagaoka, 2005]. What is more, the reversible subset is also an em-family [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2021] while the subset of bistochastic matrices forms an m-family but does not form an e-family [Hayashi and Watanabe, 2016].

## 2.4 Foliation on the $\kappa$ -lumpable family.

Although the lumpable family  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  was shown by Wolfer and Watanabe [2024] to generally not form an m-family or an e-family of stochastic matrices, it is always possible to decompose it in terms of simpler mathematical structures, called a foliation<sup>5</sup>. This decomposition is facilitated by the notion of a Markov embedding [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2024, Definition 4.3], which corresponds to a right inverse of the lumping operation and satisfies additional natural structural constraints. As such, Markov embeddings are the counterparts of the statistical morphisms axiomatized by Čencov [1983] in the context of stochastic matrices. In particular, any  $P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  induces a canonical embedding [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2024, Lemma 4.8] denoted  $\Lambda_\star^{(P)} : \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  satisfying  $P = \Lambda_\star^{(P)} \kappa_\star P$ . It was established that for any  $P_0^\sharp \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , the embedding of the family  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$  by  $\Lambda_\star^{(P_0^\sharp)}$

$$\mathcal{J}(P_0^\sharp) \triangleq \left\{ \Lambda_\star^{(P_0^\sharp)} P : P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \right\},$$

forms an e-family of stochastic matrices. Additionally, for any  $P_0^b \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ , stochastic matrices lumping into  $P_0^b$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}(P_0^b) \triangleq \left\{ P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) : \kappa_\star P = P_0^b \right\},$$

form an m-family, and the manifold  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  can be endowed with the structure of an e-foliation.

**Theorem 2.1** (Foliation on  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2024, Theorem 6.4]). For any fixed  $P_0^b \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ ,

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{L}(P_0^b)} \mathcal{J}(P),$$

$$\dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = |\mathcal{E}| - \sum_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{S}_x| + |\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{X}|.$$

Mutually dual foliations and mixed coordinate systems play a significant role in information geometry [Amari and Nagaoka, 2007, Section 3.7].

<sup>5</sup>A foliation is a decomposition of a manifold into a union of connected but disjoint submanifolds, called leaves, all sharing the same dimension [Lee, 2013, Chapter 19].

**Problem statement**— Our goal is to obtain a full characterization of exponential families of lumpable stochastic matrices in terms of combinatorial properties of the connection graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and the lumping map  $\kappa$ . Ideally, we wish to develop necessary and sufficient conditions which are all verifiable in polynomial time.

**Motivation**— Previous studies of the geometric structure of well-known families of stochastic matrices—such as reversible, bistochastic or memoryless—have mostly established geometric structure that are valid for general edge sets. This is in stark contrast to lumpable stochastic matrices, where—perhaps surprisingly—the nature of the family seems to depend intricately on the structure of the edge set and its interplay with the lumping map. Another exception is found in [Takeuchi and Kawabata, 2007, Takeuchi and Nagaoka, 2017], where the e-family nature of the context tree depends on some additional structural properties of the tree, which partially motivated our question.

In addition, exponential families of stochastic matrices enjoy distinctive properties that may offer analytical power to the practitioner. The asymptotic variance of a function  $G \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{E}}$  with respect to some irreducible stochastic matrix  $K$  can be expressed using the second derivative of the potential function of the one-parameter exponential family (Definition 2.3) anchored at  $K$  and tilted by  $G$  [Hayashi and Watanabe, 2016]. Furthermore, when  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family, Bregman geometry yields a Pythagorean identity [Hayashi and Watanabe, 2016]. Specifically, for any  $P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ ,

$$D(P|\bar{P}) = D(P|P_m) + D(P_m|\bar{P})$$

where

$$P_m \triangleq \arg \min_{\tilde{P} \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})} D(P|\tilde{P})$$

is the unique m-projection (reverse information projection) of  $P$  onto  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ .

**First approach**— As Markov embeddings are known to be e-geodesic affine [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2024, Theorem 10], an immediate sufficient condition for a family  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  to be an e-family is to find the existence of an embedding  $\Lambda_\star$  satisfying  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \Lambda_\star \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ . This corresponds to restricting the foliation of Theorem 2.1 to a single e-leaf  $\mathcal{J}$ . As we will see in this paper, this condition is quite restrictive; there exist many more exponential families.

### 3 The lumpable cone

In this section, we assume that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected and that  $\kappa: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is a surjective lumping function. Similar to Wolfer and Watanabe [2024], we define the set of lumpable functions as follows,

$$\mathcal{F}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \triangleq \left\{ F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) : \forall (x, x') \in \mathcal{D}, \forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{S}_x, \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} P(y_1, y') = \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} P(y_2, y') \right\}.$$

The positive subset  $\mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  of  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , forms a blunt<sup>6</sup> convex cone, while  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is a subcone of  $\mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , as depicted on Figure 1.

**Proposition 3.1** (Commutativity). *s-normalization preserves  $\kappa$ -lumpability and the following diagram commutes*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{\kappa_\star} & \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}) \\ \mathfrak{s} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathfrak{s} \\ \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) & \xrightarrow{\kappa_\star} & \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}). \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Since  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected,  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization is well-defined over  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and we first show that  $\mathfrak{s}(F) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . By construction,  $\mathfrak{s}(F)$  is irreducible and shares the same support as  $F$ . It remains to verify lumpability. We let  $F^\flat = \kappa_\star F$  denote the lumping of  $F$ , and  $\rho^\flat$  and  $v^\flat$  be respectively the Perron–Frobenius root and associated right eigenvector—henceforth called “right

<sup>6</sup>A convex cone is called blunt if it does not contain the null vector.

PF eigen-pair''— of  $F^b$ . For any  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , a classical argument of [Barr and Thomas \[1977\]](#) (see also [Levin et al. \[2009, Lemma 12.9\]](#)) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} F(y, y') v^b(\kappa(y')) &= \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F(y, y') v^b(\kappa(y')) = \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F(y, y') \right) v^b(x') \\ &= \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} F^b(\kappa(y), x') v^b(x') = \rho^b v^b(\kappa(y)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $(\rho^b, v^b \circ \kappa)$  is the right PF eigen-pair of  $F$ . As a consequence, for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$ ,

$$\mathfrak{s}(F)(y, y') = F(y, y') \frac{v^b(\kappa(y'))}{\rho^b v^b(\kappa(y))}.$$

For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and any  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ , it holds that

$$\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} \mathfrak{s}(F)(y, y') = \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F(y, y') \frac{v^b(\kappa(y'))}{\rho^b v^b(\kappa(y))} = \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F(y, y') \frac{v^b(x')}{\rho^b v^b(x)} = F^b(x, x') \frac{v^b(x')}{\rho^b v^b(x)},$$

which does not depend on  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ . As a result,  $\mathfrak{s}(F)$  is  $\kappa$ -lumpable, and  $\kappa_* \mathfrak{s}(F) = \mathfrak{s}(F^b)$ . □




Figure 1: We can regard  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  as a section of the cone  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ .

For  $F \in \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  the equivalence class

$$[F] \triangleq \{G \in \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) : \mathfrak{s}(G) = \mathfrak{s}(F)\},$$

can be parametrized by the  $|\mathcal{Y}|$ -dimensional positive orthant,

$$[F] = \left\{ \rho \operatorname{diag}(v) F \operatorname{diag}(v)^{-1} : \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}} \right\},$$

and the collection of all such rays generates the entire irreducible cone

$$\mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})} [P].$$

While projecting onto stochastic matrices through  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization preserves  $\kappa$ -lumpability, conjugation by an arbitrary diagonal matrix can disrupt the property. In fact, the following proposition holds.

**Proposition 3.2** (Closure under similarity transform). *Let  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}}$ . The two following statements are equivalent.*

(i) *For any irreducible lumpable matrix  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , it holds that*

$$\operatorname{diag}(v) F \operatorname{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

(ii) *For any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , it holds that for any  $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{S}_x^2$ ,  $v(y_1) = v(y_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}}$ ,  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , write  $F^b = \kappa_* F$ , let  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D} = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$ , and assume that  $v$  takes constant values  $v_x$  on  $\mathcal{S}_x$  and  $v_{x'}$  on  $\mathcal{S}_{x'}$ . Then for any  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ ,

$$\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} (\text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1})(y, y') = \frac{v_x}{v_{x'}} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F(y, y') = \frac{v_x}{v_{x'}} F^b(x, x'),$$

which does not depend on  $y$ , thus  $\text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Conversely, let us assume that  $\text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Let  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}}$  be the unique right PF eigen-pair of  $F$ , that is  $\mathfrak{s}(F) = \frac{1}{\rho} \text{diag}(w)^{-1} F \text{diag}(w)$ . From the proof of Proposition 3.1,  $w$  is constant on each  $\mathcal{S}_x$ . Observe now that

$$\mathfrak{s}(F) = \mathfrak{s}(\text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\rho} \text{diag}(v \odot w)^{-1} \text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \text{diag}(v \odot w),$$

that is  $\rho, v \odot w$  is the right PF eigen-pair of  $\text{diag}(v)F \text{diag}(v)^{-1}$ . It follows that  $v \odot w$  must be constant over each  $\mathcal{S}_{x'}$ , and so must  $v$ .  $\square$

In other words, the cone  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is closed with respect to similarity transform with positive vectors which are constant over elements of the partition of  $\mathcal{Y}$  induced by  $\kappa$ .

**Corollary 3.1** (to Proposition 3.1). *Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{s}(F) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  if and only if*

$$[F] \cap \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \neq \emptyset.$$

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\mathfrak{s}(F) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Clearly,  $F \in [F]$ , and since  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \subset \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  it is immediate that  $\mathfrak{s}(F) \in [F] \cap \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \neq \emptyset$ . Conversely, suppose that there exists  $G \in [F]$  such that  $G \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Then, by Proposition 3.1,  $\mathfrak{s}(G) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , but  $\mathfrak{s}(G) = \mathfrak{s}(F)$  since both are in  $[F]$ , thus also  $\mathfrak{s}(F) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\square$

The notion of a merging block, which we now introduce, will be instrumental to our analysis.

**Definition 3.1** (Merging block). *Let  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D} = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$  be such that for some  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$  it holds that*

$$|\{(y, y') \in \mathcal{E} : y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}\}| > 1.$$

*Then we say that  $(x, x')$  is a merging block of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  with respect to  $\kappa$ . Furthermore, when  $|\mathcal{S}_x| \geq 2$ , we say that the merging block is multi-row.*

**Theorem 3.1** (Log-affinity). *The two following statements are equivalent.*

- (i)  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has no multi-row merging block with respect to  $\kappa$  (Definition 3.1).
- (ii)  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is log-affine in the sense where for any  $F_0, F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$(1-t) \log F_0 + t \log F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}),$$

*where the logarithm is here understood to be entry-wise.*

*Proof.* Let  $F_0, F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and write  $F_0^b = \kappa_* F_0, F_1^b = \kappa_* F_1$ . For  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$ , we define  $F_t(y, y') = F_0(y, y')^{1-t} F_1(y, y')^t$ . Let  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$ , we need to show that for any  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{S}_x$ ,  $F_t(y_1, \mathcal{S}_{x'}) = F_t(y_2, \mathcal{S}_{x'})$ . The case  $|\mathcal{S}_x| = 1$  is trivial and it remains to inspect the case  $|\mathcal{S}_x| \geq 2$ . Since  $(x, x')$  is non-merging, for any  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$  we denote  $u'_{x'}(y)$  the unique element in  $\mathcal{S}_{x'}$  such that  $(y, u'_{x'}(y)) \in \mathcal{E}$ . For any  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ , it then holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F_t(y, y') &= \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F_0(y, y')^{1-t} F_1(y, y')^t = F_0(y, u'_{x'}(y))^{1-t} F_1(y, u'_{x'}(y))^t \\ &= \left( \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F_0(y, y') \right)^{1-t} \left( \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} F_1(y, y') \right)^t = F_0^b(x, x')^{1-t} F_1^b(x, x')^t, \end{aligned}$$

which does not depend on  $y$ , thus  $F_t \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Conversely, let us now suppose that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has a multi-row merging block with respect to  $\kappa$ . We show the somewhat stronger claim that there exist two stochastic matrices  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $P_0^{\odot(1-t)} \odot P_1^{\odot t} \notin \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . We let  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{D}$  be a



merging block of  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , and denote  $y_0, y_*, y'_a, y'_b \in \mathcal{S}_{x_0}^2, \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}^2$  a quadruplet such that  $y_0 \neq y_*, y'_a \neq y'_b$  and  $(y_*, y'_a), (y_*, y'_b) \in \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\eta_a, \eta_b \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\eta_a < \eta_b < 1$  and such that

$$(\eta_a + \eta_b)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \left| \left\{ \bar{x} \in \mathcal{X} : (x_0, \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{D} \right\} \right| \left| \left\{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_0} : (y_*, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{E} \right\} \right|.$$

We construct,

$$P_{a,b}(y, y') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } (y, y') \notin \mathcal{E} \\ \eta_a & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_*, y'_a) \\ \eta_b & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_*, y'_b) \\ \frac{1}{\left| \left\{ \bar{x} \in \mathcal{X} : (\kappa(y), \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{D} \right\} \right| \left| \left\{ \bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa(y')} : (y, \bar{y}) \in \mathcal{E} \right\} \right|} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We define  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  as  $P_0 = P_{a,b}$  and  $P_1 = P_{b,a}$ , and construct the combination  $\tilde{P} = P_0^{\odot 1/2} \odot P_1^{\odot 1/2}$ . By the AM-GM inequality  $2\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b} < \eta_a + \eta_b$ , and it follows that

$$\sum_{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}} \tilde{P}(y_*, \bar{y}) < \sum_{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}} \tilde{P}(y_0, \bar{y})$$

hence  $\tilde{P}_{1/2}$  is not  $\kappa$ -lumpable.  $\square$

## 4 Classification for small state spaces

**Remark 4.1** (Degenerate lumping function). *If  $\kappa: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is such that  $|\mathcal{X}| \in \{1, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$ , then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.*

It immediately follows that for  $|\mathcal{Y}| = 2$ , every lumpable family forms an e-family. We proceed to enumerate e-families for the three-state space.

**Theorem 4.1** (Three-state space classification). *When  $|\mathcal{Y}| = 3$ , and assuming that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \neq \emptyset$ , the two following statements are equivalent.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.
- (ii) Either  $\kappa$  is degenerate or  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is equivalent to one of the 12 below-listed families.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & + & + \\ + & 0 & 0 \\ + & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} + & + & + \\ + & 0 & 0 \\ + & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & + \\ + & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} + & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & + & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} + & 0 & + \\ + & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} + & + & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & + & + \\ + & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} + & + & + \\ + & 0 & + \\ + & + & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & + & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & 0 & + \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix} + & + & + \\ + & + & 0 \\ + & 0 & + \end{pmatrix}$$

*Proof.* From Remark 4.1, we only need to consider the case where  $|\mathcal{X}| = 2$ . Being an exponential family is a property common to the entire equivalence class of lumpable families. After removing empty lumpable families and grouping them into equivalence classes (refer to Section 2.2 for the definition of equivalence classes), we obtain 26 cases. The 12 families described in (ii) can be shown to forms e-families by applying Corollary 5.1, while the remaining 14 families can be shown to not be e-families using a dimensional argument introduced later in Theorem 5.2.  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** *In the three-state space setting, we observe that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forming an e-family coincides with  $\mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  being log-affine.*

## 5 Characterizing of e-families of lumpable stochastic matrices

In this section, we assume that  $1 < |\mathcal{X}| < |\mathcal{Y}|$  and that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \neq \emptyset$ .

### 5.1 Sufficient conditions

#### 5.1.1 No multi-row merging block criterion

The first criterion is a natural consequence of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 5.1** (No multi-row merging block criterion). *If  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has no multi-row merging block with respect to  $\kappa$ , then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.*

*Proof.* Let  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Defining  $\tilde{P}_t = P_0^{\odot(1-t)} \odot P_1^{\odot t}$ , it follows from Theorem 3.1 that  $\tilde{P}_t \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . It is then a consequence of Proposition 3.1 that  $\mathfrak{s}(\tilde{P}_t) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Since  $P_0, P_1$  and  $t$  were arbitrary, Nagaoka [2005, Corollary 3] implies that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.  $\square$

**Example 5.1** (Hudson expansion [Kemeny and Snell, 1983]). *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$  be a finite strongly connected graph. For a Markov chain  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  sampled according to a transition matrix  $P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$ , recall that the sliding window chain*

$$(X_1, X_2), (X_2, X_3), \dots, (X_t, X_{t+1}), \dots$$

*is also a Markov chain with transition matrix  $P^\sharp \in \mathcal{W}_h(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , with state space  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{D}$ , edge set*

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ (e = (x_1, x_2), e' = (x'_1, x'_2)) \in \mathcal{D}^2 : x_2 = x'_1 \right\},$$

*and lumping function  $h: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}, (x_1, x_2) \mapsto x_2$ . One can verify that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has no multi-row merging block with respect to  $h$ . As a result of Corollary 5.1,  $\mathcal{W}_h(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  thus forms an e-family of lumpable Markov chains. We therefore recover the known fact that the Hudson expansion of the first-order Markov chains forms an e-subfamily of second-order Markov chains. Note that, since the Hudson expansion is known to be a particular case of a Markov embedding [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2024], and Markov embeddings are known to preserve e-families of stochastic matrices, the claim also follows from an embedding argument.*

#### 5.1.2 Lazy-cycle criterion

However, for state spaces strictly larger than three, the above-stated condition is not necessary, as is demonstrated in the example below.

**Example 5.2** (Lumpable e-family with two multi-row merging blocks).

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & + \\ 0 & 0 & + & + \\ \hline 0 & + & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 & + \end{pmatrix}$$

This is a consequence of the fact that constructing an e-geodesic further involves  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization which can return the curve to the lumpable set.

**Proposition 5.1** (Lazy cycle criterion). *If any of the two following equivalent conditions are satisfied, then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.*

- (i) *For any  $P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , there exist a pair of non-negative matrices  $D$  and  $\Pi$  such that*

$$P = D + \Pi,$$

*where  $\kappa_*\Pi$  is a permutation matrix over  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $D$  is diagonal.*

- (ii) *The graph  $(\mathcal{X}, \{(\kappa(y), \kappa(y')) : (y, y') \in \mathcal{E}, y \neq y'\})$  is a cycle.*

*Proof.* The proposition states that all diagonal blocks are diagonal and that there is exactly one non-zero off-diagonal block per block-line. We first prove the statement in the special case where all diagonal blocks vanish, that is  $\{(x, x) : x \in \mathcal{X}\} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$ , and when the off-diagonal blocks have full support, that is for any  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$  with  $x \neq x'$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'} \subset \mathcal{E}$ . An application of monotonicity (refer to Theorem 6.1) generalizes the result beyond full-sport off-diagonal blocks, and stability by diagonal modifications (refer to Proposition 5.1) yield the more general case where there are non vanishing diagonal blocks on the diagonal. We further reduce the problem by observing that since the lumped matrix is irreducible,  $\Pi^b = \kappa_* \Pi$  defines a cycle. Finally, it will be convenient to order states  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{X}|\}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$ . As a result, upon relabelling, we henceforth assume that can the family can be represented by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boxplus_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \boxplus_{\mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{S}_3} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & & & 0 & \boxplus_{\mathcal{S}_{|\mathcal{X}|-1} \times \mathcal{S}_{|\mathcal{X}|}} \\ \boxplus_{\mathcal{S}_{|\mathcal{X}|} \times \mathcal{S}_1} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where for  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\boxplus_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}'}$  is  $|\mathcal{S}| \times |\mathcal{S}'|$  matrix defined by

$$\boxplus_{\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}'} = \begin{pmatrix} + & + & \dots & + \\ + & + & \dots & + \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ + & + & \dots & + \end{pmatrix}.$$

We let  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , and for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we denote  $\tilde{P}_t = P_0^{\odot(1-t)} \odot P_1^{\odot t} \in \mathcal{F}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  their log-affine combination. We define  $\rho_t$  and  $v_t$  the right PF pair of  $\tilde{P}_t$ , whose existence follows by strong connectivity of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . By  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization  $P_t = \frac{1}{\rho_t} \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \tilde{P}_t \text{diag}(v)$  is row-stochastic, and as a result, for any  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$ , it holds that for any  $y \in \mathcal{S}_x$ ,

$$\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}} P_t(y, y') = \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} P_t(y, y') = 1,$$

thus  $P_t$  is  $\kappa$ -lumpable and the claim holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.2.** *There exist e-families of lumpable stochastic matrices with an arbitrary number of multi-row merging blocks.*

It is instructive to observe that neither criterion implies the other. What is more, there exist e-families that remain unexplained by the two above-mentioned criteria. Deriving a set of necessary conditions for  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  to form an e-family is the topic of our next section.

## 5.2 Necessary conditions

As we have seen in the previous section, absence of log-affinity does not always preclude the lumpable family from being exponential. However, the former will be a critical ingredient to show that at least some families of matrices with so called “redundant blocks” cannot form e-families. First, it will be convenient to consider the following notions of block removal.

**Definition 5.1** (Sub-matrix and block removal). *Let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and a non-degenerate surjective lumping function  $\kappa: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ .*

**Sub-matrix.** *For  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{X}$ , we write*

$$\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}} \triangleq \mathcal{Y} \cap (\cup_{x \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{S}_x), \quad \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \triangleq \mathcal{E} \cap \left( \bigcup_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{T}} \mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'} \right),$$

*the resulting sub-graph is  $(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}})$  and the sub-matrix  $F|_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}})$  is defined such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}}$ ,*

$$F|_{\mathcal{T}}(y, y') = F(y, y').$$

**Block removal.** The matrix  $F$  where the block  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$  has been removed is defined as  $F^{\setminus(x_0, x'_0)} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}))$  where for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0})$ ,

$$F^{\setminus(x_0, x'_0)}(y, y') = F(y, y').$$

### 5.2.1 Redundant merging block criterion

Critically, while both operations in Definition 5.1 preserve lumpability, any of the two can disrupt strong connectivity. When a block can be removed while in some sense preserving irreducibility, we say that it is redundant.

**Definition 5.2** (Redundant block). Let  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$ . If there exists  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{X}$  such that the following condition holds:

- (i) The block  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{T}^2$ .
- (ii) The sub-graph  $(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}))$  is strongly connected.

Then we say that the block  $(x_0, x'_0)$  is redundant.

**Theorem 5.1** (Redundant merging block criterion). If  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has a multi-row merging block with respect to  $\kappa$  (Definition 3.1) which is redundant (Definition 5.2), then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family.

*Proof.* We suppose that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has a multi-row merging block  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$ , which is redundant. Recall from the proof Theorem 3.1 that there exist stochastic matrices  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $\tilde{P}_{1/2} = P_0^{\odot 1/2} \odot P_1^{\odot 1/2} \notin \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . From Corollary 3.1, it is enough to show that  $[\tilde{P}_{1/2}] \cap \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \emptyset$  in order to prove that  $\mathfrak{s}(\tilde{P}_{1/2}) \notin \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{Y})$ . In other words, it is sufficient to show that for any  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}}$ , the rescaled  $\text{diag}(v)\tilde{P}_{1/2}\text{diag}(v)^{-1}$  is not  $\kappa$ -lumpable. Let us suppose for contradiction that there exists  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{Y}}$ , such that  $\text{diag}(v)\tilde{P}_{1/2}\text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Since  $(x_0, x'_0)$  is redundant, there exists  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{X}$  such that  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{T}^2$  and  $(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}))$  is strongly connected. On one hand, by our assumption, it must hold that

$$\text{diag}(v) \left( \tilde{P}_{1/2}|_{\mathcal{T}}^{\setminus(x_0, x'_0)} \right) \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0})).$$

However, observe that by our construction in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we also have

$$\tilde{P}_{1/2}|_{\mathcal{T}}^{\setminus(x_0, x'_0)} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0})),$$

and it follows from irreducibility of  $(\mathcal{Y}|_{\mathcal{T}}, \mathcal{E}|_{\mathcal{T}} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}))$  and an application of Proposition 3.2 that  $v$  must be constant over each  $\mathcal{S}_x$  for  $x \in \mathcal{T}$ , and in particular for  $x \in \{x_0, x'_0\}$ . However, in this case, inspecting the multi-row merging block  $(x_0, x'_0)$ ,

$$\sum_{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}} (\text{diag}(v)\tilde{P}_{1/2}\text{diag}(v)^{-1})(y_0, \bar{y}) = \frac{v_{x_0}}{v_{x'_0}} \frac{1}{|\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}: (x_0, \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{D}|},$$

while

$$\sum_{\bar{y} \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}} (\text{diag}(v)\tilde{P}_{1/2}\text{diag}(v)^{-1})(y_*, \bar{y}) = \frac{v_{x_0}}{v_{x'_0}} \left( \frac{1}{|\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}: (x_0, \bar{x}) \in \mathcal{D}|} + 2\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b} - (\eta_a + \eta_b) \right),$$

which cannot be equal from the AM-GM inequality and the assumption that  $\eta_a \neq \eta_b$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ ,  $\mathcal{X} = \{a, b, c\}$ , the lumping map  $\kappa$  defined by the partition  $\mathcal{S}_a = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_b = \{2, 3\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_c = \{4, 5\}$ , and consider the lumpable family

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \sim \begin{pmatrix} + & 0 & + & + & + & 0 \\ 0 & + & + & + & 0 & + \\ \hline + & 0 & + & 0 & + & + \\ 0 & + & 0 & + & + & + \\ \hline + & + & + & 0 & + & 0 \\ + & + & 0 & + & 0 & + \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here,  $(b, c) \in \mathcal{D}$  is a merging block. When we remove edges pertaining to the block  $(b, c)$ —that is we remove  $(2, 4), (2, 5), (3, 4), (3, 5)$ —there exists a closed path

$$1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1,$$

going through all the states in  $\mathcal{Y}$ . As a result, the block  $(b, c)$  is redundant and from Theorem 5.1,  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family.

**Corollary 5.3** (Complete graph). *When  $|\mathcal{Y}| \geq 4$ , unless  $\kappa$  is degenerate,  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}^2)$  does not form an e-family.*

*Proof.* When  $\kappa$  is non-degenerate, observe that  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}^2)$  must have a multi-row merging block. Additionally, removing this block still yields a strongly connected graph. From a direct application of Theorem 5.1, it follows that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}^2)$  does not form an e-family.  $\square$

The most intriguing scenarios occur in the intermediate range between having no multi-row merging blocks and all blocks being multi-row merging. Indeed, as the number of edges in the connection graph grows, it becomes increasingly challenging for the lumpable family to form an e-family. This intuition will be rigorously formalized in Section 6.

## 5.2.2 Dimensional criterion

We introduce the set

$$\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \triangleq \{\log F: F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})\}$$

and its affine hull in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ ,

$$\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \triangleq \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i G_i: k \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k, \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = 1, G_1, \dots, G_k \in \mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \right\}.$$

From Theorem 3.1, we know that  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = \mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ —that is  $\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is an affine space—if and only if  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  has no multi-row merging block with respect to  $\kappa$ . For convenience, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{x,x'} &\triangleq \{y \in \mathcal{S}_x: \exists y'_1, y'_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{x'}, y'_1 \neq y'_2, (y, y'_1), (y, y'_2) \in \mathcal{E}\} \quad \text{for any } (x, x') \in \mathcal{D}, \\ \mathcal{M} &\triangleq \{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}: \mathcal{M}_{x,x'} \neq \emptyset\}, \\ \mathcal{U} &\triangleq \{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}: \mathcal{M}_{x,x'} \neq \mathcal{S}_x\}, \\ \mathcal{R} &\triangleq \bigcup_{(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{M}} \{(y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{M}_{x_0, x'_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0}: (y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{E}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Thus  $\mathcal{M}$  is the collection of merging blocks—not necessarily multi-row—with respect to  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\kappa$ , for any block  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{x,x'} \subset \mathcal{S}_x$  is its set of merging rows,  $\mathcal{U}$  is the collection of all blocks containing at least one non-merging row, and  $\mathcal{R}$  is the set of all edges which appear in some merging row. In particular, when  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{M}$  it holds that  $\mathcal{M}_{x,x'} = \emptyset$ . For each  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$ , we fix a set of  $|\mathcal{S}_x|$  anchor edges

$$E_{x,x'} \triangleq \left\{ (\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}'_1), \dots, (\bar{y}_{|\mathcal{S}_x|}, \bar{y}'_{|\mathcal{S}_x|}) \in \mathcal{E} \cap (\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'}), i \neq j \implies \bar{y}_i \neq \bar{y}_j \right\}. \tag{2}$$

**Lemma 5.1.**  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  is a linear space<sup>7</sup>.

*Proof.* By definition  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  is an affine space, so it suffices to show that it contains the null vector. It will be convenient to introduce  $N \triangleq \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathcal{S}_x|$ , and for  $y \in \mathcal{Y}, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$s_{y,x'} \triangleq |(\{y\} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'}) \cap \mathcal{E}|. \tag{3}$$

For  $\alpha \in (0, 1/N)$ , we let  $F_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$F_\alpha(y, y') = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{when } (y, y') \notin E_{\kappa(y), \kappa(y')}, \\ 1 - (s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \alpha & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

<sup>7</sup>In particular, it contains the null vector.

We similarly introduce  $F_\beta$  for  $\beta \in (0, 1/N)$  with  $\beta \neq \alpha$ . By construction,  $F_\alpha, F_\beta \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , let us inspect  $G_t = t \log F_\alpha + (1-t) \log F_\beta$ . Setting

$$t = \frac{\log \beta}{\log \left( \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)},$$

we obtain

$$G_t(y, y') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } (y, y') \notin E_{\kappa(y), \kappa(y')}, \\ \log \left( 1 - (s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \beta \right) + \frac{\log \beta}{\log \left( \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \right)} \log \left( \frac{1 - (s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \alpha}{1 - (s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \beta} \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Further setting  $\alpha = \delta$  and  $\beta = 2\delta$  for  $\delta \in (0, 1/(2N))$ , we obtain

$$G_t(y, y') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } (y, y') \notin E_{\kappa(y), \kappa(y')}, \\ \log \left( 1 - 2(s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \delta \right) + \frac{\log(2\delta)}{\log(2)} \log \left( \frac{1 - (s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \delta}{1 - 2(s_{y, \kappa(y')} - 1) \delta} \right) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any fixed  $s$ , the function

$$h: \delta \mapsto \log(1 - 2(s-1)\delta) + \frac{\log(2\delta)}{\log(2)} \log \left( \frac{1 - (s-1)\delta}{1 - 2(s-1)\delta} \right)$$

is continuous, negative, decreasing, and satisfies  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} h(\delta) = 0$ . So for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta_s$  such that  $h(\delta_s) < \varepsilon$ . Finally, taking  $s_* = \min \{s_{y, \kappa(y')} : (y, y') \in E_{x, x'}, (x, x') \in \mathcal{D}\}$ , for  $\delta < \delta_*$ , we have that  $\|G_t\| < \varepsilon \sqrt{|\mathcal{E}|}$ . In other words  $0 \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  can be characterized as an accumulation point of a sequence of elements of  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$ . Since  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  is an affine subspace of  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{R}^\mathcal{E}$ , it is closed—it contains all its accumulation points, in particular the null function.  $\square$

Since they coincide, we henceforth write  $\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = \text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** For  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{U}$ , let  $G_{x_0, x'_0}^\dagger \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$G_{x_0, x'_0}^\dagger(y, y') = \delta \left[ (y, y') \in E_{x_0, x'_0} \right],$$

where  $E_{x_0, x'_0}$  is introduced in (2) and the sets  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{R}$  are introduced in Eq. (1). For any  $(y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ , let  $G_{y_0, y'_0}^\dagger \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$G_{y_0, y'_0}^\dagger(y, y') = \delta \left[ (y, y') = (y_0, y'_0) \right].$$

The system of functions

$$\mathcal{B}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \triangleq \left\{ G_{x_0, x'_0}^\dagger : (x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{U} \right\} \cup \left\{ G_{y_0, y'_0}^\dagger : (y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{R} \right\},$$

forms a basis for  $\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$ , and

$$\dim \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = |\mathcal{U}| + |\mathcal{R}|.$$

*Proof.* For any  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{D}$ , and for  $b \in \{0, 1\}$ , we let  $F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(b)} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(b)}(y, y') \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{e^b}{s_{y, \kappa(y')}} & \text{when } (\kappa(y), \kappa(y')) = (x_0, x'_0), \\ \frac{1}{s_{y, \kappa(y')}} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $s_{y, \kappa(y')}$  is defined in Eq. (3). By construction,  $F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(b)} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ ,

$$\log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(1)} - \log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(0)} \in \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})),$$

where we relied on the fact that  $\text{aff}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  (Lemma 5.1), and when  $(x_0, x'_0) \notin \mathcal{M}$ , we have

$$\log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(1)} - \log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(0)} = G_{x_0, x'_0}^\uparrow.$$

Next, for  $(y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ , note that  $s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} > 1$ , and let us construct

$$\tilde{F}_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow(y, y') \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_0, y'_0), \\ \frac{1}{2(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1)} & \text{when } y = y_0, \kappa(y') = \kappa(y'_0), y' \neq y'_0, \\ \frac{1}{s_{y, \kappa(y')}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that

$$\left( \log \tilde{F}_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow - \log F_{\kappa(y_0), \kappa(y'_0)}^{(0)} \right)(y, y') = \begin{cases} \log \left( \frac{s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}}{2} \right) & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_0, y'_0), \\ \log \left( \frac{s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}}{2(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1)} \right) & \text{when } y = y_0, \kappa(y') = \kappa(y'_0), y' \neq y'_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In order to construct  $G_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow$  we first introduce

$$G_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}^\uparrow \triangleq \frac{\sum_{\bar{y}'_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\kappa(y'_0)}: (y_0, \bar{y}'_0) \in \mathcal{E}} \left( \log \tilde{F}_{y_0, \bar{y}'_0}^\uparrow - \log F_{\kappa(y_0), \kappa(\bar{y}'_0)}^{(0)} \right)}{\log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}) - \log(2) + (s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1) \left( \log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}) - \log(2) - \log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1) \right)}.$$

Observe that

$$G_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}^\uparrow(y, y') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } y = y_0 \text{ and } \kappa(y') = \kappa(y'_0), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We then construct  $G_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow$  as

$$G_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow = \left( 1 - \frac{\log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1)}{\log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}) - \log(2)} \right) \left( \frac{\log \tilde{F}_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow - \log F_{\kappa(y_0), \kappa(y'_0)}^{(0)}}{\log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}) - \log(2) - \log(s_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)} - 1)} - G_{y_0, \kappa(y'_0)}^\uparrow \right).$$

We obtain that for  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$G_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow(y, y') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_0, y'_0), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The construction of  $G_{x_0, x'_0}^\uparrow$  for  $(x_0, x'_0) \in \mathcal{U}$  follows,

$$G_{x_0, x'_0}^\uparrow = \log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(1)} - \log F_{x_0, x'_0}^{(0)} - \sum_{(y_0, y'_0) \in \mathcal{R} \cap (\mathcal{S}_{x_0} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_0})} G_{y_0, y'_0}^\uparrow.$$

Generativity and linear independence of the system of function are immediate.  $\square$

**Example 5.4.** Consider

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \sim \begin{pmatrix} \oplus & \oplus & + & \mathbf{0} \\ \oplus & \oplus & + & + \\ \oplus & \mathbf{0} & \oplus & \mathbf{0} \\ \oplus & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \oplus \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\oplus$  indicates that the edge is fixed as an anchor— that is it belongs to  $E_{x,x'}$  for some  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}$ . Then  $\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  is spanned by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Example 5.5.** Consider

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \sim \begin{pmatrix} \oplus & 0 & \oplus & 0 \\ 0 & \oplus & 0 & \oplus \\ 0 & \oplus & \oplus & + \\ \oplus & 0 & 0 & \oplus \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  is spanned by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We recall the definition of the exponential hull of a family of stochastic matrices  $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  as the smallest exponential family which contains  $\mathcal{V}$ .

**Definition 5.3** (Exponential hull, [Wolfer and Watanabe, 2021](#), Definition 7). Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a sub-family of  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ .

$$\text{e-hull}(\mathcal{V}) \triangleq \left\{ \mathfrak{s}(\tilde{P}) : \log \tilde{P} = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \log P_i, k \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k, \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = 1, P_1, \dots, P_k \in \mathcal{V} \right\},$$

where  $\mathfrak{s}$ -normalization was introduced in [Definition 2.1](#).

In particular,  $\text{e-hull}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{V}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{V}$  forms an e-family. For instance, it is known that the exponential hull of symmetric stochastic matrices yields the reversible family [[Wolfer and Watanabe, 2021](#), Theorem 9]. In our analysis, it will be convenient to further define  $\mathcal{H}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\triangleq \{\log P : P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})\} \subset \mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}), \\ \overline{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) &\triangleq \{\log P : P \in \text{e-hull}(\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is isomorphic to the affine hull of  $\mathcal{H}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})/\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ .

**Proposition 5.3.**

$$\overline{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \cong (\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) / \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$



*Proof.* Let  $\bar{H} \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . There exists  $\bar{G} \in \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  such that

$$\exp(\bar{H}) = \mathfrak{s}(\exp(\bar{G})).$$

It follows that we can write

$$\bar{H} = \bar{G} + N,$$

for some  $N \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . As a result,

$$\bar{H} \in (\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) / \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

Conversely, let  $\bar{G} \in \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  and  $N \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . It holds that

$$\mathfrak{s}(\bar{G} + N) \in \text{e-hull}(\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})),$$

hence

$$[\bar{G} + N]_{\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})} \in \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

□

**Theorem 5.2** (Dimensional criterion). *If*

$$\dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) > |\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{X}| - \sum_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{S}_x|,$$

then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family. Then  $\text{e-hull}(\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and

$$\dim \bar{\mathcal{H}}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

It follows follows then from Proposition 5.3 that

$$\dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) / \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = \dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}).$$

Recall that  $\dim \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = |\mathcal{Y}|$ , and from Theorem 2.1, that

$$\dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = |\mathcal{E}| - \sum_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{S}_x| + |\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{X}|,$$

whence the theorem holds. □

A basis for  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  can be constructed as follows. For  $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ , we define  $N_{y_0} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}$ ,

$$N_{y_0}(y, y') = \delta[y' = y_0] - \delta[y = y_0].$$

Let  $y_* \in \mathcal{Y}$  be arbitrary; then

$$\{C\} \cup \{N_{y_0} : y_0 \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \{y_*\}\},$$

where  $C \equiv 1$  is the constant unit function over  $\mathcal{E}$ , forms a basis of  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . As a consequence, the bases for  $\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}))$  and  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  can be concatenated, and determining the rank of the resulting family can be obtained algorithmically, for instance with Gaussian elimination. Before performing this somewhat costly computation, one can also proceed with the following preliminary verification which does not require computing the rank of a family of functions.

**Corollary 5.4.** *If*

$$\underbrace{\sum_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{S}_x|}_{\# \text{ of rows in every block}} > \underbrace{(|\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{U}|)}_{\# \text{ completely merging blocks}} + \underbrace{(|\mathcal{Y}| - |\mathcal{X}'|)}_{\text{state space compression}} + \underbrace{(|\mathcal{E}| - |\mathcal{R}|)}_{\# \text{ of non-merging transitions}},$$

where  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are defined in Eq. (1), then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family.

*Proof.*

$$\dim \text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \leq \dim(\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})).$$

□

**Example 5.6** (Example 5.4 continued). Recall the family

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \sim \begin{pmatrix} \oplus & \oplus & + & 0 \\ \oplus & \oplus & + & + \\ \oplus & 0 & \oplus & 0 \\ \oplus & 0 & 0 & \oplus \end{pmatrix}.$$

A basis of functions  $\mathcal{B}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  for  $\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is given in Example 5.4. The space  $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is spanned by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

On one end, the manifold dimension of the lumpable family is given by

$$\dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = |\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{D}| - |\mathcal{X}| - \sum_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathcal{S}_x| = 11 + 4 - 2 - 8 = 5.$$

On the other hand, concatenating the two bases, one can algorithmically verify that

$$\dim (\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) = 10.$$

Consequently,

$$\dim (\text{span}(\mathcal{G}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) \oplus \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})) > \dim \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) + \dim \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}),$$

and from Theorem 5.2,  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family.

## 6 Monotonicity and stability

In this section, we fix two state spaces  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  and a surjective non-trivial lumping function  $\kappa: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . For edge sets  $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$  such that  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$ , it is clear that when  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected, so must be  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ , and the graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  can be incrementally transformed into  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  by adding edges, naturally leading to the construction of a monotonous sequence of consecutive elements  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_L = \mathcal{E}'$ , where  $L = |\mathcal{E}'| - |\mathcal{E}|$ . When considering lumpability, more care is required. Indeed, even if  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is non-vacuous, adding a single edge can easily disrupt lumpability, leading to  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}') = \emptyset$ . Only by adding edges in already existing blocks, or introducing new valid blocks can we guarantee the existence of lumpable chains under the new graph. We first explain how to construct a monotonous sequence of essentially consecutive families of irreducible and lumpable stochastic matrices.

**Lemma 6.1** (Chaining). *Let  $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}' \in \mathcal{Y}^2$  be such that  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$ , and  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  are non-vacuous families of lumpable stochastic matrices. Then, there exists  $L \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite sequence of edge sets  $\mathcal{E}_0, \mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_L \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$ , such that*

1.  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_L = \mathcal{E}'$ .
2. The sequence  $\{\mathcal{E}_\ell\}_{\ell=0, \dots, L}$  is strictly monotone increasing, that is, for any  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, L-1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_\ell \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$ .
3. The sequence  $\{\mathcal{E}_\ell\}_{\ell=0, \dots, L}$  is consecutive, in the sense where for any  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, L-1\}$ , it holds that for any  $\mathcal{E}'' \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$  such that  $\mathcal{E}_\ell \subset \mathcal{E}'' \subset \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  either  $\mathcal{E}'' = \mathcal{E}_\ell, \mathcal{E}'' = \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  or  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}'') = \emptyset$ .
4. For any  $\ell \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_\ell)$  is non-vacuous.
5. For any  $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, L-1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  only differ either on an edge-link or a block-link:

**Edge-link:** We say that  $(y_\star, y'_\star) \in \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  is an edge-link between  $\mathcal{E}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  whenever

$$\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}) = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_\ell), \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1} \setminus \mathcal{E}_\ell = \{(y_\star, y'_\star)\}.$$

**Block-link:** We say that  $(x_\star, x'_\star) \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1})$  is a block-link between  $\mathcal{E}_\ell$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}$  whenever

$$\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_{\ell+1}) \neq \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_\ell), \mathcal{E}_{\ell+1} \setminus \mathcal{E}_\ell \subset \mathcal{S}_{x_\star} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_\star}, \text{ and } (x_\star, x'_\star) \text{ is non-merging.}$$

*Proof.* Let us set  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}$  and let us denote

$$\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}') \setminus \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_0) = \{(x_1, x'_1), \dots, (x_B, x'_B)\},$$

the indexed collection of  $B \in \mathbb{N}$  non-zero blocks in lumped  $\mathcal{E}'$  that vanish in lumped  $\mathcal{E}$ . For such a block  $b \in [B]$ , we denote  $s_b = |\mathcal{S}_{x_b}|$ , and we let

$$(y_{b,1}, y'_{b,1}), \dots, (y_{b,s_b}, y'_{b,s_b}) \in \mathcal{S}_{x_b} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_b} \cap \mathcal{E}'$$

be a collection of  $s_b$  pairs such that for any  $i, j \in [s_b]$ ,  $i \neq j \implies y_{b,i} \neq y_{b,j}$ . Note that such a collection of  $s_b$  pairs must necessarily exist from our assumption that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}') \neq \emptyset$ . For simplicity, we write

$$\Delta\mathcal{E}_b \triangleq \{(y_{b,1}, y'_{b,1}), \dots, (y_{b,s_b}, y'_{b,s_b})\},$$

and for  $b \in [B]$ , we then define inductively

$$\mathcal{E}_b = \mathcal{E}_{b-1} \cup \Delta\mathcal{E}_b.$$

Observe that by construction,  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_b) \neq \emptyset$  for any  $b = 0, \dots, B$ , and that by exhaustion, we obtain  $\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}') = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}_B)$ . As a second step, we now denote

$$\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}_B = \{(y_1, y'_1), \dots, (y_E, y'_E)\}$$

the set of edges in  $\mathcal{E}'$  which are still missing in  $\mathcal{E}_B$ . For  $e \in [E]$ , defining inductively

$$\mathcal{E}_{B+e} = \mathcal{E}_{B+e-1} \cup \{(y_e, y'_e)\},$$

we obtain a full chain of non-vacuous lumpable families

$$\mathcal{E}_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_B \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_{B+1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_{B+E},$$

which concludes the claim with  $L = B + E$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.1.** *Links offer minimal updates in as much as it is not possible to insert additional (non-vacuous) elements in between links. Moreover, while chains are not unique, observe that they all share the same length*

$$L = \sum_{(x,x') \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})} |(\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}) \cap (\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'})| + \sum_{(x,x') \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}') \setminus \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})} |(\mathcal{E}' \cap (\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'}))| - |\mathcal{S}_x| + 1.$$

We now state and show a monotonicity property of e-families.

**Theorem 6.1 (Monotonicity).** *Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$  such that both  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  are non-vacuous. If  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  forms an e-family, then  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.*

*Proof.* Consider the max-norm on  $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  defined by  $\|A\| = \max_{y,y' \in \mathcal{E}} |A(y, y')|$ . We prove the contrapositive of the claim. Let us suppose that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family. From [Nagaoka \[2005, Corollary 3\]](#), there exist  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $t_\star \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}(t_\star) \notin \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Constructing a ball with respect to  $\|\cdot\|$  around any lumpable matrix, it is easy to see that every point is a boundary point. In the boundary, we must also include stochastic matrices where some edges are missing. In fact, the boundary set of  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  with respect to the max-norm is given by

$$\partial\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \cup \bigcup_{\mathcal{E}'' \subsetneq \mathcal{E}} \{F \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}'') : F1^\top = 1^\top\}.$$

However, since the super-family  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family, it holds that  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)} \subset \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ , thus  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}(t_\star) \notin \partial\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . As a consequence, there must exist  $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that the curve at parameter  $t_\star$  satisfies

$$\inf_{P \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})} \left\| P - \gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}(t_\star) \right\| > \delta. \quad (4)$$

We first treat the two simple cases where  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  are connected by either an edge-link or a block-link. From the chaining Lemma 6.1, we will then deduce the general claim.

**Edge-link case:** Let us first assume that  $\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}) = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}')$  and that  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  differ on a single edge  $(y_*, y'_*) \in \mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}$ , where  $(y_*, y'_*) \in \mathcal{S}_{x_*} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_*}$ . By construction, since  $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is lumpable, there exists  $\bar{y}'_* \in \mathcal{S}_{x'_*}$  with  $\bar{y}'_* \neq y'_*$  such that  $(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) \in \mathcal{E}$ . Let  $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}/2]$  with  $\bar{\eta} \triangleq \min\{P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*), P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)\}$ , and for  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$  set

$$P'_k(y, y') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } (y, y') \notin \mathcal{E}' \\ \eta & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_*, y'_*) \\ P_k(y, y') - \eta & \text{when } (y, y') = (y_*, \bar{y}'_*) \\ P_k(y, y') & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The resulting  $P'_0$  and  $P'_1$  are irreducible and  $\kappa$ -lumpable stochastic matrices, that is  $P'_0, P'_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ . We proceed to inspect the curve  $\gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  and for simplicity, denote  $P'_t \triangleq \gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}(t)$  the transition matrix such that for any  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$ ,

$$P'_t(y, y') = P'_0(y, y')^{1-t} P'_1(y, y')^t \frac{v_{t, \eta}(y')}{\rho_{t, \eta} v_{t, \eta}(y)},$$

where  $\rho_{t, \eta}$  and  $v_{t, \eta}$  are respectively the Perron–Frobenius root and associated eigenvector of  $P'_0 \odot (1-t) \odot P'_1 \odot t$ . Observe that by unicity, for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds that  $v_t = v_{t, 0}$ ,  $\rho_t = \rho_{t, 0}$ , and following analyticity of  $\eta \mapsto v_{t, \eta}$  and  $\eta \mapsto \rho_{t, \eta}$  on the closed interval  $[0, \bar{\eta}/2]$  [Kato, 2013], at time parameter  $t = t_*$  achieving (4), it will be convenient to introduce

$$\underline{\rho} = \min_{\eta \in [0, \bar{\eta}/2]} \rho_{t_*, \eta} > 0, \quad \underline{v} = \min_{y \in \mathcal{Y}, \eta \in [0, \bar{\eta}/2]} v_{t_*, \eta}(y) > 0, \quad \bar{v} = \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y}, \eta \in [0, \bar{\eta}/2]} v_{t_*, \eta}(y).$$

Furthermore, there exists  $\bar{\eta}_\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that for  $\eta < \bar{\eta}_\delta$

$$\left| \frac{v_{t_*, \eta}(y')}{\rho_{t_*, \eta} v_{t_*, \eta}(y)} - \frac{v_{t_*}(y')}{\rho_{t_*} v_{t_*}(y)} \right| \leq \delta.$$

For  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{E}' \setminus \{(y_*, y'_*), (y_*, \bar{y}'_*)\}$  and any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$P'_t(y, y') - P_t(y, y') = P_0(y, y')^{1-t} P_1(y, y')^t \left( \frac{v_{t, \eta}(y')}{\rho_{t, \eta} v_{t, \eta}(y)} - \frac{v_t(y')}{\rho_t v_t(y)} \right),$$

thus,

$$|P'_{t_*}(y, y') - P_{t_*}(y, y')| \leq \left| \frac{v_{t_*, \eta}(y')}{\rho_{t_*, \eta} v_{t_*, \eta}(y)} - \frac{v_{t_*}(y')}{\rho_{t_*} v_{t_*}(y)} \right|.$$

Additionally,

$$P'_t(y_*, y'_*) - P_t(y_*, y'_*) = P'_t(y_*, y'_*) = \eta \frac{v_{t, \eta}(y'_*)}{\rho_{t, \eta} v_{t, \eta}(y_*)},$$

leading to

$$|P'_{t_*}(y_*, y'_*) - P_{t_*}(y_*, y'_*)| \leq \eta \frac{\bar{v}}{\underline{\rho}}.$$

Finally, observing that

$$\begin{aligned} & P'_t(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - P_t(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) \\ &= (P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^{1-t} (P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^t \frac{v_{t, \eta}(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_{t, \eta} v_{t, \eta}(y_*)} - (P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^{1-t} (P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^t \frac{v_t(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_t v_t(y_*)} \\ &+ (P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^{1-t} (P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - \eta)^t \frac{v_t(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_t v_t(y_*)} - P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)^{1-t} P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)^t \frac{v_t(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_t v_t(y_*)} \end{aligned}$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |P'_{t_*}(y_*, \bar{y}'_*) - P_{t_*}(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)| &\leq \left| \frac{v_{t_*, \eta}(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_{t_*, \eta} v_{t_*, \eta}(y_*)} - \frac{v_{t_*}(\bar{y}'_*)}{\rho_{t_*} v_{t_*}(y_*)} \right| \\ &+ \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{\eta}{P_0(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)} \right)^{1-t_*} \left( 1 - \frac{\eta}{P_1(y_*, \bar{y}'_*)} \right)^{t_*} \right) \frac{\bar{v}}{\underline{\rho}}, \end{aligned}$$

and for

$$\eta < \min \left\{ P_0(y_{\star}, \bar{y}'_{\star}) \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \delta \frac{\rho v}{4\bar{v}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(1-t_{\star})}} \right), P_1(y_{\star}, \bar{y}'_{\star}) \left( 1 - \left( 1 - \delta \frac{\rho v}{4\bar{v}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2t_{\star}}} \right), \bar{\eta}_{\delta/4} \right\},$$

the above is smaller than  $\delta/2$ . As a result, if we also assume that  $\eta$  such that  $\eta < \bar{\eta}_{\delta/2}$  and  $\eta < \frac{\delta\rho v}{2\bar{v}}$ , it holds that

$$\|P'_{t_{\star}} - P_{t_{\star}}\| \leq \delta/2.$$

For any  $P \in \mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ , it then holds from the triangle inequality that

$$\|P - P_{t_{\star}}\| \leq \|P - P'_{t_{\star}}\| + \|P'_{t_{\star}} - P_{t_{\star}}\|,$$

thus,

$$\|P - P'_{t_{\star}}\| > \|P - P_{t_{\star}}\| - \delta/2 > \delta/2,$$

and taking the infimum over  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  finishes proving that  $\gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}(t_{\star}) \notin \mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ . Invoking [Nagaoka \[2005, Corollary 3\]](#), we conclude that  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  does not form an e-family.

**Block-link case:** Let us now assume that  $\mathcal{E}'$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  differ by a block-link, that is  $\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}') \setminus \kappa_2(\mathcal{E}) = \{(x_{\star}, x'_{\star})\}$ , a single non-merging block, and  $\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_{\star}}$ . We denote  $s = |\mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}}|$  and we enumerate  $(y_1, y'_1), \dots, (y_s, y'_s) \in \mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_{\star}}$  the elements which are also in  $\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}$ . Since elements of  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  are stochastic matrices, there must exist a block  $(x_{\star}, \bar{x}'_{\star}) \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})$ , with  $\bar{x}'_{\star} \neq x'_{\star}$ . We let  $\eta \in (0, \bar{\eta}/2]$  where

$$\bar{\eta} \triangleq \min\{P_k(y, y') : k \in \{0, 1\}, (y, y') \in \mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{x}'_{\star}}\}.$$

We further let  $\bar{y}'_1, \dots, \bar{y}'_s \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{x}'_{\star}}$  be such that  $(y_1, \bar{y}'_1), \dots, (y_s, \bar{y}'_s) \in \mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}} \times \mathcal{S}_{\bar{x}'_{\star}}$ . For  $k \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $(y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}^2$ , we construct

$$P'_k(y, y') = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } (y, y') \notin \mathcal{E}' \\ \eta & \text{when } (y, y') \in \mathcal{S}_{x_{\star}} \times \mathcal{S}_{x'_{\star}} \\ P_k(y, y') - \eta & \text{when there exists } i \in [s] \text{ such that } (y, y') = (y_i, y'_i) \\ P_k(y, y') & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that  $P'_0$  and  $P'_1$  are both irreducible and  $\kappa$ -lumpable stochastic matrices. Similar to the edge-link case, we inspect the curve  $\gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ , and we denote  $P'_t = \gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}(t)$  the point on the curve at time parameter  $t$ . Using a similar analyticity argument as for the edge-link case, we show that the two curves  $\gamma_{P'_0, P'_1}^{(e)}$  and  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}$  can be made arbitrarily close point-wise, and in particular for  $t = t_{\star}$ . That is, there exists  $\bar{\eta}_{\delta}$  such that for  $\eta < \bar{\eta}_{\delta}$ , it holds that  $\|P'_t - P_{t_{\star}}\| \leq \delta/2$ . An application of the triangle inequality and [Nagaoka \[2005, Corollary 3\]](#) conclude the claim.

**Chaining and conclusion.** As a conclusion of the above, if  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  only differ by an edge-link or a block-link, the claim holds. The general case can be obtained by inductively applying the above result to the chain of consecutive edge sets  $\{\mathcal{E}_{\ell}\}_{\ell=0, \dots, L}$  with  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_L = \mathcal{E}'$ , obtained from [Lemma 6.1](#).  $\square$

**Remark 6.2.** Any chain constructed between two e-families can only be linked by non-merging blocks as adding a merging block immediately disrupts the property of being an e-family. Note that adding either an edge-link or a (non-merging) block-link can still disrupt the quality of being an e-family. The length of a chain between two e-families  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  simplifies to

$$L = |\kappa_2(\mathcal{E}') \setminus \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})| + \sum_{(x, x') \in \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})} |(\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E}) \cap (\mathcal{S}_x \times \mathcal{S}_{x'})|.$$

**Definition 6.1** (Maximal e-families and minimal non e-families). We consider the partial order on non-vacuous lumpable and irreducible families induced from their edge sets ordered by inclusion. We call  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  a maximal e-family, if  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family, and any non-vacuous lumpable family  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  such that  $\mathcal{E} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}'$  does not form an e-family. Similarly, we call  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  a minimal non e-family, if  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  forms an e-family, and any non-vacuous lumpable family  $\mathcal{W}_{\kappa}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $\mathcal{E} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}'$  forms an e-family.

**Remark 6.3** (Well-definedness). *The family  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}^2)$  defined over the complete graph being lumpable for any  $\kappa$ , irreducible, and not forming an e-family (in non-trivial settings) it always holds that for any  $\mathcal{E} \subsetneq \mathcal{Y}^2$  such that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family, that there exists  $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$  with  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$  such that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  does not form an e-family. Note however that for any  $\mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  is non-vacuous and does not form an e-family, it is not always possible to extract  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}'$  such that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms a non-vacuous e-family. The example below demonstrates this fact.*

$$\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}) \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & | & 0 & + \\ 0 & 0 & | & + & 0 \\ \hline 0 & + & | & 0 & + \\ + & + & | & 0 & + \end{pmatrix}$$

Observe that if we remove any subset of edges from the family above, it would become either reducible, or non-lumpable. The minimality statement thus only holds vacuously in this case.

It is instructive to observe that adding or removing diagonal blocks from the diagonal does not alter the e-family property.

**Proposition 6.1** (Stability through diagonal modification). *Let  $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}'$  where  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}' \subset \mathcal{Y}^2$  be such that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}') \neq \emptyset$ , and suppose additionally that*

$$\mathcal{E}' \setminus \mathcal{E} \subset \{(y, y) : y \in \mathcal{Y}, \kappa(y) \notin \mathcal{D} = \kappa_2(\mathcal{E})\}.$$

Then it holds that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  forms an e-family if and only if  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family.

*Proof.* Let us first assume that  $\mathcal{E}'$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  differ on a single diagonal block  $(x_0, x_0) \in \mathcal{D}'$  and suppose that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family. We let  $P'_0, P'_1$  be an arbitrary pair in  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$  and for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , we define  $\tilde{P}'_t = P'_0 \odot^{(1-t)} \odot P'_1 \odot^t$  to be their log-affine combination. For  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , we additionally define  $P_i \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  be such that

$$P_i(y, y') = \begin{cases} P'_i(y, y') & \text{when } \kappa(y) \neq x_0 \\ 0 & \text{when } (\kappa(y), \kappa(y')) = (x_0, x_0) \\ \frac{P'_i(y, y')}{\sum_{x' \neq x_0} P'_i(x_0, x')} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an e-family, it must be that  $\mathfrak{s}(\tilde{P}_t) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  where  $\tilde{P}_t = P_0 \odot^{(1-t)} \odot P_1 \odot^t$ . Thus, from Corollary 3.1, there exists  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\text{diag}(v) \tilde{P}_t \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$ . Observe now that the same vector  $v$  also satisfies  $\text{diag}(v) \tilde{P}'_t \text{diag}(v)^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ , thus  $\mathfrak{s}(\tilde{P}'_t) \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}')$ , which forms an e-family. The case where  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$  differ by more than one diagonal block can be retrieved using chaining (refer to Lemma 6.1). The converse statement follows more generally by monotonicity (refer to Theorem 6.1).  $\square$

## 7 Algorithmics

The classification problem involves determining whether the family  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  forms an exponential family, given a strongly connected graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and a lumping map  $\kappa$ . Specifically, we will provide a worst-case time complexity analysis of the criteria developed in Section 5.1 and Section 5.2.

### 7.1 Deterministic classification

Complexity will be typically expressed as a function of the number of vertices or edges in the graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and the lumping map  $\kappa$ . The space  $\mathcal{Y}$  is represented by the integers  $\{1, \dots, |\mathcal{Y}|\}$ . As is traditional in the literature, we will use the landau notation  $\mathcal{O}$ . We assume that the graph  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is represented in the machine using adjacency lists leading to a total structure of size  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ . Time complexity is measured in terms of elementary field operations (addition, multiplication) and memory accesses. Storing the graph already requires  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$  operations thus we will take this quantity as our lower bound and be mostly concerned with complexity which exceeds this value. Recall that the lumping map can have two representations—either partitional or functional. For the partitional representation, we store an array of size  $|\mathcal{X}|$  corresponding to each elements of the lumped space. In each entry  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  of this array we store a list of elements of  $\mathcal{Y}$  lumping into  $x$ . For the functional representation, we store an array of size  $|\mathcal{Y}|$  where at each entry  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  we store  $\kappa(y)$ . It is not hard to see that one representation can be constructed

from the other in  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}|)$ . As a result, both representations can be interchangeably considered, and we will henceforth assume that we can both compute  $\kappa(y)$  in  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  and loop over elements of  $\mathcal{S}_x$  in  $|\mathcal{S}_x|$ .

**Proposition 7.1** (Complexity of basic procedures). *We rely on the subroutines below.*

- (i) Determine whether  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected:  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .
- (ii) Determine whether  $P \in \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is  $\kappa$ -lumpable:  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .
- (iii) Determine whether  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  is non-vacuous:  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .
- (iv) Construct the lumped graph  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D})$  (as adjacency lists) in  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}|^2 + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .
- (v) List merging blocks of  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  with respect to  $\kappa$ :  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .

*Proof.* Simple algorithms yields (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), while for (i), listing strongly connected components can be achieved by running Tarjan’s strongly connected components algorithm [Tarjan, 1972], Kosaraju-Sharir’s algorithm [Sharir, 1981], or the path-based strong component algorithm [Dijkstra, 1976] which all run in  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 7.2** (Complexity of no multi-row merging block criterion (Corollary 5.1)).  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .

**Proposition 7.3** (Complexity of dimensional criterion (Theorem 5.2)).  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}|^\omega)$  with  $\omega \leq 2.371552$ .

*Proof.* It should be clear that the bottleneck operation is the computation of the rank of the system of matrices. Typically, computing the rank of a matrix is done by Gaussian elimination. For a system of  $m$  vectors of dimension  $n$ , this approach can be theoretically implemented in  $\mathcal{O}(mn^{\omega-1})$  [Ibarra et al., 1982] where  $2 \leq \omega \leq 2.371552$  is the matrix multiplication exponent [Williams et al., 2024]. In our case, we have at most  $|\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{Y}|$  vectors, each of dimension  $|\mathcal{E}|$ . As a result, we obtain a worst-case time complexity of  $\mathcal{O}((|\mathcal{E}| + |\mathcal{Y}|) |\mathcal{E}|^{\omega-1})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 7.1.** *In practice—that is for most implementations—the complexity is of order  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{E}|^3)$ . Note that with a parallel algorithm, it is possible to deterministically compute this rank in  $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 |\mathcal{Y}|)$  time [Mulmuley, 1986] using a polynomial number of processors. Since the rank calculation is the bottleneck, distributing this task would substantially improve the efficiency of our algorithm.*

**Proposition 7.4.** *There exists a  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}|^\omega)$  time verifiable witness that can be used to conclude that a lumpable family is not an e-family.*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  does not form an e-family. Then there exists a  $P_0, P_1 \in \mathcal{W}_\kappa(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E})$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}(t)$  is not  $\kappa$ -lumpable. The triplet  $(P_0, P_1, t)$  is a witness and it remains to argue that it can be verified in polynomial time. Since constructing a point at parameter  $t$  on the e-geodesic amounts to computing the Perron-Frobenius eigenpair of a Hadamard product of two matrices of size  $|\mathcal{Y}| \times |\mathcal{Y}|$ , it follows that  $\gamma_{P_0, P_1}^{(e)}(t)$  can be computed in  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{Y}|^\omega)$ , and it can be verified that it is not  $\kappa$ -lumpable in  $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{X}| |\mathcal{Y}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ .  $\square$

## References

- S. Amari and H. Nagaoka. *Methods of information geometry*, volume 191. American Mathematical Soc., Rhode Island, 2007. (pages: 2, 5)
- S.-I. Amari. Natural gradient works efficiently in learning. *Neural computation*, 10(2):251–276, 1998. (page: 2)
- D. R. Barr and M. U. Thomas. An eigenvector condition for markov chain lumpability. *Operations Research*, 25(6):1028–1031, 1977. (page: 7)
- L. B. Boza. Asymptotically optimal tests for finite Markov chains. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1992–2007, 1971. (page: 2)
- C. Burke and M. Rosenblatt. A Markovian function of a Markov chain. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 29(4):1112–1122, 1958. (page: 4)
- I. Csiszár, T. M. Cover, and B.-S. Choi. Conditional limit theorems under Markov conditioning. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 33(6):788–801, 1987. (page: 2)

- G. Darrois. Sur les lois de probabilité à estimation exhaustive. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 260(1265):85, 1935. (page: 2)
- E. W. Dijkstra. A discipline of programming, 1976. (page: 23)
- B. Efron. Defining the curvature of a statistical problem (with applications to second order efficiency). *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1189–1242, 1975. (page: 2)
- V. Fabian and J. Hannan. On the Cramér-Rao inequality. *The Annals of Statistics*, 5(1):197–205, 1977. (page: 2)
- M. Hayashi and S. Watanabe. Information geometry approach to parameter estimation in Markov chains. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(4):1495 – 1535, 2016. doi: 10.1214/15-AOS1420. (pages: 2, 5, and 6)
- O. H. Ibarra, S. Moran, and R. Hui. A generalization of the fast LUP matrix decomposition algorithm and applications. *Journal of algorithms*, 3(1):45–56, 1982. (page: 23)
- H. Ito and S.-i. Amari. Geometry of information sources. In *Proceedings of the 11th Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications (SITA '88)*, pages 57–60, 1988. (page: 2)
- V. Joshi. On the attainment of the Cramér-Rao lower bound. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 998–1002, 1976. (page: 2)
- T. Kato. *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, volume 132. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013. (page: 20)
- J. G. Kemeny and J. L. Snell. *Finite Markov chains: with a new appendix "Generalization of a fundamental matrix"*. Springer, New York, 1983. (pages: 1, 2, 4, and 10)
- B. O. Koopman. On distributions admitting a sufficient statistic. *Transactions of the American Mathematical society*, 39(3):399–409, 1936. (page: 2)
- J. M. Lee. Smooth manifolds. In *Introduction to Smooth Manifolds*. Springer, New York, 2013. (page: 5)
- D. A. Levin, Y. Peres, and E. L. Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times, second edition*. American Mathematical Soc., 2009. (pages: 4, 7)
- H. Miller. A convexity property in the theory of random variables defined on a finite Markov chain. *The Annals of mathematical statistics*, pages 1260–1270, 1961. (page: 4)
- V. Moulos and V. Anantharam. Optimal Chernoff and Hoeffding bounds for finite state Markov chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.04467*, 2019. (page: 2)
- U. Muller-Funk, F. Pukelsheim, and H. Witting. On the attainment of the Cramér-Rao bound in  $L_r$ -differentiable families of distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1742–1748, 1989. (page: 2)
- K. Mulmuley. A fast parallel algorithm to compute the rank of a matrix over an arbitrary field. In *Proceedings of the eighteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 338–339, 1986. (page: 23)
- H. Nagaoka. The exponential family of Markov chains and its information geometry. In *The proceedings of the Symposium on Information Theory and Its Applications*, volume 28(2), pages 601–604, 2005. (pages: 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 19, and 21)
- K. Nakagawa and F. Kanaya. On the converse theorem in statistical hypothesis testing for Markov chains. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 39(2):629–633, 1993. (page: 2)
- E. J. G. Pitman. Sufficient statistics and intrinsic accuracy. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical society*, volume 32, pages 567–579. Cambridge University Press, 1936. (page: 2)
- L. C. Rogers and J. Pitman. Markov functions. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 573–582, 1981. (page: 4)
- M. Sharir. A strong-connectivity algorithm and its applications in data flow analysis. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 7(1):67–72, 1981. (page: 23)
- J. Takeuchi and T. Kawabata. Exponential curvature of Markov models. In *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pages 2891–2895. IEEE, 2007. (pages: 2, 6)



- J. Takeuchi and H. Nagaoka. Information geometry of the family of Markov kernels defined by a context tree. In *2017 IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, pages 429–433. IEEE, 2017. (pages: 2, 6)
- R. Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM journal on computing*, 1(2):146–160, 1972. (page: 23)
- N. N. Čencov. *Statistical decision rules and optimal inference*. Number 53. American Mathematical Soc., 1983. (pages: 2, 5)
- S. Watanabe and M. Hayashi. Finite-length analysis on tail probability for Markov chain and application to simple hypothesis testing. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 27(2):811–845, 04 2017. doi: 10.1214/16-AAP1216. (page: 2)
- R. Wijsman. On the attainment of the Cramér-Rao lower bound. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(3):538–542, 1973. (page: 2)
- V. V. Williams, Y. Xu, Z. Xu, and R. Zhou. New bounds for matrix multiplication: from alpha to omega. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 3792–3835. SIAM, 2024. (page: 23)
- G. Wolfer and S. Watanabe. Information geometry of reversible Markov chains. *Information Geometry*, 4(2): 393–433, 12 2021. ISSN 2511-2481. doi: 10.1007/s41884-021-00061-7. (pages: 2, 5, and 16)
- G. Wolfer and S. Watanabe. Geometric aspects of data-processing of Markov chains. *Transactions of Mathematics and Its Applications*, 8(1), 05 2024. ISSN 2398-4945. doi: 10.1093/imatrm/tnae001. (pages: 2, 5, 6, and 10)