## **Regularly Parametrised Models**

Thomas Waring

March 8, 2022

This talk introduces the RLCT of an ideal, which we can use, via regularly parametrised models, to simply calculations. The main reference is [Lin11], see §§1.4 and 4.1. Throughout, let  $W \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be compact and semianalytic, and  $\mathcal{A}_W$  be the ring of (real) analytic functions on W.

**Definition 1.** Let  $f, \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_W$  be non-negative analytic functions on W. The RLCT of f, with the prior  $\varphi$ , is the pair  $(\lambda, \theta)$  of real numbers, such that the *partition function*:

$$Z(n) := \int_{W} e^{-nf(w)} \varphi(w) \, du$$

obeys the asymptotic expression:

$$-\log Z(n) = \lambda \log n - (\theta - 1) \log \log n + O(1).$$
(1)

Notation:  $\operatorname{RLCT}_W(f;\varphi) = (\lambda, \theta).$ 

**Remark 2.** See [Lin11, §3] for the proof that this is well-defined. In fact  $\lambda$  is rational and  $\theta$  a positive integer, and they can be respectively calculated as the smallest pole of

$$\zeta(z) = \int_W f(w)^{-z} \varphi(w) \, dw$$

and its multiplicity. We we write  $(\lambda, \theta) < (\lambda', \theta')$ , if  $\lambda < \lambda'$  or  $\lambda = \lambda'$  and  $\theta > \theta'$ , which is equivalent to

$$\lambda \log n - (\theta - 1) \log \log n < \lambda' \log n - (\theta' - 1) \log \log n$$

for all sufficiently large n.

**Lemma 3.** Let f, g be real analytic on W. If there is a positive constant c such that  $f \leq cg$  on W, then

$$\operatorname{RLCT}_W(f;\varphi) \leq \operatorname{RLCT}_W(g;\varphi),$$

for any prior  $\varphi$ .

*Proof.* Observe that:

$$Z_f(n) = \int_W dw \, e^{-nf(w)} \ge \int_W dw \, e^{-cng(w)} = Z_g(cn),$$

so we have,

$$\begin{split} \lambda_f \log n - (\theta_f - 1) \log \log n &\leq \lambda_g \log(cn) - (\theta_g - 1) \log \log(cn) + O(1) \\ &= \lambda_g \log n - (\theta_g - 1) \log \log n + \lambda_g \log c \\ &- (\theta_g - 1) \log \left(1 + \frac{\log c}{\log n}\right) + O(1). \end{split}$$

The last two terms are O(1), so we have, for sufficiently large n:

$$\lambda_f \log n - (\theta_f - 1) \log \log n \le \lambda_g \log n - (\theta_g - 1) \log \log n.$$

**Corollary 4.** If there are positive constants c, d such that  $cg(w) \leq f(w) \leq dg(w)$ , then  $\operatorname{RLCT}_W(f;\varphi) = \operatorname{RLCT}_W(g;\varphi)$ . Such functions are called *comparable*.

**Corollary 5.** Let  $I = (f_1, \ldots, f_s)$  and  $J = (g_1, \ldots, g_r)$  be ideals (with a choice of generators) of  $\mathcal{A}_W$ . If  $I \subset J$ , then

$$\operatorname{RLCT}_W(f_1^2 + \dots + f_r^2; \varphi) \leq \operatorname{RLCT}_W(g_1^2 + \dots + g_r^2; \varphi).$$

*Proof.* Writing each  $f_i$  in terms of the  $g_j$ , we have:

$$f_i = \sum_{j=1}^r h_{ij} g_j,$$

for some  $h_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_W$ . By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality:

$$f_i^2 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^r h_{ij}g_j\right)^2 \le \left(\sum_{j=1}^r h_{ij}^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^r g_j^2\right).$$

and so,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} f_i^2 \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{r} h_{ij}^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} g_j^2\right).$$

As the  $h_{ij}$  are analytic (continuous) on the compact set W, there exists a constant c so that,

$$\sup_{w \in W} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{r} h_{ij}(w)^2 \right) = c$$

and we win.

The last corollary makes the next definition independent of the choice of (finitely many) generators for the ideal I.

**Definition 6.** Let  $I = (f_1, \ldots, f_r) \subset \mathcal{A}_W$  be an ideal. Then  $\operatorname{RLCT}_W(I; \varphi)$  is defined to be the RLCT associated to the function  $f_1^2 + \cdots + f_r^2$ , with the prior  $\varphi$ .

**Caution:** this differs (for convenience) by a factor of 2 from the definition in [Lin11]. As a result, there is a discrepancy between the RLCT of a (non-negative) function, and of the ideal it generates:

$$\operatorname{RLCT}_W(f;\varphi) = (\lambda,\theta),$$
  
$$\operatorname{RLCT}_W((f);\varphi) = (\lambda/2,\theta)$$

(Proof: examine the zeta functions.)

Our definition is useful by the following theorem (which is [Lin11, Proposition 4.4]. In particular, the hypotheses are satisfied when  $f(w) = D_{\text{KL}}(q \mid \mid p(-\mid w))$ , where  $p : W \to \Delta Z$ parametrises probability distributions over some finite set Z. In this case, the fibre ideal is generated by the difference between the component probabilities of p and the true distribution q.

**Theorem 7.** Let  $f: W \to \mathbb{R}$  be real analytic, and suppose that f factors through  $u: W \to U$ , where  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^M$  is compact and semi-analytic.



Let  $\hat{w} \in W$  be a point with  $f(\hat{w}) = 0$ , and set  $\hat{u} = u(\hat{w})$ . If the Hessian of g is positive definite at  $\hat{u}$ , then there is a semi-analytic neighbourhood  $W' \subset W$  of  $\hat{w}$  so that  $\operatorname{RLCT}_{W'}(f;\varphi) =$  $\operatorname{RLCT}_{W'}(I;\varphi)$ , where I is the *fibre ideal*, generated by the components of u:

$$I = (u_i - \hat{u}_i : i = 1, \dots, m).$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\hat{u} = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^M$ . By the Morse lemma, there is a linear change of coordinates  $T : \mathbb{R}^M \to \mathbb{R}^M$  so that  $h = g \circ T^{-1} : V \to \mathbb{R}$  has the form:

$$h(v) = (v_1^2 + \dots + v_m^2)(1 + \tilde{h}(v)),$$

where V = T(U) and  $\tilde{h}(0) = 0$ . Shrinking to  $V' \subset V$ , assume that  $\tilde{h}(V') \subset [-1/2, 1/2]$ . Letting  $\lambda, \mu$  be, respectively, the smallest and largest eigenvalues of  $T^tT$ , we therefore have:

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}(x_1^2 + \dots + x_m^2) \le g(u) \le \frac{3\mu}{2}(x_1^2 + \dots + x_m^2),$$

where the  $x_i$  are coordinates on  $U' = T^{-1}(V')$ . As such, on  $W' = u^{-1}(U')$ , f is comparable (in the sense of Corollary 4) to the function

$$u_1^2 + \dots + u_m^2$$

which calculates  $\operatorname{RLCT}_{W'}(I;\varphi)$ .

This is useful for two reasons. First, the functions  $u_i$  may well be simpler than the original f. For example, in the case of program synthesis on a Turing machine, they are polynomials (see thesis). Second, the ideal definition is more flexible. As well as the freedom to choose generators, it satisfies several other properties which simplify calculations: see here.

## References

[Lin11] S. Lin. Algebraic Methods for Evaluating Integrals in Bayesian Statistics. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2011.