

# Discrete versions of the transport equation and the Shepp–Olkin conjecture

Erwan Hillion      Oliver Johnson\*

March 15, 2013

## Abstract

We introduce a framework to consider transport problems for integer-valued random variables. We introduce weighting coefficients which allow us to characterise transport problems in a gradient flow setting, and form the basis of our introduction of a discrete version of the Benamou–Brenier formula. Further, we use these coefficients to state a new form of weighted log-concavity. These results are applied to prove the monotone case of the Shepp–Olkin entropy concavity conjecture.

MSC2000: primary; 60E15, secondary; 94A17, 60D99

Keywords: entropy, transportation of measures, Bernoulli sums, concavity

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been intensive study of relationships between entropy and a range of probabilistic inequalities. Since the work of Monge in the eighteenth century, it has been understood how one probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  can be transformed into another in a smooth fashion which minimises the cost in an appropriate sense. As described for example in [38, 39], the use of the quadratic cost function induces the quadratic Wasserstein distance  $W_2$ . Using relationships such as the Benamou–Brenier formula [6, 7], this distance can be understood in terms of velocity fields which arise in gradient models of the kind discussed in [2, 8, 21]. In such models, the concavity of entropy along the geodesic plays a central role, and led to proofs of inequalities such as HWI, log-Sobolev and transportation, as described for example in [9]. A key role is played by log-concavity of the underlying measures, and the Ricci curvature of the underlying metric space. For example Sturm, Lott and Villani [25, 35, 36] showed that concavity of the entropy functional along the geodesics is equivalent to Ricci curvature bounds on Riemannian manifolds.

---

\*The collaboration of Oliver Johnson and Erwan Hillion is supported by an EPSRC grant, *Information Geometry of Graphs*, reference EP/I009450/1.

However, this work has almost exclusively focused on continuous random variables, taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , or more generally on Riemannian manifolds satisfying a curvature condition. In this paper, we propose a framework for considering similar problems for integer-valued random variables. We show how many natural models of transportation of discrete random variables can be considered in the context of gradient models, and propose a version of the Benamou–Brenier formula which applies in this case. As an example of the insights gained by this approach, we give a proof of a significant new case of the Shepp–Olkin concavity conjecture [33], which has remained unresolved for over 30 years.

Shepp and Olkin considered sums of  $n$  independent Bernoulli variables (referred to throughout this article as Bernoulli sums), with parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  respectively, where  $p_i \in [0, 1]$ , and  $n$  remains fixed. This sum has a probability distribution  $(f_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$ , and Shepp and Olkin conjectured [33] that its entropy is a concave function of its parameters.

**Conjecture 1.1** ([33]). *Consider the entropy of  $(f_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$ , defined by*

$$H(p_1, \dots, p_n) := - \sum_{k=0}^n f_k \log(f_k),$$

where by convention  $0 \log(0) = 0$ . If  $p_1, \dots, p_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are affine functions, then the function

$$H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto H(p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t))$$

is concave in  $t$ .

We emphasise that Conjecture 1.1 refers to concavity of entropy in the parameter space. This should be contrasted with concavity in the space of mass functions themselves. For example, the result that the entropy of mixtures of mass functions  $f_k(\alpha) := (1 - \alpha)f_k^{(1)} + \alpha f_k^{(2)}$  is convex in  $\alpha$  is standard (see for example [11, Theorem 2.7.3]). Indeed duality between this parameter representation and the distribution space is exploited in the field of Information Geometry (see for example [1]), where the concavity of entropy also plays a central role.

Although the Shepp–Olkin Conjecture 1.1 remains open, we briefly describe the main cases which had previously been resolved. First, in Shepp and Olkin’s original paper [33], they showed that the entropy is a Schur-concave function, stated that the conjecture holds in the cases  $n = 2$  and  $n = 3$ , and proved it for interpolation between two binomials, when  $p_i(t)$  does not depend on  $i$ .

Second, in Theorem 2 of Yu and Johnson [42], the concavity of the entropy of  $H(T_t X + T_{1-t} Y)$  is proved, for  $X$  and  $Y$  satisfying the ultra log-concavity property (see Definition 3.11 below), where  $T_t$  represents Rényi’s thinning operation [31], see Equation (40) below. As remarked in [42, Corollary 1], this resolves the special case of Conjecture 1.1 where each parameter is either  $p_i(t) = p_i(0)(1 - t)$  or  $p_i(t) = p_i(1)t$  (that is,  $p_i(0)p_i(1) = 0$  for each  $i$ ). In this paper we restrict our attention to cases where measures satisfy a stochastic ordering property, so as in Proposition 1 of [42] we might wish to consider  $H(T_t X)$ .

Third, Theorem 1.1 of Hillion [16] resolves the case where for each  $i$ , either  $p_i(t) \equiv p_i(0)$  for all  $t$  or  $p_i(t) = t$  (the translation case of Example 3.10 below).

In this article, given a family of affine functions  $p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t)$ , we will consider the associated Bernoulli sum  $(f_k(t))_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$  as a function of the spatial variable  $k$  and the time variable  $t$ . We will often omit the explicit dependence of  $f_k$  on  $t$ . Throughout this article we will restrict our attention to the special case that  $p'_i \geq 0$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , so the random variables  $f_k(t)$  satisfy a stochastic ordering property. We will write the left derivative  $\nabla_1 f_k = f_k - f_{k-1}$ , and write  $\nabla_2 = (\nabla_1)^2$  for the map taking  $\nabla_2 f_k = f_k - 2f_{k-1} + f_{k-2}$ .

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we review properties of continuous gradient flow models, and develop a framework to prove concavity of entropy. We introduce and discuss the Benamou–Brenier formula, Equation (10).

In Section 3 we introduce a formalism to describe interpolation of discrete probability mass functions  $f_k$ , motivated by properties of the binomial mass functions. In Definition 3.2, we propose a discrete analogue of the Benamou–Brenier formula. A key role is played by our introduction of a family of functions  $\alpha_k(t)$  which are used to generate mixtures of  $f_k$  and  $f_{k+1}$ . We write  $\mathcal{A}$  for the set of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) = (\alpha_0(t), \alpha_1(t), \dots, \alpha_n(t))$ , where  $\alpha_0(t) \equiv 0$  and  $\alpha_n(t) \equiv 1$ , and  $0 \leq \alpha_k(t) \leq 1$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ .

Our formula of Benamou–Brenier type motivates the following definition:

**Definition 1.2.** *We say that a sequence of probability mass functions  $f_k(t)$  is a constant speed path, if for some  $v$  and for some sequence of probability mass functions  $g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t)$ , it satisfies a modified transport equation*

$$\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) = -v \nabla_1 \left( g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) \right) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where for some  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) = \alpha_{k+1}(t) f_{k+1}(t) + (1 - \alpha_k(t)) f_k(t) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (2)$$

If  $f_k(t)$  satisfies a modified transport equation, we write  $h$  for the function (not necessarily a probability mass function) satisfying a second-order modified transport equation

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial t^2}(t) = v^2 \nabla_2 (h_k), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

In Section 3.3 we discuss this property – in Lemma 3.4 we show that any such representation is unique, and we give some examples which lie within this framework. In Section 4, by examining the properties of the optimal coefficients  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}$ , we are able to give sufficient conditions for the concavity of entropy along the interpolation. To be specific, we introduce the following three conditions:

**Condition 1** (*k*-MON). *Given  $t$ , we say that the  $\alpha_k(t)$  are  $k$ -monotone at  $t$  if*

$$\alpha_k(t) \leq \alpha_{k+1}(t) \quad \text{for all } k = 0, \dots, n-1. \quad (4)$$

**Condition 2** (*t*-MON). Given  $t$ , we say that the  $\alpha_k(t)$  are *t*-monotone at  $t$  if

$$\frac{\partial \alpha_k}{\partial t}(t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } k = 0, \dots, n. \quad (5)$$

**Condition 3** (GLC). We say that probability mass function  $f_k$  supported on  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  is  $\alpha$ -generalized log-concave at  $t$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{GLC}(\alpha(t))$ , if

$$GLC(\alpha)_k(t) := \alpha_{k+1}(t)(1 - \alpha_{k+1}(t))f_{k+1}^2(t) - \alpha_{k+2}(t)(1 - \alpha_k(t))f_k(t)f_{k+2}(t) \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

for  $k = 0, \dots, n - 2$ .

In Section 4 we prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.** Consider a constant speed interpolation  $f_k(t)$  of probability mass functions and associated optimal  $\alpha(t)$ . If Conditions 1, 2 and 3 hold, then the entropy is concave. In fact, given  $t$ , if the  $\alpha_k(t)$  are  $k$ -monotone and  $t$ -monotone at  $t$  and  $f_k(t)$  is  $\mathbf{GLC}(\alpha(t))$  then the entropy  $H(f(t))$  is concave at  $t$ .

Theorem 1.3 gives a new perspective on Shepp and Olkin's proof [33] that the entropy of  $\text{Bin}(n, t)$  random variables is convex in  $t$ :

**Example 1.4.** In this case, Example 3.1 shows that the optimal  $\alpha_k(t) \equiv k/n$ , so that the  $k$ -monotone and  $t$ -monotone conditions, Conditions 1 and 2 are clear. Further, this choice of  $\alpha_k(t)$  means that the GLC Condition 3 reduces to the ultra log-concavity of order  $n$  of Pemantle [30] and Liggett [24] (see Definition 3.11), which clearly holds with equality in this case.

In fact, similar arguments work in new cases as well. For example, in the 'symmetric case' where  $p'_i$  does not depend on  $i$ , we find that  $\alpha_k(t) = k/n$  (see Remark 5.3 below), and so a similar argument applies.

Having set up this formalism, we then use it to consider the Shepp–Olkin theorem, in the 'monotone' setting  $p'_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$  mentioned previously. In Section 5, we show that in the monotone case, the Shepp–Olkin interpolation can be seen as a constant speed path in the sense of Definition 1.2. In Proposition 5.2 we show that the  $k$ -monotone Condition 1 is automatically satisfied in this case. Similarly Proposition 5.4 shows that GLC, Condition 3 also holds for all Shepp–Olkin interpolations in this context.

Unfortunately  $t$ -monotonicity, Condition 2, does not hold for all (monotone) Shepp–Olkin interpolations. However, Proposition 4.2 shows that we can replace Condition 2 by Condition 4, which is less restrictive, although less transparent in nature.

We prove the monotone Shepp–Olkin conjecture by showing that Condition 4 is satisfied in this case. The proof uses properties of Bernoulli sum mass functions, including a 'cubic' inequality Theorem A.2. In Section 6, we therefore prove the main result of this paper:

**Theorem 1.5** (Monotone Shepp–Olkin). Consider the entropy of  $(f_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$ , defined by

$$H(p_1, \dots, p_n) := - \sum_{k=0}^n f_k \log(f_k).$$

If  $p_1, \dots, p_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  are affine functions with  $p'_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$ , then the function

$$H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto H(p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t))$$

is concave in  $t$ .

## 2 Geodesics for continuous random variables

### 2.1 General framework for concavity of entropy

Section 2 is devoted to the study of the entropy for several families of random variables on  $\mathbb{R}$ . For each of the standard examples we study, the concavity of entropy is a consequence of the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(f_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  be a smooth family of probability positive densities on  $\mathbb{R}$ . We consider the families of functions  $(g_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  and  $(h_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  such that for each  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $g_t$  and  $h_t$  vanish at  $x = -\infty, +\infty$  and satisfy the differential equations (stated in a form which motivates Equations (1) and (3)):*

$$\frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial g_t(x)}{\partial x}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} = \frac{\partial^2 h_t(x)}{\partial x^2}. \quad (7)$$

Then the entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$ , defined by

$$H(t) := - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \log(f_t(x)) dx$$

satisfies

$$H''(t) \leq - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( h_t(x) - \frac{g_t(x)^2}{f_t(x)} \right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (\log(f_t(x))) dx.$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} H''(t) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} \log(f_t(x)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{f_t(x)} \left( \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} \right)^2 dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\partial^2 h_t(x)}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{f_t(x)} \left( \frac{\partial g_t(x)}{\partial x} \right)^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

After several integrations by parts, we find

$$\begin{aligned} H''(t) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( h_t(x) - \frac{g_t(x)^2}{f_t(x)} \right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (\log(f_t(x))) dx \\ &\quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{g_t(x)}{f_t(x)} \right) \right)^2 f_t(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The second integral being non-negative, the theorem is proven.  $\square$

In some sense, an extreme example for which we can apply Theorem 2.1 is the following:

**Example 2.2.** Consider the translation of some probability density  $f_0$ , where we have

$$f_t(x) := f_0(x - vt)$$

for some constant velocity  $v > 0$ . It is then easy to see that  $g_t(x) = vf_t(x)$  and  $h_t(x) = v^2 f_t(x)$ . Theorem 2.1 then confirms the fact that shift invariance of the entropy on translation makes the entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$  constant, and hence a concave function of  $t$ .

## 2.2 Benamou–Brenier formula

The study of geodesics interpolating between continuous probability densities exploits properties of the quadratic Wasserstein distance  $W_2$ . In particular, recall from [6, 7] that  $W_2$  has a variational characterisation involving velocity fields, given by the Benamou–Brenier formula (10) below.

Consider fixed smooth distribution functions  $F_0$  and  $F_1$ . Write  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  for the set of probability densities  $f_t(x)$ , with corresponding distribution functions  $F_t(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x f_t(y) dy$  satisfying constraints  $F_t(x)|_{t=0} = F_0(x)$  and  $F_t(x)|_{t=1} = F_1(x)$ . Then given any sequence  $f_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ , we can define the velocity field  $v_t$  by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f_t(x) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (v_t(x) f_t(x)) = 0, \quad (8)$$

or equivalently by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} F_t(x) + (v_t(x) f_t(x)) = 0, \quad (9)$$

Benamou and Brenier prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.3** ([6, 7]). *Using the notation above, the quadratic Wasserstein distance is given by*

$$W_2^2(F_0, F_1) = \inf_{f_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})} \int_0^1 \left( \int f_t(y) v_t(y)^2 dy \right) dt. \quad (10)$$

In analogy with Example 2.2, we can show that the entropy is concave along any Benamou–Brenier geodesic (the path achieving the infimum in Equation (10)). A change of variables  $x = F_t(y)$  in Equation (10) makes the inner integrand

$$\left( \int f_t(y) v_t(y)^2 dy \right) = \left( \int v_t(F_t^{-1}(x))^2 dx \right).$$

Combining Equations (2.1) and (2.4) of [7], we see that the geodesic has a velocity field  $v_t(F_t^{-1}(x))$  which is constant in time, in the sense that  $v_t(F_t^{-1}(x)) = (\Phi'(x) - x)$  for all  $t$  for a certain function  $\Phi$ . Using the fact that the total derivative of  $v_t(F_t^{-1}(x))$  with respect to  $t$  is 0 leads to the formula:

$$\frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial x} v_t(x). \quad (11)$$

Taking a further time derivative of (8), and using (11), we deduce a second-order PDE for  $f_t(x)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial t^2} &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial v_t}{\partial t}(x) f_t(x) + v_t(x) \frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(x) \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial x} v_t(x) f_t(x) + v_t(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (v_t(x) f_t(x)) \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (v_t(x)^2 f_t(x)). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

(assuming the  $t$  and  $x$  derivatives can be exchanged).

In the notation of Theorem 2.1, we can rewrite equations (8) and (12) in the form  $g_t(x) = v_t(x) f_t(x)$  and  $h_t(x) = v_t(x)^2 f_t(x)$ . This makes a clear analogy with the translation case, Example 2.2. By a straightforward application of Theorem 2.1, we deduce that the entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$  is a concave function of  $t$ , which is equivalent, up to the regularity of  $f$ , to say that  $\text{Ric}(\mathbb{R}) \geq 0$  in the sense of Sturm-Lott-Villani [25, 35, 36].

In Section 3 we describe how a similar formula can be established in the discrete case.

### 2.3 Diffusions on $\mathbb{R}$

Let  $(f_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be a smooth curve in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  satisfying the diffusion equation

$$\frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial x^2}. \tag{13}$$

In this case, the families of functions  $(g_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  and  $(h_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  defined by Equation (7) can be simply written

$$g_t(x) = -\frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial x}, \quad h_t(x) = \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial x^2}$$

and Theorem 2.1 implies:

**Theorem 2.4.** *The entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$  satisfies*

$$H''(t) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 dx \leq 0. \tag{14}$$

Another proof of Theorem 2.4 was given by Villani [37] who used it to prove, by a simple application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, that  $H''(t) \leq -H'(t)^2$ . From this he deduced Costa's restricted form of Shannon's entropy power inequality (see [10]), which implies the Gaussian logarithmic Sobolev inequality of Gross [15].

**Example 2.5.** *In the information-theoretic community, one particular case of interest related to this kind of diffusion is interpolation between continuous  $X$  with variance  $\sigma^2$  and*

$Z$ , a Gaussian with the same variance and density  $\phi_\sigma^2$ . We can write  $f_t$  for the density of  $\sqrt{1-t}X + \sqrt{t}Z$ , and observe that

$$\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial t}(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(1-t)} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( f_t(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log \left( \frac{f_t(x)}{\phi_\sigma^2(x)} \right) \right). \quad (15)$$

In the notation above, this means that  $g_t(x) = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2(1-t)} (f_t(x)(\rho_t(x) + x/\sigma^2))$ , where  $\rho_t(x)$  is the score function with respect to location parameter.

This particular interpolation is the basis of the de Bruijn identity, first stated by Stam [34], and given in the following reparameterised form by Barron [5, Lemma 1]. The de Bruijn identity shows that the derivative with respect to  $t$  of relative entropy of  $f_t$  is a multiple of the standardized Fisher information:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} D(f_t \| \phi_\sigma^2) &= \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \left( \sigma^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \rho_t(x) + \frac{x}{\sigma^2} \right)^2 dx \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(1-t)} \left( \sigma^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \rho_t(x)^2 dx - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This result was used in Stam's proof [34] of Gross's log-Sobolev inequality [15], and forms the basis of Barron's information-theoretic proof of the Central Limit Theorem [5].

Another example for which similar calculations lead to interesting results about the concavity of entropy is the case of Schrödinger bridges, which have been recently studied by Léonard in [23] in the setting of Markov chains as a generalization of Wasserstein geodesics.

**Example 2.6.** In the case of a simple diffusion on  $\mathbb{R}$ , we consider a smooth family of positive densities  $(f_t(x))_{t \in [0,1]}$  and we suppose that

$$f_t(x) = u_t(x)v_t(x), \quad \frac{\partial u_t(x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u_t(x)}{\partial x^2}, \quad \frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial^2 v_t(x)}{\partial x^2}. \quad (16)$$

It is then easy to compute that in this case, using the notation of Theorem 2.1,

$$g_t(x) = u_t(x) \frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial u_t(x)}{\partial x} v_t(x), \quad (17)$$

$$h_t(x) = u_t(x) \frac{\partial^2 v_t(x)}{\partial x^2} - 2 \frac{\partial u_t(x)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial v_t(x)}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial^2 u_t(x)}{\partial x^2} v_t(x). \quad (18)$$

Using these expressions we can show that

$$f_t(x)h_t(x) - g_t(x)^2 = f_t(x) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)), \quad (19)$$

from which direct substitution in Theorem 2.1 shows that the entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$  is a concave function of  $t$ .



## 2.4 A Gaussian approximation to the Shepp–Olkin conjecture

Sums of independent Bernoulli variables are often approximated by Gaussian distributions of same mean value and variance. We will thus consider in this section the family of probability densities

$$f(x; p_1, \dots, p_n) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(1-p_i)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i)^2}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(1-p_i)}\right), \quad (20)$$

where  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  are  $n$  parameters in  $[0, 1]$ . This continuous approximation motivates the Shepp–Olkin conjecture, due to the following result:

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $p_1, \dots, p_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be affine functions and*

$$f_t(x) := f(x; p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t)).$$

*Then the entropy  $H(t)$  of  $f_t$  is a concave function of  $t$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mu(t) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(t)$  and  $V(t) := \sum_{i=1}^n p_i(t)(1-p_i(t))$  be the mean and variance functions. Since  $\mu''(t) = 0$ , we can use differential properties satisfied by Gaussian kernels to compute

$$\begin{aligned} g_t(x) &= -\frac{V'(t)}{2} \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial x} + \mu'(t) f_t(x) \\ h_t(x) &= V''(t) f_t(x) + \mu'(t) f_t(x) - \mu'(t) V'(t) \frac{\partial f_t(x)}{\partial x} + \frac{V'(t)^2}{4} \frac{\partial^2 f_t(x)}{\partial x^2} \end{aligned}$$

In this case, the key term in Theorem 2.1 simplifies to give

$$h_t(x) - \frac{g_t(x)^2}{f_t(x)} = \frac{V''(t)}{2} f_t(x) + \frac{V'(t)^2}{4} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right).$$

Substituting in Theorem 2.1 we obtain that  $H''(t)$  can be expressed in terms of two perfect squares, since  $H''(t)$  is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{V''(t)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right) dx - \frac{V'(t)^2}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 dx \\ &= \frac{V''(t)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 dx - \frac{V'(t)^2}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 dx. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Since  $V''(t) \leq 0$ , the result follows. Indeed, it is clear that for any Gaussian model of this kind where  $V''(t) \leq 0$ , a similar argument will apply.

In the case where  $v = \mu'(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i'(t) > 0$ , we can restate this argument in a way that motivates the proof of Theorem 1.3. If we write

$$\alpha(t) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i'(2p_i - 1)}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i'} = -\frac{V'(t)}{2v}, \quad (22)$$

in particular we have

$$\frac{\partial \alpha(t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\sum p_i'^2}{\sum p_i'} = -\frac{V''(t)}{2v} > 0. \quad (23)$$

We can rewrite Equation (21) in the form

$$H''(t) \leq -v^2 \left( \frac{1}{v} \frac{\partial \alpha(t)}{\partial t} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 + \alpha(t)^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_t(x) \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \log(f_t(x)) \right)^2 dx \right)$$

which is strongly reminiscent of the form obtained in the discrete case in Equation (66) below.  $\square$

### 3 Discrete gradient field models

#### 3.1 Motivating example and discrete Benamou–Brenier formula

We now show how natural choices of paths connecting probability mass functions on the integers can be viewed in the gradient field framework described previously. We give a new perspective on the time derivative using a series of functions  $\alpha_k(t)$ , where  $k = 0, \dots, n$  and  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . Recall that we use the left derivative map  $\nabla_1$  defined by  $\nabla_1 f_k = f_k - f_{k-1}$  for any function  $f$ , and write  $\nabla_2 = (\nabla_1)^2$  for the map taking  $\nabla_2 f_k = f_k - 2f_{k-1} + f_{k-2}$ . Write  $\nabla_1^*$ , defined by  $\nabla_1^* f_k = f_k - f_{k+1}$ , for its adjoint (with respect to counting measure).

We first give a motivating example, which is a special case of the Shepp–Olkin interpolation. We write  $\text{Bin}_k(n, p) := \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$  for the probability mass function of a binomial with parameters  $n$  and  $p$ .

**Example 3.1.** *Consider interpolating between two binomial random variables. For fixed  $n$  and  $0 \leq p < q \leq 1$ , define  $p(t) = p(1-t) + qt$ , and write  $f_k(t) = \text{Bin}_k(n, p(t))$  for the probability mass functions which interpolate in the natural way in the parameter space. A simple calculation (see for example [27] and [33]) shows that for any  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) &= n(q-p) (\text{Bin}_{k-1}(n-1, p(t)) - \text{Bin}_k(n-1, p(t))) \\ &= -\nabla_1(n(q-p)\text{Bin}_k(n-1, p(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Although Equation (24) expresses the time derivative of  $f(t)$  as the spatial gradient of another function, we prefer to reformulate it using an insight of Yu [40], who defined an operation which he referred to as hypergeometric thinning. Lemma 2 of [40] observes that for any  $n, p$ :

$$\text{Bin}_k(n-1, p) = \frac{(k+1)}{n} \text{Bin}_{k+1}(n, p) + \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) \text{Bin}_k(n, p). \quad (25)$$

This suggests that we rewrite Equation (24) in the form, modelled on (8),

$$0 = \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) + \nabla_1 \left( (n(q-p)) g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) \right) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n, \quad (26)$$

$$\text{for } g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) = \alpha_{k+1}(t) f_{k+1}(t) + (1 - \alpha_k(t)) f_k(t) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (27)$$

with  $\alpha_k(t) = k/n$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ .

The form of Equations (26) and (27) suggests a version of the Benamou–Brenier formula [6, 7] for discrete random variables.

**Definition 3.2.** Write  $\mathcal{A}$  for the collection of functions  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}(t) = (\alpha_0(t), \alpha_1(t), \dots, \alpha_n(t))$ , where  $\alpha_0(t) \equiv 0$  and  $\alpha_n(t) \equiv 1$ , and  $0 \leq \alpha_k(t) \leq 1$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ . Given  $\alpha_k(t) \in \mathcal{A}$ , for a sequence of mass functions  $f_k(t)$ , define probability mass function  $g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t)$  and velocity field  $v_{\alpha,k}(t)$  by

$$g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) = \alpha_{k+1}(t)f_{k+1}(t) + (1 - \alpha_k(t))f_k(t) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, \quad (28)$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) + \nabla_1 \left( v_{\alpha,k}(t) g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) \right). \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n. \quad (29)$$

Given  $f_k(0)$  and  $f_k(1)$ , we write  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$  for the set of sequences of probability mass functions  $f_k$  satisfying the end constraints  $f_k(t)|_{t=0} = f_k(0)$  and  $f_k(t)|_{t=1} = f_k(1)$ , then define distance  $V_n$  via

$$V_n^2(f(0), f(1)) = \inf_{f_k \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \alpha_k(t) \in \mathcal{A}} \int_0^1 \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g_k^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) v_{\alpha,k}(t)^2 \right) dt. \quad (30)$$

Note that if we transpose the geodesic  $f(t)$  in time and space  $\tilde{f}_x(t) = f_{n-x}(1-t)$ , a simple symmetry argument gives that taking  $\tilde{\alpha}_x(t) = 1 - \alpha_{n-x}(1-t)$  gives  $\tilde{g}_x^{(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})}(t) = g_{n-x-1}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(1-t)$ , and  $V_n^2(f(0), f(1)) = V_n^2(f(1), f(0))$ .

## 3.2 Constant speed paths

In the continuous Benamou–Brenier formula (10), as mentioned above, the infimum is obtained when the velocity field is constant with respect to time, using arguments based on Cauchy–Schwarz. A similar argument applies here.

**Lemma 3.3.** For any geodesic  $f(t)$  interpolating between  $f(0)$  and  $f(1)$ , with means  $\lambda(t) = \sum_k k f_k(t)$  the

$$V_n(f(0), f(1)) \geq |\lambda(0) - \lambda(1)|,$$

with equality if and only if  $v_{\alpha,k} = v$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ .

*Proof.* We work with the distribution function  $F_l(t) := \sum_{k=0}^l f_k(t)$ . In this notation, in analogy with Equation (9) we can rewrite Equation (29) as

$$\frac{\partial F_l}{\partial t}(t) + g_l^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) v_{\alpha,l}(t) = 0. \quad (31)$$

Since  $\lambda(t) = \sum_{k=0}^n (1 - F_k(t))$ , summing Equation (31) over  $l$  gives that

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t) = \sum_{l=0}^n g_l^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}(t) v_{\alpha,l}(t). \quad (32)$$

Using Equation (29) and Cauchy-Schwarz, we know that for any  $t$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \sum_{k=0}^n g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) v_{\alpha,k}(t)^2 \right) &= \left( \sum_{k=0}^n g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) v_{\alpha,k}(t)^2 \right) \left( \sum_{k=0}^n g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) \right) \\
&\geq \left( \sum_{k=0}^n g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) v_{\alpha,k}(t) \right)^2 \\
&= \left( \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t) \right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Observe that equality holds in Equation (33) if and only if  $v_{\alpha,k}(t) = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t)$  for all  $k$ . Substituting this in Equation (30), if  $f_k(t)$  obtains equality in Equation (30) then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
V_n^2(f(0), f(1)) &= \int_0^1 \left( \sum_{k=0}^n g_k^{(\alpha)}(t) v_{\alpha,k}(t)^2 \right) dt \\
&\geq \left( \int_0^1 \left( \frac{\partial \lambda(t)}{\partial t} \right)^2 dt \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \left( \int_0^1 \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t) dt \right)^2 \\
&= (\lambda(1) - \lambda(0))^2
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

again using Cauchy-Schwarz. Note that from above equality holds in Equation (34) if and only if  $v_{\alpha,k}(t) = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t)$  for all  $k$  and equality holds in Equation (35) if  $\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial t}(t) = (\lambda(1) - \lambda(0))$  for all  $t$ .  $\square$

Lemma 3.3 focuses attention on interpolations for which there exist  $\alpha(t) \in \mathcal{A}$  giving rise to a  $v$  such that the velocity field  $v_k(t) \equiv v$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ . Recall from Definition 1.2 that we refer to such an interpolation as a ‘constant speed path’ with speed  $v$ , and say that  $f(t)$  satisfies a modified transport equation.

**Lemma 3.4.** *If a geodesic  $f_k(t)$  can be expressed as a constant speed path for some choice of  $v$  and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ , then this representation is unique (there is no other choice of  $v$  and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  for which it is a constant speed path).*

*Proof.* Equation (32) shows that if there exists a constant speed path with speed  $v$ , then  $v = \lambda(1) - \lambda(0)$ .

Using a similar argument, we can always be explicit about the optimal value of  $\alpha$ . The key is to observe that for any choice of  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha_n = 1$ , the sum

$$\sum_{l=k}^{n-1} g_l^{(\alpha)}(t) = \sum_{l=k}^n f_l(t) - \alpha_k(t) f_k(t). \tag{36}$$

Hence, if there exists a constant speed geodesic, then taking  $v_{\alpha,l}(t) \equiv v$  in Equation (31), and taking a partial sum over  $l$ , we obtain

$$0 = \sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \frac{\partial F_l}{\partial t}(t) + v \sum_{l=k}^{n-1} g_l^{(\alpha)}(t) = \sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \frac{\partial F_l}{\partial t}(t) + v \left( \sum_{l=k}^n f_l(t) - \alpha_k(t) f_k(t) \right),$$

so we deduce that if  $f_k(t)$  is a constant speed path with speed  $v$ , then the corresponding  $\alpha$  are given by

$$\alpha_k(t) = \frac{\sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \frac{\partial F_l}{\partial t}(t) + v \sum_{l=k}^n f_l(t)}{v f_k(t)}. \quad (37)$$

An alternative expression is given in terms of  $f_k(t)$  and  $g_k^{(\alpha)}(t)$ , on rearranging Equation 36 to express

$$\alpha_k(t) = \frac{\sum_{l=k}^n f_l(t) - \sum_{l=k}^{n-1} g_l^{(\alpha)}(t)}{f_k(t)}. \quad (38)$$

□

We now show that in certain circumstances our distance measure  $V_n$  coincides with the Wasserstein distance  $W_1$ , a metric which is known to have a natural relationship to discrete interpolations as described in Section 3.3 below.

**Lemma 3.5.** *If there exists a constant speed path between  $f(0)$  and  $f(1)$  with speed  $v$  then the Wasserstein distance  $W_1(F(0), F(1))$  and  $V_n(f(0), f(1))$  coincide, and are equal to  $\lambda(1) - \lambda(0)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall from the proof of Lemma 3.4 that if there exists a constant speed path with speed  $v$ , then  $v = \lambda(1) - \lambda(0)$ . In this case,  $V_n = v = \lambda(1) - \lambda(0)$ .

Without loss of generality we may assume that  $v \geq 0$ . Using Equation (31), this means that  $F_k(t)$  is decreasing in  $t$  for all  $t$  and  $k$ . This means that  $F(0)$  stochastically dominates  $F(1)$  in the standard sense (see for example [32]). Writing  $F^{-1}(s; t) = \inf\{x : F_x(t) \geq s\}$ , this means that  $F^{-1}(s; 0) \leq F^{-1}(s; 1)$  for all  $s$ , then

$$W_1(F(0), F(1)) = \int F^{-1}(s; 1) ds - \int F^{-1}(s; 0) ds = \int y dF_1(y) - \int y dF_0(y) = \lambda(1) - \lambda(0),$$

and the argument is complete. □

### 3.3 Binomial interpolation

**Example 3.6.** *An interesting example comes from the natural binomial interpolation considered in Example 3.1. By comparing Equations (26) and (29) we see that, taking  $\alpha_k(t) \equiv k/n$ , this interpolation has constant speed  $v_{\alpha,k}(t) \equiv n(q - p)$  in this sense. This means that this interpolation achieves the lower bound in Lemma 3.3, and that  $V_n(\text{Bin}(n, p), \text{Bin}(n, q)) = n(q - p)$  in this sense, as we would hope.*

**Remark 3.7.**

1. We contrast Example 3.6 with the approach given by Maas [26] and by Erbar and Maas [13] (see also Mielke [28]). Specializing their technique, based on Markov chains with a given stationary distribution, to the case of random variables on the two-point space, we obtain the following. Taking as a reference the stationary distribution  $(\pi_0, \pi_1) = (q/(p+q), p/(p+q))$ , [26] writes  $\rho^\beta$  for a relative density equivalent to the probability mass function  $f^\beta = (f_0^\beta, f_1^\beta) = ((1-\beta)/2, (1+\beta)/2)$ . Example 2.6 of [26] implies a distance of

$$\mathcal{W}(\rho^\alpha, \rho^\beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2p}} \int_\alpha^\beta \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{arctanh} r}{r}} dr,$$

in this case, in contrast to the  $|\beta - \alpha|/2$  we obtain.

2. Based on Equation (10), which implies the squared length of a (continuous) geodesic is

$$\int_0^1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\partial F_t}{\partial t}(x) \right)^2 \frac{1}{f_t(x)} dx dt,$$

one might imagine that a more natural definition than Equation (30) for random variables supported on  $\{0, \dots, n\}$  would be

$$\int_0^1 \sum_{x=0}^n \left( \frac{\partial F_t}{\partial t}(x) \right)^2 \frac{1}{f_t(x)} dt. \tag{39}$$

However, this has the disadvantage that  $\frac{\partial F_t}{\partial t}(n)$  is always equal to zero, whereas  $f_t(n)$  need not be. For example, in the two-point case described above, suppose we interpolate between  $f(0) = (1-p, p)$  and  $f(1) = (1-q, q)$ , with  $p \leq q$ . Writing  $\theta(t)$  for a function with  $\theta(0) = 1-p$  and  $\theta(1) = 1-q$ , taking  $f_0(t) = \theta(t)$  and  $f_1(t) = 1-\theta(t)$ , Equation (39) gives the length of the path as  $\int_0^1 \theta'(t)^2 / \theta(t) dt$ . Standard results in calculus of variations show that the optimal  $\theta^*(t) = (t\sqrt{1-q} + (1-t)\sqrt{1-p})^2$ , with squared length  $4(\sqrt{1-q} - \sqrt{1-p})^2$ . We believe that such a value and optimal path are not as intuitive as the ones resulting from Definition 3.2.

Example 3.6 can be generalized considerably as follows. Recall the operation of thinning of a probability measure, introduced by Rényi [31]. That is, given a probability mass function  $f_k$ , we can describe the thinned probability mass function

$$T_t f_l = \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} f_k \operatorname{Bin}(k, l) t^l (1-t)^{k-l} = \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} f_k \operatorname{Bin}_l(k, t). \tag{40}$$

We can think of this as an interpolation between the original measure  $f = T_1 f$  and a point mass at zero  $T_0 f$ . This operation was introduced in the context of entropy of random variables in [19], and was extended by Gozlan et al. [14] and by Hillion [17].

**Definition 3.8.** A coupling  $\pi$  of mass functions  $f(0)$  and  $f(1)$  (that is, a joint distribution function  $\pi_{x,y}$  whose marginals satisfy  $f(0)_x = \sum_y \pi_{x,y}$  and  $f(1)_y = \sum_x \pi_{x,y}$ ), induces a geodesic as follows. Consider  $f(0)$  and  $f(1)$  supported on  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then Section 2.2 of [14] defines a mass function

$$f_k(t) = v_k^\pi(t) := \sum_{x,y} \pi_{x,y} \text{Bin}_{k-x}(|y-x|, t). \quad (41)$$

Proposition 2.7 of [14] gives a partial differential equation showing how this mass function evolves with  $t$ , using a mixture of left and right gradients in a form introduced in [18]. Proposition 2.5 of [14] shows that if  $\pi^*$  is an optimal coupling (in the sense of Wasserstein distance  $W_1$ ) then  $v^{\pi^*}(t)$  defines a (constant speed) geodesic between  $f(0)$  and  $f(1)$ . We relate this to the discrete Benamou–Brenier framework above, where recall that Lemma 3.5 showed that the Wasserstein distance  $W_1$  is a natural one in the ‘stochastically ordered’ context.

**Lemma 3.9.** The interpolation of Equation (41) can be understood as a constant speed path, in the case where  $x \leq y$  for all  $(x, y)$  in the support of  $\pi$ . Define  $v = \sum_{x,y} \pi_{x,y}(y-x)$ , and  $\tilde{\pi}_{x,y} = \pi_{x,y}(y-x)/v$  for another ‘distance-biased’ joint distribution function. Then we can verify that

$$\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) + \nabla_1(vg_k(t)) = 0,$$

where  $g_k(t) = \sum_{x,y} \tilde{\pi}_{x,y} \text{Bin}_{k-x}(y-x-1, t)$ . This gives an expression for  $\alpha_k$ :

$$\alpha_k(t) = \frac{\sum_{x,y} \pi_{x,y} [t \text{Bin}_{k-x-1}(y-x, t) + \sum_{l=k}^{n-1} \text{Bin}_{l-x}(y-x-1, t) (1 - \frac{y-x}{v})]}{f_k(t)}. \quad (42)$$

*Proof.* Since for any  $x$ , the convolution  $(1-t)\text{Bin}_x(m-1, t) + t\text{Bin}_{x-1}(m-1, t) = \text{Bin}_x(m, t)$ , in Equation (41) we can express

$$f_l(t) = \sum_{x,y} \pi_{x,y} ((1-t)\text{Bin}_{l-x}(y-x-1, t) + t\text{Bin}_{l-x-1}(y-x-1, t)),$$

and substituting in Equation (38) we obtain the result.  $\square$

In general, the coefficients  $\alpha_k$  defined in Equation (42) need not lie between 0 and 1, though we mention one interesting case where they do. Theorem 1.1 of Hillion [16] considers a special case of the interpolation of Definition 3.8, that is where  $f(1)$  is an integer translation of  $f(0)$ , and showed that if  $f$  is log-concave, the entropy is a concave function of  $t$ .

**Example 3.10** (Translation case). If  $f(1)_{k+m} = f(0)_k$  for some  $m$ , then we can interpolate by  $\pi_{x,y}$  supported only on  $\{(x, y) : y-x = m\}$ , so that  $\tilde{\pi} = \pi$ , and clearly  $v = m$ .

Substituting in (42), this leaves

$$f_k(t) = \sum_l f(0)_l \text{Bin}_{k-l}(m, t) \quad (43)$$

$$g_k(t) = \sum_l f(0)_l \text{Bin}_{k-l}(m-1, t) \quad (44)$$

$$\alpha_k(t) = \frac{tg_{k-1}(t)}{f_k(t)} = 1 - \frac{(1-t)g_k(t)}{f_k(t)} \quad (45)$$

so that clearly  $\alpha_k(t)$  lies between 0 and 1 for all  $k$  and  $t$ .

The results of this paper generalize Hillion's result, in the sense that the form of Equation (45) shows that GLC, Condition 3, holds with equality in this case. Further, Equations (43) and (44) show that  $f_k(t) = (1-t)g_k(t) + tg_{k-1}(t)$ . This means that the  $k$ -monotonicity Condition 1 holds as a consequence of log-concavity of  $g_k(t)$  (which follows from log-concavity of  $f$ ). The  $t$ -monotonicity, Condition 2 is less straightforward, but can be verified using direct calculation, using the log-concavity of  $h$ . Since the conditions of Theorem 1.3 are verified in this case, the concavity of entropy is reproved.

The question of which interpolations in the form of Definition 3.8 induce coefficients  $0 \leq \alpha_k(t) \leq 1$  is an interesting one, which we hope to consider further in future work.

### 3.4 Generalized log-concavity

In the context of continuous densities, results such as logarithmic Sobolev inequalities can be viewed in the context of the Bakry-Émery condition [4] (see also for example [9, 3] for more details). The Bakry-Émery condition is known to hold if the relative density  $f/\phi_{1/c}$  is log-concave (in the continuous sense), where  $\phi$  is a normal density. Indeed, Cordero-Erausquin [9, Corollary 1] uses arguments based on mass transportation to give a direct proof of a log-Sobolev inequality when  $f/\phi_{1/c}$  is log-concave.

In the study of properties of entropy of integer-valued random variables, a key role is played by the corresponding property of ultra log-concavity, introduced by Pemantle [30] and brought to prominence by work of Liggett [24], who made the following definition:

**Definition 3.11.** *For any  $n$ , a probability mass function supported on  $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  is ultra log-concave of order  $n$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{ULC}(n)$ , if the ratio  $f_k/\text{Bin}_k(n, t)$  is a log-concave function. Equivalently we require that*

$$\frac{k+1}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k+1}{n}\right) f_{k+1}^2 - \frac{k+2}{n} \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) f_k f_{k+2} \geq 0 \quad \text{for } k = 0, \dots, n-2. \quad (46)$$

We include the possibility that (formally speaking)  $n = \infty$ , in which case we require that the ratio of  $f_k$  and a Poisson mass function be log-concave, and write  $\mathbf{ULC}(\infty)$ .

These definitions were first applied in the context of controlling the entropy of random variables in the work of Johnson [19], who showed that, fixing the mean, the entropy is



maximised in the class  $\mathbf{ULC}(\infty)$  by the Poisson mass function. A corresponding result was proved by Yu [41], who showed that, fixing the mean, the binomial is maximum entropy in the class  $\mathbf{ULC}(n)$ . In particular, it is well-known that by Newton's inequalities (see for example Niculescu [29]) that the sums of independent Bernoulli random variables are  $\mathbf{ULC}(n)$ . This means that Yu's work generalizes the result (see [27] and [33]) that the entropy of Bernoulli sums with a given mean is maximised by the binomial.

Our generalized log-concavity Condition 3 generalizes Definition 3.11. Clearly, comparing Equations (46) and (6), we see that  $\mathbf{ULC}(n)$  corresponds to  $\mathbf{GLC}(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha_k = k/n$ , as in Example 3.1. As remarked previously, the choice of  $\alpha_k(t)$  made in the translation case Example 3.10 ensures that  $GLC(\alpha)_k \equiv 0$  (i.e.  $\mathbf{GLC}(\alpha)$  holds with equality in this case).

Note that  $\mathbf{GLC}$ , Condition 3, and  $k$ -monotonicity, Condition 1, together imply that  $f$  is log-concave.

## 4 Framework for concavity of discrete entropy

Recall that in Section 2, the Benamou–Brenier formula led to proofs of concavity of entropy, using the property that  $g_t(x)^2 = f_t(x)h_t(x)$ . In this section, we give a proof of our entropy concavity result, Theorem 1.3. In fact, we prove the following more general result:

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider a constant speed interpolation  $f_k(t)$  of probability mass functions and associated optimal  $\alpha(t)$  and  $g_k^{(\alpha)}(t)$ , satisfying a modified transport equation (1)  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) = -v\nabla_1(g_k^{(\alpha)}(t))$ . If there exists  $\tilde{h}_k$  such that for all  $k = 0, \dots, n-2$ :*

$$\left(g_k^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k \geq 0, \quad (47)$$

$$\left(g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2} \geq 0, \quad (48)$$

$$\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k^{(\alpha)} g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)} \geq 0, \quad (49)$$

$$\left(\left(g_k^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k\right) \left(\left(g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}\right) - \left(\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k^{(\alpha)} g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 \geq 0, \quad (50)$$

$$\tilde{h}_k \geq h_k, \quad (51)$$

where  $h$  satisfies  $\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial t^2}(t) = v^2 \nabla_2(h_k)$  (as in Equation (3)), then  $H''(t) \leq 0$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we write  $g_k$  for  $g_k^{(\alpha)}$ . First note that Equations (47), (48) and (49) together imply that  $f$  is log-concave.

In a standard fashion, we can write the second derivative of entropy as

$$\begin{aligned} H''(t) &= - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial t^2}(t) \log(f_k(t)) - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{f_k} \left( \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) \right)^2 \\ &= - \sum_{k=0}^n v^2 \nabla_2(h_k) \log(f_k(t)) - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(\nabla_1(vg_k))^2}{f_k} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$= - \sum_{k=0}^n v^2 (h_k) \log \left( \frac{f_k(t) f_{k+2}(t)}{f_{k+1}(t)^2} \right) - \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(\nabla_1(vg_k))^2}{f_k} \quad (53)$$

$$\leq -v^2 \left[ \sum_{k=0}^n \tilde{h}_k \log \left( \frac{f_k(t) f_{k+2}(t)}{f_{k+1}(t)^2} \right) + \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(\nabla_1(g_k))^2}{f_k} \right] \quad (54)$$

where Equation (52) follows using Equations (3) and (69) respectively, and Equation (53) uses the adjoint of  $\nabla_2$ . Finally Equation (54) follows from Equation (51) and the log-concavity of  $f$ .

We will write  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  for the first and second sums in the square bracket of Equation (54), noting that the theorem will follow if  $S_1 + S_2 \geq 0$ . Using the convention  $\frac{0}{0} = 0$ , the sum  $S_2$  can be transformed in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} - 2 \frac{g_k g_{k-1}}{f_k} + \frac{g_{k-1}^2}{f_k} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} - 2 \frac{g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} + \frac{g_{k+1}^2}{f_{k+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now transform  $S_1$  using telescopic sums in a way similar to the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{h}_k \log \left( \frac{f_k \tilde{h}_k}{g_k^2} \right) - 2 \tilde{h}_{k-1} \log \left( \frac{f_k \tilde{h}_{k-1}}{g_k g_{k-1}} \right) + \tilde{h}_{k-2} \log \left( \frac{f_k h_{k-2}}{g_{k-1}^2} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_k}{g_k^2} \right) - 2 \frac{g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1}}{g_k g_{k+1}} \right) + \frac{g_{k+1}^2}{f_{k+2}} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}}{g_{k+1}^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $U(x) = x \log(x)$ . It is possible to control the Taylor expansion of the function  $U$  as in [16] by using the inequalities

$$\forall x \geq 0, \quad U(1-x) \geq -x + \frac{x^2}{2}, \quad -U(1+x) \geq -x - \frac{x^2}{2}. \quad (55)$$

The assumptions (47)–(49) each justify the fact that the  $x \geq 0$  in each of the following applications of the inequalities (55):

1.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_k}{g_k^2} \right) &= \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} U \left( 1 - \frac{g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k}{g_k^2} \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k}{f_k} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k)^2}{f_k g_k^2}, \end{aligned}$$

2.

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \frac{g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1}}{g_k g_{k+1}} \right) &= -2 \frac{g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} U \left( 1 + \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k g_{k+1}}{g_k g_{k+1}} \right) \\ &\geq -2 \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} - \frac{(\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k g_{k+1})^2}{f_{k+1} g_k g_{k+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

3.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g_{k+1}^2}{f_{k+2}} U \left( \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}}{g_{k+1}^2} \right) &= \frac{g_{k+1}^2}{f_{k+2}} U \left( 1 - \frac{g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}}{g_{k+1}^2} \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}}{f_{k+2}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2})^2}{f_{k+2} g_{k+1}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We treat separately the first and second order terms arising from these expressions 1–3. First adding together the first-order terms of the expansion of  $S_1$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} -\frac{g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k}{f_k} - 2 \frac{\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} - \frac{g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2}}{f_{k+2}} \\ &= -\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_k^2}{f_k} - 2 \frac{g_k g_{k+1}}{f_{k+1}} + \frac{g_{k+1}^2}{f_{k+2}} \\ &= -S_2, \end{aligned}$$

so the result will be proved if the second-order terms are positive. Using Equation (50) gives that the second-order terms satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k)^2}{f_k g_k^2} - \frac{(\tilde{h}_k f_{k+1} - g_k g_{k+1})^2}{f_{k+1} g_k g_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2})^2}{f_{k+2} g_{k+1}^2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k)^2}{f_k g_k^2} - \frac{(g_k^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_k)(g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2})}{f_{k+1} g_k g_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(g_{k+1}^2 - \tilde{h}_k f_{k+2})^2}{f_{k+2} g_{k+1}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Log-concavity of  $f$  means that the polynomial

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{S^2}{f_k g_k^2} - \frac{ST}{f_{k+1} g_k g_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{T^2}{f_{k+2} g_{k+1}^2}$$

has negative discriminant, and is therefore positive for any choice of  $S, T$ . In particular, as required, Equation (56) is therefore always positive.

Since the second-order terms are positive, we have

$$H''(t) \leq -v^2[S_1 + S_2] \leq 0,$$

which proves Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

Note that Theorem 4.1 implies Theorem 1.3. In fact, we can replace  $t$ -monotonicity (Condition 2) by a weaker condition, Condition 4:

**Condition 4.** Consider a constant speed interpolation, satisfying a modified transport equation  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) = -v\nabla_1(g_k^{(\alpha)}(t))$  with some  $h$  satisfying  $\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial t^2}(t) = v^2\nabla_2(h_k)$ . If we define

$$\tilde{h}_k := \frac{2g_k^{(\alpha)}g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}f_{k+1} - \left(g_k^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 f_{k+2} - \left(g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 f_k}{f_{k+1}^2 - f_k f_{k+2}}, \quad (57)$$

then we require that

$$h_k \leq \tilde{h}_k \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-2. \quad (58)$$

**Proposition 4.2.** If Conditions 1, 3 and 4 hold then the entropy of  $H(f)$  is concave in  $t$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we write

$$D_k := f_k^2 - f_{k-1}f_{k+1} \geq 0 \quad (59)$$

$$A_k := (f_{k+1}g_k^{(\alpha)} - f_k g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}) \geq 0 \quad (60)$$

$$B_k := (f_{k+1}g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)} - f_{k+2}g_k^{(\alpha)}) \geq 0, \quad (61)$$

The positivity of  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  follows from GLC and  $k$ -monotonicity, since we can write  $(1 - \alpha_{k+1})A_k = GLC(\alpha)_k + (\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k)f_k g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}$ , and a similar expression for  $B_k$ .

This choice of  $\tilde{h}_k$  makes the left hand sides of (47)–(49) equal to  $A_k^2/D_{k+1}$ ,  $B_k^2/D_{k+1}$  and  $A_k B_k/D_{k+1}$  respectively, which are all positive. Further, Equation (50) holds with equality.

Since Condition 4 is a restatement of (51) for this particular choice of  $\tilde{h}$ , if this Condition is satisfied, all the conditions of Theorem 4.1 have been verified, and the entropy is therefore concave.  $\square$

We now show that  $t$ -monotonicity, Condition 2, implies Condition 4. The key is to observe that the same coefficients  $(\alpha_k)_{k=0,\dots,n}$  introduced in Equation (71) can be used to state a second-order modified transport equation:

**Proposition 4.3.** If there exist coefficients  $\alpha$  giving rise to an interpolation with constant speed  $v$  then

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_k}{\partial t^2} = v^2\nabla_2(h_k), \quad (62)$$

where for  $k = 0, \dots, n-2$ ,

$$h_k = (1 - \alpha_k)(1 - \alpha_{k+1})f_k + 2\alpha_{k+1}(1 - \alpha_{k+1})f_{k+1} + \alpha_{k+1}\alpha_{k+2}f_{k+2} - f_{k+1}\frac{1}{v}\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t} \quad (63)$$

*Proof.* Recall that we write

$$g_k^{(\alpha)} = \alpha_{k+1}(t)f_{k+1}(t) + (1 - \alpha_k(t))f_k(t) \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (64)$$

Differentiating Equation (64) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{v}\frac{\partial g_k^{(\alpha)}}{\partial t} &= (1 - \alpha_k)\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t} - f_k\frac{\partial\alpha_k}{\partial t} + f_{k+1}\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t} + \alpha_{k+1}\frac{\partial f_{k+1}}{\partial t} \\ &= \left[ f_{k+1}\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t} - v g_k^{(\alpha)} - \alpha_{k+1}v g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)} \right] - \left[ f_k\frac{\partial\alpha_k}{\partial t} - v g_{k-1}^{(\alpha)} - \alpha_k v g_k^{(\alpha)} \right] \\ &= \nabla_1[vh_k], \end{aligned}$$

using the expression from (63), and the proposition follows easily.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** Consider  $\tilde{h}_k$  and  $h_k$  defined in Equations (57) and (63). If Conditions 1, 2 and 3 hold, then Condition 4 holds.

*Proof.* The key is to observe that (in the notation above)

$$\tilde{h}_k = \frac{g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}A_k + g_k^{(\alpha)}B_k}{D_{k+1}},$$

and

$$h_k = \alpha_{k+1}g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)} + (1 - \alpha_{k+1})g_k^{(\alpha)} - f_{k+1}\frac{1}{v}\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t}. \quad (65)$$

Direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} g_k^{(\alpha)}D_{k+1} &= f_{k+1}A_k + f_kB_k, \\ g_{k+1}^{(\alpha)}D_{k+1} &= f_{k+2}A_k + f_{k+1}B_k. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the coefficients of  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ , we can substitute these expressions in Equation (65) to obtain:

$$\tilde{h}_k - h_k = \frac{f_{k+2}(\alpha_{k+2} - \alpha_{k+1})A_k + f_k(\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k)B_k}{D_{k+1}} + f_{k+1}\frac{1}{v}\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t} \geq 0, \quad (66)$$

where the positivity of  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  follows as in Proposition 4.2, and the positivity of  $\frac{\partial\alpha_{k+1}}{\partial t}$  is assumed in Condition 2.  $\square$

Note that we can regard Equation (66) as weaker than Condition 2, since we add a term which Condition 1 tells us is positive.

## 5 Shepp–Olkin interpolation as a geodesic

Recall that in Conjecture 1.1 we are given  $n \geq 1$  affine functions  $p_j : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and we denote by  $(f_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$  the distribution of the sum of independent Bernoulli random variables of parameters  $p_1(t), \dots, p_n(t)$ , where for each  $i$ ,  $p_i(t) = p_i(0)(1-t) + p_i t$ . Further we write  $(f_k^{(i)})_{k=0,\dots,n-1}$  for the mass function of the  $i$ th ‘leave one out’ sum – that is, the distribution of a Bernoulli sum with parameters  $p_1(t), \dots, p_{i-1}(t), p_{i+1}(t), \dots, p_n(t)$ , and  $f_k^{(i,j)}$  for the ‘leave two out’ sum, involving all parameters except  $p_i(t)$  and  $p_j(t)$ . Further, we write

$$D_k^{(i)} = (f_k^{(i)})^2 - f_{k-1}^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)}, \quad (67)$$

$$E_k^{(i)} = f_k^{(i)} f_{k-1}^{(i)} - f_{k-2}^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)}, \quad (68)$$

with corresponding notation for  $D_k$ ,  $D_k^{(i,j)}$  and so on.

We now show how the Shepp–Olkin problem can be viewed in the framework we introduced above. To be specific, if each derivative  $p'_i$  is positive it is possible to express the Shepp–Olkin interpolation as a constant speed path with speed  $v$  in the sense of Definition 1.2. That is:

**Proposition 5.1.** *The probability mass function defined by the Shepp–Olkin interpolation satisfies a modified transport equation:*

$$\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) + \nabla_1(v g_k) = 0. \quad (69)$$

Here we set  $v := \sum_{i=1}^n p'_i$ , and write the probability mass function

$$g_k(t) := (1 - \alpha_k(t)) f_k(t) + \alpha_{k+1}(t) f_{k+1}(t), \quad (70)$$

where

$$\alpha_k(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p'_i p_i(t) f_{k-1}^{(i)}(t)}{v f_k(t)} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p'_i (1 - p_i(t)) f_k^{(i)}(t)}{v f_k(t)}. \quad (71)$$

Further, observe that  $\alpha_0(t) \equiv 0$  and  $\alpha_n(t) \equiv 1$ , and that if all  $p'_i \geq 0$  then  $0 \leq \alpha_k(t) \leq 1$  for all  $k$  and  $t$ .

*Proof.* Observe that by definition, the  $f_k$  have probability generating function

$$\sum_{k=0}^n f_k(t) s^k = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - p_i(t) + s p_i(t)),$$

which has derivative given by

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t}(t) s^k = \sum_{i=1}^n p'_i (s-1) \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - p_j(t) + s p_j(t)),$$

so comparing coefficients, we see that  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial t} + \nabla_1(v\tilde{g}_k(t)) = 0$ , where  $\tilde{g}_k(t) := \frac{1}{v} \sum_{i=1}^n p'_i f_k^{(i)}$ . Substituting Equation (71) in Equation (70), we obtain that  $\tilde{g}_k(t) = g_k(t)$ , and so Equation (69) follows.

The values of  $\alpha_0(t)$  and  $\alpha_n(t)$  follow from the fact that  $f_{-1}^{(i)} = f_n^{(i)} = 0$ . The positivity of  $\alpha_k(t)$  and  $1 - \alpha_k(t)$  follow from the assumption that  $p'_i \geq 0$ , meaning that all the terms in both the fractions in Equation (71) are positive.  $\square$

For clarity, we now suppress the explicit dependence of  $\alpha_k$  on  $t$ . Observe that the  $k$ -monotonicity Condition 1 is automatic for Shepp–Olkin interpolations with  $p'_i \geq 0$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** *For the Shepp–Olkin interpolation described above, if  $p'_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$  then the coefficients  $(\alpha_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  satisfy the inequality*

$$\alpha_k \leq \alpha_{k+1},$$

that is  $k$ -monotonicity (Condition 1) holds.

*Proof.* If  $k$  is such that  $f_k > 0$  and  $f_{k+1} > 0$ , then

$$\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m p'_i p_i [f_k^{(i)} f_k - f_{k-1}^{(i)} f_{k+1}]}{(\sum_{i=1}^m p'_i) f_k f_{k+1}}.$$

Moreover, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_k^{(i)} f_k - f_{k-1}^{(i)} f_{k+1} &= f_k^{(i)} \left[ (1 - p_i) f_k^{(i)} + p_i f_{k-1}^{(i)} \right] - f_{k-1}^{(i)} \left[ (1 - p_i) f_{k+1}^{(i)} + p_i f_k^{(i)} \right] \\ &= (1 - p_i) \left[ (f_k^{(i)})^2 - f_{k-1}^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right] \\ &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

by the log-concavity property for the Bernoulli sum  $(f_k^{(i)})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . The fact that each  $p'_i$  is non-negative finally proves that  $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_{k+1}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.** *Observe that in this Shepp–Olkin case, these  $\alpha_k$  can be expressed as a conditional expectation of a weighted sum, in a similar fashion to the ‘scaled score function’ of [22]. This follows since writing  $B_i$  for a Bernoulli random variable with parameter  $p_i(t)$ , we obtain  $\mathbb{P}(B_i = 1 | B_1 + \dots + B_n = k) = p_i(t) f_{k-1}^{(i)}(t) / f_k(t)$ , so that the  $\alpha_k$  of Equation (71) satisfy*

$$\alpha_k(t) = \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i B_i \mid \sum_{i=1}^n B_i = k \right), \quad (72)$$

where weights  $\lambda_i = p'_i / (\sum p'_i)$ . Note that in particular, in the ‘symmetric’ case where  $p'_i \equiv p'$  for all  $i$ , then  $\lambda'_i = 1/n$  and  $\alpha_k(t) \equiv k/n$ .

This conditional expectation characterization allows us to give an alternative proof of the  $k$ -monotonicity Proposition 5.2. A result of Efron [12] (see also [20, Equation (3.1)]) shows that if  $\phi(u_1, \dots, u_n)$  is an increasing function and  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent log-concave random variables, then  $\Phi(k) := \mathbb{E}[\phi(X_1, \dots, X_n) | X_1 + \dots + X_n = k]$  is an increasing function of  $k$ . Applying this to  $\phi(B_1, \dots, B_n) = \sum \lambda_i B_i$ , the result follows.

We now prove that the Bernoulli sum mass function is  $\mathbf{GLC}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ , for the natural choice of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , and hence Condition 3 is automatic in the Shepp–Olkin case.

**Proposition 5.4.** *In the Shepp–Olkin interpolation case, taking  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  as defined in Equation (71), if all the  $p'_i$  are positive then the Bernoulli sum mass function  $(f_k)_{k=0,1,\dots,n}$  is  $\mathbf{GLC}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ , and Condition 3 holds.*

*Proof.* Formula (71) shows that  $GLC(\boldsymbol{\alpha})_k$  can be written as  $1/v^2$  times

$$\left( \sum_i p'_i p_i f_k^{(i)} \right) \cdot \left( \sum_i p'_i (1-p_i) f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right) - \left( \sum_i p'_i (1-p_i) f_k^{(i)} \right) \cdot \left( \sum_i p'_i p_i f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right). \quad (73)$$

Expanding this expression as a quadratic form in  $p'_1, \dots, p'_n$ , the coefficients of  $p_i^2$  vanish, leaving an expression which simplifies to

$$\sum_{i < j} p'_i p'_j (p_i - p_j)^2 \left[ \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 - f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right].$$

The positivity of this expression, and hence the  $\mathbf{GLC}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  property, follow from the log-concavity of  $(f_k^{(i,j)})_{k=0,\dots,n-2}$  and positivity of  $p'_i$ .  $\square$

## 6 Concavity of entropy in the Shepp–Olkin regime

We will now show that entropy is concave in the monotone Shepp–Olkin regime. Having already verified Conditions 1 and 3 in Propositions 5.2 and 5.4, Proposition 4.2 shows that concavity of entropy will follow if Condition 4 holds.

**Proposition 6.1.** *For monotone Shepp–Olkin interpolations, Condition 4 holds if*

$$\sum_{i < j} (p_i'^2 p_j (1-p_j) b_{i,j} + p_j'^2 p_i (1-p_i) b_{j,i} + 2p'_i p'_j p_i (1-p_i) p_j (1-p_j) c_{i,j}) \geq 0, \quad (74)$$

where  $b_{i,j}$  and  $c_{i,j}$  are defined in Equations (76) and (77) below.

*Proof.* In the Shepp–Olkin case, we know that

$$h_k = \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} p'_i p'_j f_k^{(i,j)}}{v^2}.$$

We use the fact that (in the notation of Equations (60) and (61) the numerator of  $\tilde{h}_k$  can be written as  $g_{k+1} A_k + g_k B_k$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &:= (f_{k+1} g_k - f_k g_{k+1}) = \frac{1}{v} \sum_i p'_i p_i D_k^{(i)} \geq 0, \\ B_k &:= (f_{k+1} g_{k+1} - f_{k+2} g_k) = \frac{1}{v} \sum_i p'_i (1-p_i) D_{k+1}^{(i)} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$



This means that Condition 4 is equivalent to the positivity of

$$\begin{aligned}
& v^2(g_{k+1}A_k + g_kB_k) - D_{k+1} \sum_{i \neq j} p'_i p'_j f_k^{(i,j)} \\
&= \sum_i (p'_i)^2 \left( f_{k+1}^{(i)} p_i D_k^{(i)} + f_k^{(i)} (1 - p_i) D_{k+1}^{(i)} \right) \\
& \quad + \sum_{i \neq j} p'_i p'_j \left( f_{k+1}^{(j)} p_i D_k^{(i)} + f_k^{(j)} (1 - p_i) D_{k+1}^{(i)} - D_{k+1} f_k^{(i,j)} \right). \tag{75}
\end{aligned}$$

We expand the two bracketed terms in Equation (75) in terms of  $f_k^{(i,j)}$ , using Lemma A.1 below, which implies (using the notation of Equations (67) and (68)) that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_k^{(i)} f_{k-1}^{(i)} &= \sum_{j \neq i} p_j (1 - p_j) D_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \\
f_k^{(i)} f_{k-2}^{(i)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} p_j (1 - p_j) E_{k-1}^{(i,j)}
\end{aligned}$$

First observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_{k+1}^{(i)} p_i D_k^{(i)} + f_k^{(i)} (1 - p_i) D_{k+1}^{(i)} \\
&= p_i f_k^{(i)} \left[ f_k^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right] - p_i f_{k+1}^{(i)} \left[ f_{k-1}^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right] (1 - p_i) f_{k+1}^{(i)} \left[ f_k^{(i)} f_{k+1}^{(i)} \right] - (1 - p_i) f_k^{(i)} \left[ f_k^{(i)} f_{k+2}^{(i)} \right] \\
&= \sum_{j \neq i} p_j (1 - p_j) \frac{1}{2} \left( 2p_i f_k^{(i)} D_k^{(i,j)} - p_i f_{k+1}^{(i)} E_k^{(i,j)} + 2(1 - p_i) f_{k+1}^{(i)} D_k^{(i,j)} - (1 - p_i) f_k^{(i)} E_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
&=: \sum_{j \neq i} p_j (1 - p_j) b_{i,j}
\end{aligned}$$

where each term in square brackets is expanded using Lemma A.1. Further by writing  $f_k^{(i)} = (1 - p_j) f_k^{(i,j)} + p_j f_{k-1}^{(i,j)}$  we can rearrange the expression for  $b_{i,j}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{2} p_i p_j \left( \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} - 2 \left( f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} + f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} (1 - p_i) (1 - p_j) \left( \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} - 2 \left( f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} + f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} (1 - p_i) p_j \left( 2 \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^3 - 3 f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} + \left( f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} p_i (1 - p_j) \left( 2 \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^3 - 3 f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} + \left( f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} \right). \tag{76}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using simplifications such as the fact that

$$D_k = (1 - p_i)^2 D_{k-1}^{(i)} + p_i^2 D_k^{(i)} + p_i (1 - p_i) E_k^{(i)}.$$

the second bracket of Equation (75) can be written as  $p_i(1-p_i)p_j(1-p_j)c_{i,j}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{i,j} &:= \left( f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} E_k^{(i,j)} - f_k^{(i,j)} D_k^{(i,j)} - f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} D_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
&= - \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^3 + 2f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} - \left( f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} \\
&\quad - \left( f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} + f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+2}^{(i,j)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

□

We now verify that Condition 4 holds in the Shepp–Olkin case.

**Lemma 6.2.** *For the Shepp–Olkin interpolation described above, for each  $i \neq j$ , the  $b_{i,j} \geq 0$  and*

$$b_{i,j} \geq -\frac{p_i(1-p_j) + p_j(1-p_i)}{2} c_{i,j},$$

and hence Condition 4 is satisfied, and so the entropy is concave.

*Proof.* To verify the positivity of  $b_{i,j}$ , we simply observe that each of the brackets in Equation (76) is positive, by an application of the Equations (80), (81), (84) and (85) proved in Appendix A below.

To verify that  $b_{i,j} + \frac{1}{2}(p_i(1-p_j) + p_j(1-p_i))c_{i,j}$  is positive, we consider adding the final two terms of Equation (76) to the expression given in (77), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1-p_i)p_j \left( \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^3 - f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} - \left( f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} + f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} \right) \\
&+ p_i(1-p_j) \left( \left( f_k^{(i,j)} \right)^3 - f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+1}^{(i,j)} - \left( f_{k-1}^{(i,j)} \right)^2 f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} + f_{k-2}^{(i,j)} f_k^{(i,j)} f_{k+2}^{(i,j)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the positivity of the two final terms is guaranteed by Equations (82) and (83) below.

Condition 4 is verified by considering the bracketed term in Equation (74), which has negative discriminant (under this assumption) since

$$\begin{aligned}
4p_i(1-p_i)p_j(1-p_j)c_{i,j}^2 - 4b_{i,j}b_{j,i} &\leq c_{i,j}^2 (4p_i(1-p_i)p_j(1-p_j) - (p_i(1-p_j) + p_j(1-p_i))^2) \\
&= -c_{i,j}^2 (p_i - p_j)^2 \leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Since Condition 4 has been verified, the proof of the monotone Shepp–Olkin theorem, Theorem 1.5, is complete.

## A Technical results regarding Bernoulli sums

In this section, we prove some technical results regarding the mass functions of Bernoulli sum random variables, required to prove the monotone Shepp–Olkin Theorem 1.5.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be the Bernoulli sum of parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_m$ . Then for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $q \geq 1$  we have the identity*

$$q f_k f_{k-q} = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (1 - p_j) \left[ f_{k-1}^{(j)} f_{k-q}^{(j)} - f_k^{(j)} f_{k-q-1}^{(j)} \right]. \quad (78)$$

*Proof.* We prove this lemma by induction on the number  $m$  of parameters, the case where  $m = 1$  being obvious. If  $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is the Bernoulli sum of parameters  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  we set for  $p \in [0, 1]$

$$\tilde{f}_k := (1 - p) f_k + p f_{k-1}$$

and we want to prove, given  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $q \geq 1$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} q \tilde{f}_k \tilde{f}_{k-q} &= \sum_{j=1}^m p_j (1 - p_j) \left[ \tilde{f}_{k-1}^{(j)} \tilde{f}_{k-q}^{(j)} - \tilde{f}_k^{(j)} \tilde{f}_{k-q-1}^{(j)} \right] \\ &\quad + p(1 - p) [f_{k-1} f_{k-q} - f_k f_{k-q-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Expanding each side with the respect to the basis  $(1 - p)^2, 2p(1 - p), p^2$ , it is easy to show that Equation (79) is satisfied for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $q \geq 1$  if (78) holds true for the pairs  $(k, q), (k, q + 1)$  and  $(k - 1, q)$ .  $\square$

Next we prove the following technical inequality, which may be of independent interest:

**Theorem A.2. Property(m) holds:** *that is, for every  $(g_k^{[m]})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$  which is the probability mass function of a sum of  $m$  independent Bernoulli variables*

$$C_1(k) := g_{k-1}^{[m]} \left( g_k^{[m]} \right)^2 - 2 \left( g_{k-1}^{[m]} \right)^2 g_{k+1}^{[m]} + g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} g_{k-2}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (80)$$

We first show that **Property(m)** implies a number of related inequalities, which are of use elsewhere in the paper:

**Corollary A.3.** *If Property(m) holds, then for any  $g^{[m]}$ , the probability mass function*

for the sum of  $m$  independent Bernoulli random variables, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ :

$$\overline{C}_1(k) := \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k+1}^{[m]} - 2 \left(g_{k+1}^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-1}^{[m]} + g_{k+2}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k-1}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad (81)$$

$$C_2(k) := \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^3 - g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} - \left(g_{k-1}^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k+2}^{[m]} + g_{k-2}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+2}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad (82)$$

$$\overline{C}_2(k) := \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^3 - g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} - \left(g_{k+1}^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-2}^{[m]} + g_{k-2}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+2}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad (83)$$

$$C_3(k) := 2 \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^3 - 3 g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} + \left(g_{k-1}^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k+2}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad (84)$$

$$\overline{C}_3(k) := 2 \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^3 - 3 g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} + \left(g_{k+1}^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-2}^{[m]} \geq 0, \quad (85)$$

$$D_1(k) := 2 \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-2}^{[m]} - 3 g_{k-2}^{[m]} g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} + g_{k+1}^{[m]} g_k^{[m]} g_{k-3}^{[m]} \geq 0. \quad (86)$$

*Proof.* First note that these inequalities can be paired up by a duality argument. That is, if **Property**( $m$ ) holds for every Bernoulli sum  $g^{[m]}$ , it is true for  $\overline{g}_k := g_{m-k}^{[m]}$  with parameters  $1-p_1, 1-p_2, \dots, 1-p_m$ , which implies Equation (81). Similarly (82) implies (83) and (84) implies (85). We will write

$$D_k^{[m]} = \left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^2 - g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]}.$$

In this notation, Equations (82), (84) and (86) are a consequence of (80), since simple calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k+1}^{[m]} C_2(k) &= 2(g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} - g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+2}^{[m]}) D_k^{[m]} + g_{k+2}^{[m]} C_1(k) \geq 0, \\ g_k^{[m]} C_3(k) &= 2 \left(D_k^{[m]}\right)^2 + g_{k-1}^{[m]} \overline{C}_1(k) \geq 0, \\ g_{k-1}^{[m]} D_1(k) &= 2g_{k-2}^{[m]} C_1(k) + g_{k+1}^{[m]} C_1(k-1) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

In a similar way, we can argue that:

**Proposition A.4.** *If **Property**( $m$ ) is satisfied, then for every sum of  $m$  independent Bernoulli variables we have*

$$g_k^{[m]} D_k^{[m]} + g_{k-2}^{[m]} D_{k+1}^{[m]} \geq 2g_{k+2}^{[m]} D_{k-1}^{[m]} \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (87)$$

*Proof.* We can restate **Property**( $m$ ) as being equivalent to the inequality,

$$D_k^{[m]} \geq \frac{g_{k+1}^{[m]}}{g_{k-1}^{[m]}} D_{k-1}^{[m]}$$

iteration of which gives

$$D_{k+1}^{[m]} \geq \frac{g_{k+2}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]}}{g_k^{[m]} g_{k-1}^{[m]}} D_{k-1}^{[m]},$$

so Equation (87) holds if we have

$$\frac{g_k^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]}}{g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+2}^{[m]}} + \frac{g_{k-2}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]}}{g_k^{[m]} g_{k-1}^{[m]}} - 2 \geq 0,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\frac{C_1(k+1)}{g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]} g_{k+2}^{[m]}} + 2 \frac{\left(D_k^{[m]}\right)^2}{\left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-1}^{[m]} g_{k+1}^{[m]}} + \frac{C_1(k)}{\left(g_k^{[m]}\right)^2 g_{k-1}^{[m]}} \geq 0$$

which is positive by assumption, which proves the proposition.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem A.2.* We prove **Property**( $m$ ) by induction on the number of parameters  $m$ . It is clear that **Property**(1) is true. Let us suppose **Property**( $m$ ) holds for some  $m \geq 1$ . In order to prove **Property**( $m+1$ ) it suffices to show that, for every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$g_{k-1}^{[m+1]} \left(g_k^{[m+1]}\right)^2 - 2 \left(g_{k-1}^{[m+1]}\right)^2 g_{k+1}^{[m+1]} + g_{k-2}^{[m+1]} g_k^{[m+1]} g_{k+1}^{[m+1]} \geq 0, \quad (88)$$

where  $g^{[m+1]}$  is the distribution of a sum of  $m+1$  Bernoulli variables. For  $p = p_{m+1} \in [0, 1]$ , we can write  $g_k^{[m+1]} := (1-p)g_k^{[m]} + pg_{k-1}^{[m]}$ . To prove that (88) is positive, we expand it as a polynomial in  $p$ , of order 3, in the basis  $(1-p)^3, p(1-p)^2, p^2(1-p), p^3$ , and show that the coefficients of each of these terms are positive.

1. The coefficient of  $(1-p)^3$  is  $C_1(k)$  which is clearly positive, by **Property**( $m$ ).
2. The coefficient of  $p^3$  is  $C_1(k-1)$  which is also positive, by **Property**( $m$ ).
3. The coefficient of  $p(1-p)^2$  is  $D_1(k)$  which is positive, since **Property**( $m$ ) implies Equation (86).
4. The coefficient of  $p^2(1-p)$  can be written

$$g_{k-1}^{[m]} D_{k-1}^{[m]} + g_{k-3}^{[m]} D_k^{[m]} - 2g_{k+1}^{[m]} D_{k-2}^{[m]},$$

which is positive by Proposition A.4.

Since each coefficient is positive, we deduce that Equation (88) is satisfied, which shows that **Property**( $m+1$ ) holds.  $\square$

## References

- [1] S.-i. Amari and H. Nagaoka. *Methods of information geometry*, volume 191 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second edition, 2008.
- [3] C. Ané, S. Blachere, D. Chafaï, P. Fougères, I. Gentil, F. Malrieu, C. Roberto, and G. Scheffer. Sur les inégalités de Sobolev logarithmiques. *Panoramas et Synthèses*, 10:217, 2000.
- [4] D. Bakry and M. Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84*, volume 1123 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 177–206. Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [5] A. R. Barron. Entropy and the Central Limit Theorem. *Ann. Probab.*, 14(1):336–342, 1986.
- [6] J.-D. Benamou and Y. Brenier. A numerical method for the optimal time-continuous mass transport problem and related problems. In *Monge Ampère equation: applications to geometry and optimization (Deerfield Beach, FL, 1997)*, volume 226 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 1–11. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [7] J.-D. Benamou and Y. Brenier. A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer problem. *Numer. Math.*, 84(3):375–393, 2000.
- [8] E. A. Carlen and W. Gangbo. Constrained steepest descent in the 2-Wasserstein metric. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 157(3):807–846, 2003.
- [9] D. Cordero-Erausquin. Some applications of mass transport to Gaussian-type inequalities. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 161(3):257–269, 2002.
- [10] M. H. M. Costa. A new entropy power inequality. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 31(6):751–760, 1985.
- [11] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. John Wiley, New York, 1991.
- [12] B. Efron. Increasing properties of Pólya frequency functions. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 33:272–279, 1965.
- [13] M. Erbar and J. Maas. Ricci curvature of finite Markov chains via convexity of the entropy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 206:997–1038, 2012.

- [14] N. Gozlan, C. Roberto, P.-M. Samson, and P. Tetali. Displacement convexity of entropy and related inequalities on graphs. See [arXiv:1207.5116](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.5116), 2012.
- [15] L. Gross. Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. *Amer. J. Math.*, 97(4):1061–1083, 1975.
- [16] E. Hillion. Concavity of entropy along binomial convolutions. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 17:no. 4, 1–9, 2012.
- [17] E. Hillion. Contraction of measures on graphs. In submission: see <http://www.maths.bris.ac.uk/~maxeh/MCPGraph.pdf>, 2012.
- [18] E. Hillion, O. T. Johnson, and Y. Yu. A natural derivative on  $[0, n]$  and a binomial Poincaré inequality. In submission, see [arXiv:1107.0127](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.0127), 2011.
- [19] O. T. Johnson. Log-concavity and the maximum entropy property of the Poisson distribution. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 117(6):791–802, 2007.
- [20] O. T. Johnson and Y. M. Suhov. The von Neumann entropy and information rate for integrable quantum Gibbs ensembles 2. *Quantum Computers and Computing*, 4(1):128–143, 2003.
- [21] R. Jordan, D. Kinderlehrer, and F. Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
- [22] I. Kontoyiannis, P. Harremoës, and O. T. Johnson. Entropy and the law of small numbers. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 51(2):466–472, 2005.
- [23] C. Léonard. Private communication. 2013.
- [24] T. M. Liggett. Ultra logconcave sequences and negative dependence. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 79(2):315–325, 1997.
- [25] J. Lott and C. Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 169(3):903–991, 2009.
- [26] J. Maas. Gradient flows of the entropy for finite Markov chains. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(8):2250–2292, 2011.
- [27] P. Mateev. The entropy of the multinomial distribution. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primen.*, 23(1):196–198, 1978.
- [28] A. Mielke. Geodesic convexity of the relative entropy in reversible Markov chains. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, pages 1–31, 2012. Online First article. doi:10.1007/s00526-012-0538-8.
- [29] C. P. Niculescu. A new look at Newton’s inequalities. *JIPAM. J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, 1, 2000. Issue 2, Article 17; see also <http://jipam.vu.edu.au/>.

- [30] R. Pemantle. Towards a theory of negative dependence. *J. Math. Phys.*, 41(3):1371–1390, 2000.
- [31] A. Rényi. A characterization of Poisson processes. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 1:519–527, 1956.
- [32] M. Shaked and J. G. Shanthikumar. *Stochastic orders*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, 2007.
- [33] L. A. Shepp and I. Olkin. Entropy of the sum of independent Bernoulli random variables and of the multinomial distribution. In *Contributions to probability*, pages 201–206. Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [34] A. J. Stam. Some inequalities satisfied by the quantities of information of Fisher and Shannon. *Information and Control*, 2:101–112, 1959.
- [35] K.-T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):65–131, 2006.
- [36] K.-T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):133–177, 2006.
- [37] C. Villani. A short proof of the concavity of entropy power. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 46(4):1695–1696, 2000.
- [38] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [39] C. Villani. *Optimal transport: Old and New*, volume 338 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.
- [40] Y. Yu. On the maximum entropy properties of the binomial distribution. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 54(7):3351–3353, July 2008.
- [41] Y. Yu. Monotonic convergence in an information-theoretic law of small numbers. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 55(12):5412–5422, 2009.
- [42] Y. Yu and O. T. Johnson. Concavity of entropy under thinning. In *Proceedings of ISIT 2009, 28th June - 3rd July 2009, Seoul*, pages 144–148, 2009.

Erwan Hillion: School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Bristol, BS8 1TW, UK. Email: [Erwan.Hillion@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:Erwan.Hillion@bristol.ac.uk)

Oliver Johnson: School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Bristol BS8 1TW. UK. Email: [o.johnson@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:o.johnson@bristol.ac.uk)