

# MARKOV RANDOM FIELDS AND ITERATED TORIC FIBRE PRODUCTS

JAN DRAISMA AND FLORIAN M. OOSTERHOF

**ABSTRACT.** We prove that iterated toric fibre products from a finite collection of toric varieties are defined by binomials of uniformly bounded degree. This implies that Markov random fields built up from a finite collection of finite graphs have uniformly bounded Markov degree.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

The notion of *toric fibre product* of two toric varieties goes back to [Sul07]. It is of relevance in algebraic statistics since it captures algebraically the Markov random field on a graph obtained by glueing two graphs along a common subgraph; see [RS16] and also below. In [Sul07, RS16, RS14] it is proved that under certain conditions, one can explicitly construct a Markov basis for the large Markov random field from bases for the components. For related results see [Shi12, EKS14, KR14].

However, these conditions are not always satisfied. Nevertheless, in [RS16, Conjecture 56] the hope was raised that when building larger graphs by glueing copies from a finite collection of graphs along a common subgraph, there might be a uniform upper bound on the Markov degree of the models thus constructed, independent of how many copies of each graph are used. A special case of this conjecture was proved in the same paper [RS16, Theorem 54]. We prove the conjecture in general, and along the way we link it to recent work [SS17] in *representation stability*. Indeed, an important point we would like to make, apart from proving said conjecture, is that algebraic statistics is a natural source of problems in *asymptotic algebra*, to which ideas from representation stability apply. Our main theorems are reminiscent of Sam's recent stabilisation theorems on equations and higher syzygies for secant varieties of Veronese embeddings [Sam17a, Sam17b].

**Markov random fields.** Let  $G = (N, E)$  be a finite, undirected, simple graph and for each node  $j \in N$  let  $X_j$  be a random variable taking values in the finite set  $[d_j] := \{1, \dots, d_j\}$ . A joint probability distribution on  $(X_j)_{j \in N}$  is said to satisfy the *local Markov properties* imposed by the graph if for any two non-neighbours  $j, k \in N$  the variables  $X_j$  and  $X_k$  are conditionally independent given  $\{X_l \mid \{j, l\} \in E\}$ .

On the other hand, a joint probability distribution  $f$  on the  $X_j$  is said to *factorise according to  $G$*  if for each maximal clique  $C$  of  $G$  and configuration  $\alpha \in \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]$  of the random variables labelled by  $C$  there exists an interaction parameter  $\theta_\alpha^C$  such that for each configuration  $\beta \in \prod_{j \in N} [d_j]$  of all random variables of  $G$ :

$$f(\beta) = \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \theta_{\beta|_C}^C$$

where  $\text{mcl}(G)$  is the set of maximal cliques of  $G$ , and  $\beta|_C$  is the restriction of  $\beta$  to  $C$ .


These two notions are connected by the Hammersley-Clifford theorem, which says that a positive joint probability distribution on  $G$  factorises according to  $G$  if and only if it satisfies the Markov properties; see [HC71] or [Lau98, Theorem 3.9].

The set of all positive joint probability distributions on  $G$  that satisfy the Markov properties is therefore a subset of the image of the following map:

$$\varphi_G : \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{j \in N} [d_j]}, \quad (\theta_\alpha^C)_{C, \alpha} \mapsto \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \theta_{\beta|_C}^C \right)_\beta$$

It is the ideal  $I_G$  of polynomials vanishing on  $\text{im } \varphi_G$  that is of interest in algebraic statistics. Since the components of  $\varphi_G$  are monomials,  $I_G$  is generated by finitely many binomials (differences of two monomials) in the standard coordinates on  $\mathbb{C}^{\prod_{j \in N} [d_j]}$ , and any finite generating set of binomials can be used to set up a Markov chain for testing whether given observations of the variables  $X_j$  are compatible with the assumption that their joint distribution factorises according to the graph  $G$  [DS98]. The zero locus of  $I_G$  is often called the *graphical model* of  $G$ .

Now suppose we have graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_s$  with node sets  $N_1, \dots, N_s$ , that  $N_i \cap N_k$  equals a fixed set  $N_0$  for all  $i \neq k$  in  $[s]$ , and that the graph induced on  $N_0$  by each  $G_i$  is equal to a fixed graph  $H$ . Moreover, for each  $j \in \bigcup_i N_i$  fix a number  $d_j$  of states. We can then glue copies of the  $G_i$  along their common subgraph  $H$ , by which we mean first taking disjoint copies of the  $G_i$  and then identifying the nodes labelled by a fixed  $j \in N_0$  across all copies. For  $a_1, \dots, a_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we denote the graph obtained by glueing  $a_i$  copies of graph  $G_i, i \in [s]$  by  $\sum_H^{a_1} G_1 +_H \dots +_H \sum_H^{a_s} G_s$ :



**Theorem 1.** Let  $G_1, \dots, G_s$  be graphs with a common subgraph  $H$  and a number of states associated to each node. Then there exists a uniform bound  $D \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that for all multiplicities  $a_1, \dots, a_s$ , the ideal  $I_G$  of  $G = \sum_H^{a_1} G_1 +_H \dots +_H \sum_H^{a_s} G_s$  is generated by binomials of degree at most  $D$ .

Our proof shows that one needs only finitely many combinatorial types of binomials, independent of  $a_1, \dots, a_s$ , to generate  $I_G$ . This result is similar in flavour to the Independent Set Theorem from [HS12], where the graph is fixed but the  $d_j$  vary. Interestingly, the underlying categories responsible for these two stabilisation phenomena are opposite to each other; see Remark 23.

**Example 2.** In [RS14] it is proved that the ideal  $I_G$  for the complete bipartite graph  $G = K_{3,N}$ , with two states for each of the random variables, is generated in degree at most 12 for all  $N$ . The graph  $G$  is obtained by glueing  $N$  copies of  $K_{3,1}$  along their common subgraph consisting of 3 nodes without any edges.

We derive Theorem 1 from a general stabilisation result on *toric fibre products*, which we introduce next.

**Toric fibre products.** Fix a ground field  $K$ , let  $r$  be a natural number, and let  $U_1, \dots, U_r, V_1, \dots, V_r$  be finite-dimensional vector spaces over  $K$ .

Define a bilinear operation

$$(1) \quad \prod_j U_j \times \prod_j V_j \rightarrow \prod_j (U_j \otimes V_j), \quad (u, v) \mapsto u * v := (u_1 \otimes v_1, \dots, u_r \otimes v_r).$$

**Definition 3.** The *toric fibre product*  $X * Y$  of Zariski-closed subsets  $X \subseteq \prod_j U_j$  and  $Y \subseteq \prod_j V_j$  equals the Zariski-closure of the set  $\{u * v \mid u \in X, v \in Y\}$ . ♣

**Remark 4.** In [Sul07], the toric fibre product is defined at the level of ideals: if  $(x_i^j)_i$  are coordinate functions on  $U_j$  and  $(y_k^j)_k$  are coordinate functions on  $V_j$ , then  $(z_{i,k}^j := x_i^j \otimes y_k^j)_{i,k}$  are coordinate functions on  $U_j \otimes V_j$ . The ring homomorphism of coordinate rings

$$K[(z_{i,k}^j)_{i,k}] = K\left[\prod_j (U_j \otimes V_j)\right] \rightarrow K\left[\prod_j U_j \times \prod_j V_j\right] = K[(x_i^j)_{i,j}, (y_k^j)_{k,j}]$$

dual to (1) sends  $z_{i,k}^j$  to  $x_i^j \cdot y_k^j$ . If we compose this homomorphism with the projection modulo the ideal of  $X \times Y$ , then the kernel of the composition is precisely the toric fibre product of the ideals of  $X$  and  $Y$  as introduced in [Sul07]. In that paper, multigradings play a crucial role for *computing* toric fibre products of ideals, but do not affect the *definition* of toric fibre products. ♣

The product  $*$  is associative and commutative up to reordering tensor factors. We can iterate this construction and form products like  $X^{*2} * Y * Z^{*3}$ , where  $Z$  also lives in a product of  $r$  vector spaces  $W_j$ . This variety lives in  $\prod_j (U_j^{\otimes 2}) \otimes V_j \otimes (W_j^{\otimes 3})$ .

We will not be taking toric fibre products of general varieties, but rather *Hadamard-stable* ones. For this, we have to choose coordinates on each  $U_j$ , so that  $U_j = K^{d_j}$ .

**Definition 5.** On  $K^d$  the Hadamard product is defined as  $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \circ (b_1, \dots, b_d) = (a_1 b_1, \dots, a_d b_d)$ . On  $U := U_1 \times \dots \times U_r$ , where  $U_j = K^{d_j}$ , it is defined component-wise. A set  $X \subseteq \prod_j U_j$  is called *Hadamard-stable* if  $X$  contains the all-one vector  $\mathbf{1}_U$  (the unit element of  $\circ$ ) and if moreover  $x \circ z \in X$  for all  $x, z \in X$ . ♣

**Remark 6.** By [ES96, Remark after Proposition 2.3],  $X$  is Hadamard-stable if and only if its ideal is generated by differences of two monomials.

In particular, the Zariski-closure in  $U$  of a subtorus of the  $\sum_j d_j$ -dimensional torus  $\prod_j (K \setminus \{0\})^{d_j}$  is Hadamard-stable. These are the toric varieties from the abstract.

Suppose that we also fix identifications  $V_j = K^{d_j'}$  and a corresponding Hadamard multiplication  $\prod_j V_j \times \prod_j V_j \rightarrow \prod_j V_j$ . Equipping the spaces  $U_j \otimes V_j$  with the natural coordinates and corresponding Hadamard multiplication, the two operations just defined satisfy  $(u \circ u') * (v \circ v') = (u * v) \circ (u' * v')$  as well as  $\mathbf{1}_{U_j \otimes V_j} = \mathbf{1}_{U_j} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{V_j}$ . Consequently, if both  $X \subseteq \prod_j U_j$  and  $Y \subseteq \prod_j V_j$  are Zariski-closed and Hadamard-stable, then so is their toric fibre product  $X * Y$ . We can now formulate our second main result.

**Theorem 7.** *Let  $s, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . For each  $i \in [s]$  and  $j \in [r]$  let  $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and set  $V_{ij} := K^{d_{ij}}$ . For each  $i \in [s]$ , let  $X_i \subseteq \prod_j V_{ij}$  be a Hadamard-stable Zariski-closed subset. Then there exists a uniform bound  $D \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that for any exponents  $a_1, \dots, a_s$  the ideal of  $X_1^{*a_1} \cdots X_s^{*a_s} \subseteq \prod_{j=1}^r \bigotimes_{i=1}^s V_{ij}^{\otimes a_i}$  is generated by polynomials of degree at most  $D$ .*

**Remark 8.** A straightforward generalisation of this theorem also holds, where each  $X_i$  is a closed sub-scheme given by some ideal  $J_i$  in the coordinate ring of  $\prod_j V_{ij}$ . Hadamard-stable then says that the pull-back of  $J_i$  under the Hadamard product lies in the ideal of  $X_i \times X_i$ , and the toric fibre product is as in Remark 4. Since this generality would slightly obscure our arguments, we have decided to present explicitly the version with Zariski-closed subsets—see also Remark 22.

Also, the theorem remains valid if we remove the condition that the  $X_i$  contain the all-one vector, but require only that they be closed under Hadamard-multiplication; see Remark 21. ♣

**Organisation of this paper.** The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the categories of (affine) **Fin**-varieties and, dually, **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-algebras. The point is that, as we will see in Section 4, the iterated toric fibre products together form such a **Fin**-variety (or rather a **Fin**<sup>s</sup>-variety, where **Fin**<sup>s</sup> is the product category of  $s$  copies of **Fin**).

Indeed, they sit naturally in a Cartesian product of copies of the **Fin**-variety of rank-one tensors, which, as we prove in Section 3, is Noetherian (Theorem 12). This Noetherianity result is of a similar flavour as the recent result from [SS17] (see also [DK14, Proposition 7.5] which follows the same proof strategy) that any finitely generated **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-module is Noetherian; this result played a crucial role in a proof of the *Artinian conjecture*. However, our Noetherianity result concerns certain **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-algebras rather than modules, and is more complicated. Finally, in Section 4 we first prove Theorem 7 and then derive Theorem 1 as a corollary.

**Acknowledgements.** Both authors are (partially) supported by Draisma’s *Vici* grant *Stabilisation in Algebra and Geometry* from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The current paper is partly based on the second author’s Master’s thesis at Eindhoven University of Technology; see [Oos16]. We thank Johannes Rauh and Seth Sullivant for fruitful discussions at *Prague Stochastics*, August 2014.

## 2. AFFINE **Fin**-VARIETIES AND **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-ALGEBRAS

The category **Fin** has as objects all finite sets and as morphisms all maps. Its opposite category is denoted **Fin**<sup>op</sup>. When **C** is another category whose objects are called *somethings*, then a **Fin**-*something* is a covariant functor from **Fin** to **C** and a **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-*something* is a contravariant functor from **Fin** to **C**. The **C**-homomorphism associated to a **Fin**-morphism  $\pi$  is denoted  $\pi_*$  (the *push-forward* of  $\pi$ ) in the covariant case and  $\pi^*$  (the *pull-back* of  $\pi$ ) in the contravariant case.

More generally, we can replace **Fin** by any category **D**. The **D**-somethings themselves form a category, in which morphisms are natural transformations. In our paper, **D** is always closely related to **Fin** or to **Fin**<sup>s</sup>, the  $s$ -fold product of **Fin**.

Here are three instances of **Fin** or **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-somethings crucial to our paper.

**Example 9.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then the functor  $S \mapsto [n]^S$  is a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -set, which to  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Fin}}(S, T)$  associates the map  $\pi^* : [n]^T \rightarrow [n]^S, \alpha \mapsto \alpha\pi$ , the composition of  $\alpha$  and  $\pi$ .

Building on this example, the functor  $A_n : S \mapsto K[x_\alpha \mid \alpha \in [n]^S]$ , a polynomial ring in variables labelled by  $[n]^S$ , is a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ - $K$ -algebra, which associates to  $\pi$  the  $K$ -algebra homomorphism  $\pi^* : A(T) \rightarrow A(S), x_\alpha \mapsto x_{\alpha\pi}$ .

Third, we define an affine  $\mathbf{Fin}$ - $K$ -vector space  $Q_n$  by  $Q_n : S \mapsto (K^n)^{\otimes S}$ , the space of  $n \times \cdots \times n$ -tensors with factors labelled by  $S$ , which sends  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Fin}}(S, T)$  to the linear morphism  $\pi_* : (K^n)^{\otimes S} \rightarrow (K^n)^{\otimes T}$  determined by

$$\pi_* : \otimes_{i \in S} v_i \mapsto \otimes_{j \in T} \left( \bigcirc_{i \in \pi^{-1}(j)} v_i \right),$$

where  $\bigcirc$  is the Hadamard product in  $K^n$ . We follow the natural convention that an empty Hadamard product equals the all-one vector  $\mathbf{1} \in K^n$ ; in particular, this holds in the previous formula for all  $j \in T$  that are not in the image of  $\pi$ .

The ring  $A_n$  and the space  $Q_n$  are related as follows:  $Q_n(S)$  has a basis consisting of vectors  $e_\alpha := \otimes_{i \in S} e_{\alpha_i}, \alpha \in [n]^S$ , where  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  is the standard basis of  $K^n$ ;  $A_n(S)$  is the coordinate ring of  $Q_n(S)$  generated by the dual basis  $(x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in [n]^S}$ ; and for  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Fin}}(S, T)$  the pullback  $\pi^* : A_n(T) \rightarrow A_n(S)$  is the homomorphism of  $K$ -algebras dual to the linear map  $\pi_* : Q_n(S) \rightarrow Q_n(T)$ . Indeed, this is verified by the following computation for  $\alpha \in [n]^T$ :

$$x_\alpha(\pi_* \otimes_{i \in S} v_i) = x_\alpha(\otimes_{j \in T} \left( \bigcirc_{i \in \pi^{-1}(j)} v_i \right)) = \prod_{j \in T} \left( \bigcirc_{i \in \pi^{-1}(j)} v_i \right)_{\alpha_j} = \prod_{i \in S} (v_i)_{\alpha_{\pi(i)}} = \pi^*(x_\alpha)(\otimes_{i \in S} v_i).$$

This is used in Section 3. ♣

In general, by *algebra* we shall mean an associative, commutative  $K$ -algebra with 1, and homomorphisms are required to preserve 1. So a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $B$  assigns to each finite set  $S$  an algebra and to each map  $\pi : S \rightarrow T$  an algebra homomorphism  $\pi^* : B(T) \rightarrow B(S)$ . An *ideal* in  $B$  is a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -subset  $I$  of  $B$  (i.e.,  $I(S)$  is a subset of  $B(S)$  for each finite set  $S$  and  $\pi^*$  maps  $I(T)$  into  $I(S)$ ) such that each  $I(S)$  is an ideal in  $B(S)$ ; then  $S \mapsto B(S)/I(S)$  is again a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra, the *quotient*  $B/I$  of  $B$  by  $I$ .

Given a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $B$ , finite sets  $S_j$  for  $j$  in some index set  $J$ , and an element  $b_j \in B(S_j)$  for each  $j$ , there is a unique smallest ideal  $I$  in  $B$  such that each  $I(S_j)$  contains  $b_j$ . This ideal is constructed as:

$$I(S) = \left( \pi^*(b_j) \mid j \in J, \pi \in \text{Hom}(S, S_j) \right)$$

This is the ideal *generated* by the  $b_j$ . A  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra is called *Noetherian* if each ideal  $I$  in it is generated by finitely many elements in various  $I(S_j)$ , i.e.,  $J$  can be taken finite.

**Example 10.** The  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $A_1$  is Noetherian. Indeed,  $A_1(S)$  is the polynomial ring  $K[t]$  in a single variable  $t$  for all  $S$ , and the homomorphism  $A_1(T) \rightarrow A_1(S)$  is the identity  $K[t] \rightarrow K[t]$ . So Noetherianity follows from Noetherianity of the algebra  $K[t]$ .

For  $n \geq 2$  the  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $A_n$  is *not* Noetherian. For instance, consider the monomials

$$u_2 := x_{21}x_{12} \in A_n([2]), u_3 := x_{211}x_{121}x_{112} \in A_n([3]), u_4 := x_{2111}x_{1211}x_{1121}x_{1112} \in A_n([4]),$$

and so on. For any map  $\pi : [k] \rightarrow [l]$  with  $k > l$ , by the pigeon hole principle there are two indices  $i, j \in [k]$  such that  $\pi(i) = \pi(j) =: m \in [l]$ . Then  $\pi^*x_{1\dots 121\dots 1}$ , where the 2 is in the  $m$ -th position, is a variable with at least two indices equal to 2. Since  $u_k$  contains no such variable,  $\pi^*u_l$  does not divide  $u_k$ . So  $u_2, u_3, \dots$  generates a non-finitely generated monomial  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -ideal in  $A_n$ . (On the other hand, for each  $d$  the piece of  $A_n$  of homogeneous polynomials of degree at most  $d$  is Noetherian as a  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -module, see [DK14, Proposition 7.5].)  $\clubsuit$

We shall see in the following section that certain interesting quotients of each  $A_n$  are Noetherian.

### 3. RANK-ONE TENSORS FORM A NOETHERIAN $\mathbf{Fin}$ -VARIETY

Let  $Q_n^{\leq 1}(S)$  be the variety of *rank-one tensors*, i.e., those of the form  $\otimes_{i \in S} v_i$  for vectors  $v_i \in K^n$ . We claim that this defines a Zariski-closed  $\mathbf{Fin}$ -subvariety  $Q_n^{\leq 1}$  of  $Q_n$ .

For this, we must verify that for a map  $\pi : S \rightarrow T$  the map  $Q_n(S) \rightarrow Q_n(T)$  dual to the algebra homomorphism  $A_n(T) \rightarrow A_n(S)$  sends  $Q_n^{\leq 1}(S)$  into  $Q_n^{\leq 1}(T)$ . And indeed, in Example 9 we have seen that this map sends

$$\otimes_{i \in S} v_i \mapsto \otimes_{j \in T} \left( \bigcirc_{i \in \pi^{-1}(j)} v_i \right).$$

It is well known that (if  $K$  is infinite) the ideal in  $A_n(S)$  of  $Q_n^{\leq 1}(S)$  equals the ideal  $I_n(S)$  generated by all binomials constructed as follows. Partition  $S$  into two parts  $S_1, S_2$ , let  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in [n]^{S_i}$  and write  $\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2$  for the element of  $[n]^S$  which equals  $\alpha_i$  on  $S_i$ . Then we have the binomial

$$(2) \quad x_{\alpha_1 \parallel \alpha_2} x_{\beta_1 \parallel \beta_2} - x_{\alpha_1 \parallel \beta_2} x_{\beta_1 \parallel \alpha_2} \in I_n(S),$$

and  $I_n(S)$  is the ideal generated by these for all partitions and all  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ . The functor  $S \mapsto I_n(S)$  is an ideal in the  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $A_n$ ; for infinite  $K$  this follows from the computation above, and for arbitrary  $K$  it follows since the binomials above are mapped to binomials by pull-backs of maps  $T \rightarrow S$  in  $\mathbf{Fin}$ . Moreover,  $I_n$  is finitely generated (see also [DK14, Lemma 7.4]):

**Lemma 11.** *The ideal  $I_n$  in the  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra  $A_n$  is finitely generated.*

*Proof.* In the determinantal equation (2), if there exist distinct  $j, l \in S_1$  such that  $\alpha_1(j) = \alpha_2(l)$  and  $\beta_1(j) = \beta_2(l)$ , then the equation comes from an equation in  $I_n(S \setminus \{j\})$  via the map  $S \rightarrow S \setminus \{j\}$  that is the identity on  $S \setminus \{j\}$  and maps  $j \rightarrow l$ . By the pigeon hole principle this happens when  $|S_1| > n^2$ . Similarly for  $|S_2| > n^2$ . Hence  $I_n$  is certainly generated by  $I_n([2n^2 - 1])$ .  $\square$

The main result in this section is the following.

**Theorem 12.** *For each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  the coordinate ring  $A_n/I_n$  of the  $\mathbf{Fin}$ -variety  $Q_n^{\leq 1}$  of rank-one tensors is a Noetherian  $\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}}$ -algebra.*

Our proof follows the general technique from [SS17], namely, to pass to a suitable category close to  $\mathbf{Fin}$  that allows for a Gröbner basis argument. However, the relevant well-partial-orderedness proved below is new and quite subtle. We use the category  $\mathbf{OS}$  from [SS17] (also implicit in [DK14, Section 7]) defined as follows.

**Definition 13.** The objects of the category **OS** (“ordered-surjective”) are all finite sets equipped with a linear order and the morphisms  $\pi : S \rightarrow T$  are all surjective maps with the additional property that the function  $T \rightarrow S, j \mapsto \min \pi^{-1}(j)$  is strictly increasing. ♣

Any **Fin**-algebra is also an **OS**-algebra, and **OS**-Noetherianity implies **Fin**-Noetherianity. So to prove Theorem 12 we set out to prove the stronger statement that  $A_n/I_n$  is, in fact, **OS**-Noetherian.

We get a more concrete grip on the  $K$ -algebra  $A_n/I_n$  through the following construction. Let  $M_n$  denote the (Abelian) **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-monoid defined by

$$M_n(S) := \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{[n] \times S} \mid \forall j, l \in S : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{il} \right\},$$

in which the multiplication is given by addition, and where the pull-back of a map  $\pi : S \rightarrow T$  is the map  $\pi^* : M_n(T) \rightarrow M_n(S)$  sending  $(\alpha_{ij})_{i \in [n], j \in T}$  to  $(\alpha_{i\pi(j)})_{i \in [n], j \in S}$ . So elements of  $M_n(S)$  are matrices with nonnegative integral entries and constant column sum. Let  $KM_n$  denote the **Fin**-algebra sending  $S$  to the monoid  $K$ -algebra  $KM_n(S)$ . The following proposition is a reformulation of a well-known fact.

**Proposition 14.** *The **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-algebra  $A_n/I_n$  is isomorphic to the **Fin**<sup>op</sup>-algebra  $KM_n$  (and the same is true when both are regarded as **OS**<sup>op</sup>-algebras).*

*Proof.* For each finite set  $S$ , the  $K$ -algebra homomorphism  $\Phi_S : A_n(S) \rightarrow KM_n(S)$  that sends  $x_\alpha, \alpha \in [n]^S$  to the  $[n] \times S$  matrix in  $M_n(S)$  with a 1 at the positions  $(\alpha_j, j)$ ,  $j \in S$  and zeroes elsewhere is surjective and has as kernel the ideal  $I_n(S)$ . Moreover, if  $\pi : S \rightarrow T$  is a morphism in **Fin**, then we have  $\Phi_T \pi^* = \pi^* \Phi_S$ , i.e., the  $(\Phi_S)_S$  define a natural transformation. □

Choose any monomial order  $>$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , i.e., a well-order such that  $a > b$  implies  $a + c > b + c$  for every  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Then for each object  $S$  in **OS** we define a linear order  $>$  on  $M_n(S)$ , as follows:  $\alpha > \beta$  if  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and the smallest  $j \in S$  with  $\alpha_{\cdot, j} \neq \beta_{\cdot, j}$  (i.e., the  $j$ -th column of  $\alpha$  is not equal to that of  $\beta$ ) satisfies  $\alpha_{\cdot, j} > \beta_{\cdot, j}$  in the chosen monomial order on  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . A straightforward verification shows that this is a monomial order on  $M_n(S)$  (we call the elements of  $M_n(S)$  monomials, even though  $KM_n(S)$  is not a polynomial ring). Moreover, for various  $S$ , these orders are interrelated as follows.

**Lemma 15.** *For any  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S, T)$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in M_n(T)$ , we have  $\alpha > \beta \Rightarrow \pi^* \alpha > \pi^* \beta$ .*

*Proof.* If  $j \in T$  is the smallest column index where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  differ, then  $\alpha' := \pi^* \alpha$  and  $\beta' := \pi^* \beta$  differ in column  $l := \min \pi^{-1}(j)$ , where they equal  $\alpha_{\cdot, j}$  and  $\beta_{\cdot, j}$ , respectively, and the former is larger than the latter. Furthermore, if  $l'$  is the smallest position where  $\alpha', \beta'$  differ, then  $\alpha_{\cdot, \pi(l')} \neq \beta_{\cdot, \pi(l')}$  and hence  $\pi(l') \geq j$  and hence  $l' = \min \pi^{-1}(\pi(l')) \geq \min \pi^{-1}(j) = l$ . Hence in fact  $l = l'$  and  $\pi^* \alpha > \pi^* \beta$ . □

In addition to the well-order  $\leq$  on each individual  $M_n(S)$ , we also need the following partial order  $|$  on the union of all of them.

**Definition 16.** Let  $S, T$  be objects in **OS**. We say that  $\alpha \in M_n(T)$  *divides*  $\beta \in M_n(S)$  if there exist a  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S, T)$  and a  $\gamma \in M_n(S)$  such that  $\beta = \gamma + \pi^* \alpha$ . In this case, we write  $\alpha | \beta$ . ♣

The key combinatorial property of the relation just defined is the following.

**Proposition 17.** *The relation  $|$  is a well-quasi-order, that is, for any sequence  $\alpha^{(1)} \in M_n(S_1), \alpha^{(2)} \in M_n(S_2), \dots$  there exist  $i < j$  such that  $\alpha^{(i)} | \alpha^{(j)}$ .*

*Proof.* First, to each  $\alpha \in M_n(S)$  we associate the monomial ideal  $P(\alpha)$  in the polynomial ring  $R := K[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  (here  $K$  is but a place holder) generated by the monomials  $z^{\alpha \cdot j}$ ,  $j \in S$ . The crucial fact that we will use about monomial ideals in  $R$  is that in any sequence  $P_1, P_2, \dots$  of such ideals there exist  $i < j$  such that  $P_i \supseteq P_j$ —in other words, monomial ideals are well-quasi-ordered with respect to reverse inclusion [Mac01].

To prove the proposition, suppose, on the contrary, that there exists a sequence as above with  $\alpha^{(i)} \not| \alpha^{(j)}$  for all  $i < j$ . Such a sequence is called *bad*. Then by basic properties of well-quasi-orders, some bad sequence exists in which moreover

$$(3) \quad P(\alpha^{(1)}) \supseteq P(\alpha^{(2)}) \supseteq \dots$$

Among all bad sequences *with this additional property* choose one in which, for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ , the cardinality  $|S_j|$  is minimal among all bad sequences starting with  $\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(j-1)}$ .

Write  $\alpha^{(j)} = (\gamma^{(j)} | \beta^{(j)})$ , where  $\beta^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  is the last column (the one labelled by the largest element of  $S_j$ ), and  $\gamma^{(j)}$  is the remainder. By Dickson's lemma, there exists a subsequence  $j_1 < j_2 < \dots$  such that  $\beta^{(j_1)}, \beta^{(j_2)}, \dots$  increase weakly in the coordinate-wise ordering on  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . By restricting to a further subsequence, we may moreover assume that also

$$(4) \quad P(\gamma^{(j_1)}) \supseteq P(\gamma^{(j_2)}) \supseteq \dots$$

Then consider the new sequence

$$\alpha^{(1)}, \dots, \alpha^{(j_1-1)}, \gamma^{(j_1)}, \gamma^{(j_2)}, \dots$$

By (4) and (3), and since  $P(\alpha^{(j)}) \supseteq P(\gamma^{(j)})$ , this sequence also satisfies (3). We claim that, furthermore, it is bad.

Suppose, for instance, that  $\gamma^{(j_1)} | \gamma^{(j_2)}$ . Set  $a_i := \max S_{j_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then there exists a  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S_{j_2} \setminus \{a_2\}, S_{j_1} \setminus \{a_1\})$  such that  $\gamma^{(j_2)} - \pi^* \gamma^{(j_1)} \in M_n(S_{j_2} \setminus \{a_2\})$ . But then extend  $\pi$  to an element  $\pi$  of  $\text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S_{j_2}, S_{j_1})$  by setting  $\pi(a_2) := a_1$ ; since  $\beta^{(j_1)}$  is coordinate-wise smaller than  $\beta^{(j_2)}$  we find that  $\alpha^{(j_2)} - \pi^* \alpha^{(j_1)} \in M_n(S_{j_2})$ , so  $\alpha^{(j_1)} | \alpha^{(j_2)}$ , in contradiction to the badness of the original sequence.

On the other hand, suppose for instance that  $\alpha^{(1)} | \gamma^{(j_2)}$  and write  $a_2 := \max S_{j_2}$ . Then there exists a  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S_{j_2} \setminus \{a_2\}, S_1)$  such that  $\gamma^{(j_2)} - \pi^* (\alpha^{(1)}) \in M_n(S_{j_2} \setminus \{a_2\})$ . Now, *and this is why we required that (3) holds*, since  $P(\alpha^{(j_2)}) \subseteq P(\alpha^{(1)})$ , there exists an element  $s \in S_1$  such that the column  $\beta^{(j_2)}$  is coordinatewise at least as large as the  $s$ -th column of  $\alpha^{(1)}$ . Extend  $\pi$  to an element of  $\text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S_{j_2}, S_1)$  by setting  $\pi(a_2) = s$ . Since  $a_2$  is the maximal element of  $S_{j_2}$ , this does not destroy the property that the



function  $\min \pi^{-1}(\cdot)$  be increasing in its argument. Moreover, this  $\pi$  has the property that  $\alpha^{(j_2)} - \pi^* \alpha^{(1)} \in M_n(S_{j_2})$ , again a contradiction.

Since we have found a bad sequence satisfying (3) but with strictly smaller underlying set at the  $j_1$ -st position, we have arrived at a contradiction.  $\square$

Next we use a Gröbner basis argument.

*Proof of Theorem 12.* We prove the stronger statement that  $KM_n$  is Noetherian as an **OS**-algebra. Let  $P$  be any ideal in  $A_n/I_n = KM_n$ . For each object  $S$  in **OS**, let  $L(S) \subseteq M_n(S)$  denote the set of leading terms of nonzero elements of  $P(S)$  relative to the ordering  $>$ . Proposition 17 implies that there exists a finite collection  $S_1, \dots, S_N$  and  $\alpha^{(j)} \in L(S_j)$  such that each element of each  $L(S)$  is divisible by some  $\alpha^{(j)}$ . Correspondingly, there exist elements  $f_j \in P(S_j)$  with leading monomial  $\alpha^{(j)}$  and leading coefficient 1. To see that the  $f_j$  generate  $P$ , suppose that there exists an  $S$  such that  $P(S)$  is not contained in the ideal generated by the  $f_j$ , and let  $g \in P(S)$  have minimal leading term  $\beta$  among all elements of  $P(S)$  not in the ideal generated by the  $f_j$ ; without loss of generality  $g$  has leading coefficient 1. By construction, there exists some  $j$  and some  $\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OS}}(S, S_j)$  such that  $\beta - \pi^* \alpha^{(j)} \in M_n(S)$ . But now, by Lemma 15, we find that the leading monomial of  $\pi^* f_j$  equals  $\pi^* \alpha^{(j)}$ , hence subtracting a monomial times  $\pi^* f_j$  from  $g$  we obtain an element of  $P(S)$  with smaller leading monomial that is not in the ideal generated by the  $f_j$ —a contradiction.  $\square$

Below, we need the following generalisation of Theorem 12.

**Theorem 18.** *For any  $n_1, \dots, n_r \in (\mathbb{Z})_{\geq 0}$  the **Fin**-algebra (or **OS**-algebra)  $(A_{n_1}/I_{n_1}) \otimes \dots \otimes (A_{n_r}/I_{n_r})$  is Noetherian.*

*Proof.* This algebra is isomorphic to  $B := K(M_{n_1} \times \dots \times M_{n_r})$ . There is a natural embedding  $\iota : M_{n_1} \times \dots \times M_{n_r} \rightarrow M_{n_1 + \dots + n_r} =: M_n$  by forming a block matrix; its image consists of block matrices with constant partial column sums. And while a subalgebra of a Noetherian algebra is not necessarily Noetherian, this is true in the current setting.

The crucial point is that if  $\alpha_i \in (M_{n_1} \times \dots \times M_{n_r})(S_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , then *a priori*  $\iota(\alpha_1) \iota(\alpha_2)$  only means that  $\iota(\alpha_2) - \pi^* \iota(\alpha_1) \in M_n(S_2)$ ; but since both summands have constant partial column sums, so does their difference, so in fact, the difference lies in the image of  $\iota$ . With this observation, the proof above for the case where  $r = 1$  goes through unaltered for arbitrary  $r$ .  $\square$

**Remark 19.** Similar arguments for passing to sub-algebras are also used in [HS12] and [Dra10].  $\clubsuit$

#### 4. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section we prove Theorems 1 and 7.

**Toric fibre products.** To prove Theorem 7, we work with a product of  $s$  copies of the category **Fin**; one for each of the varieties  $X_i$  whose iterated fibre products are under consideration. Let  $s, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . For each  $i \in [s]$  and  $j \in [r]$  let  $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and set

$V_{ij} := K^{d_{ij}}$ . Consider the  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -variety  $\mathcal{V}$  that assigns to an  $s$ -tuple  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_s)$  the product

$$\prod_{j=1}^r \bigotimes_{i=1}^s V_{ij}^{\otimes S_i}$$

and to a morphism  $\pi = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_s) : S \rightarrow T := (T_1, \dots, T_s)$  in  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$  the linear map  $\mathcal{V}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(T)$  determined by

$$(5) \quad \left( \otimes_i \otimes_{k \in S_i} v_{ijk} \right)_{j \in [r]} \mapsto \left( \otimes_i \otimes_{l \in T_i} \left( \bigcirc_{k \in \pi_i^{-1}(l)} v_{ijk} \right) \right)_{j \in [r]},$$

where the Hadamard product  $\bigcirc$  is the one on  $V_{ij}$ . Let  $Q^{\leq 1}(S)$  be the Zariski-closed subset of  $\mathcal{V}(S)$  consisting of  $r$ -tuples of tensors of rank at most one; thus  $Q^{\leq 1}$  is a  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -subvariety of  $\mathcal{V}$ .

For each  $i \in [s]$  let  $X_i \subseteq \prod_{j=1}^r V_{ij}$  be a Hadamard-stable Zariski-closed subset. Then for any tuple  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_s)$  in  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$  the variety  $X(S) := X_1^{*S_1} * \dots * X_s^{*S_s}$  is a Zariski-closed subset of  $\mathcal{V}(S)$ .

**Lemma 20.** *The association  $S \mapsto X(S)$  defines a  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -closed subvariety of  $Q^{\leq 1}$ .*

*Proof.* From the definition of  $*$  in (1) it is clear that the elements of  $X(S)$  are  $r$ -tuples of tensors of rank at most 1. Furthermore, for a morphism  $S \rightarrow T$  in  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$  the linear map  $\mathcal{V}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(T)$  from (5) sends  $X(S)$  into  $X(T)$ —here we use that if  $(v_{i,j,k})_{j \in [r]} \in X_i$  for each  $k \in \pi^{-1}(l)$ , then also  $(\bigcirc_{k \in \pi^{-1}(l)} v_{i,j,k})_{j \in [r]} \in X_i$  since  $X_i$  is Hadamard-stable.  $\square$

Now Theorem 7 follows once we know that the coordinate ring of  $Q^{\leq 1}$  is a Noetherian  $(\mathbf{Fin}^s)^{\text{op}}$ -algebra. For  $s = 1$  and  $r = 1$  this is Theorem 12 with  $n$  equal to  $d_{11}$ . For  $s = 1$  and general  $r$ , this is Theorem 18 with  $n_j$  equal to  $d_{1j}$ .

For  $r = 1$  and general  $s$ , Theorem 7 follows from a  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -analogue of Theorem 12, which is proved as follows. The coordinate ring of  $Q^{\leq 1}(S_1, \dots, S_s)$  is the subring of  $K(M_{d_{11}}(S_1) \times \dots \times M_{d_{s1}}(S_s))$  spanned by the monomials corresponding to  $s$ -tuples of matrices with the *same* constant column sum. Using Proposition 17 and the fact that a finite product of well-quasi-ordered sets is well-quasi-ordered one finds that the natural  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -analogue on  $M_{d_{11}} \times \dots \times M_{d_{s1}}$  of the division relation  $|$  is a well-quasi-order; and this implies, once again, that the coordinate ring of  $Q^{\leq 1}$  is a Noetherian  $(\mathbf{OS}^s)^{\text{op}}$ -algebra.

Finally, for general  $s$  and general  $r$ , the result follows as in the proof of Theorem 18. This proves the Theorem 7 in full generality.  $\square$

**Remark 21.** The only place where we used that the  $X_i$  contain the all-one vector is in the proof of Lemma 20 when  $\pi^{-1}(l)$  happens to be empty. If we do not require this, then the conclusion of Theorem 7 still holds, since one can work directly with the category  $\mathbf{OS}^s$  in which morphisms  $\pi$  are surjective.

**Remark 22.** If we replace the  $X_i$  by Hadamard-stable closed subschemes rather than subvarieties, then  $S \mapsto X(S)$  is still a  $\mathbf{Fin}^s$ -closed subscheme of  $Q^{\leq 1}$ , and since the coordinate ring of the latter is Noetherian, the proof goes through unaltered.

**Remark 23.** In the Independent Set Theorem from [HS12], the graph  $G = (N, E)$  is fixed but the state space sizes  $d_j$  grow unboundedly for  $j$  in an independent set  $T \subseteq N$  and are fixed for  $j \notin T$ . In this case, given a  $T$ -tuple of maps  $(\pi_j : S_j \rightarrow P_j)_{j \in T}$  of finite sets, where  $S_j$  is thought of as the state space of  $j \in T$  in the smaller model and  $P_j$  as the state space in the larger model, we obtain a natural map from the larger model into the smaller model. Hence then the graphical model is naturally a  $(\mathbf{Fin}^{\text{op}})^T$ -variety and its coordinate ring is a  $\mathbf{Fin}^T$ -algebra. Note the reversal of the roles of these two categories compared to Lemma 20.

**Markov random fields.** Given a finite (undirected, simple) graph  $G = (N, E)$  with a number  $d_j$  of states attached to each node  $j \in N$ , the graphical model is  $X_G := \overline{\text{im } \varphi_G}$ , where  $\varphi_G$  is the parameterisation

$$\varphi_G : \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{j \in N} [d_j]}, \quad (\theta_\alpha^C)_{C, \alpha} \mapsto \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \theta_{\beta|_C}^C \right)_\beta.$$

**Lemma 24.** *For any finite graph  $G$ , the graphical model  $X_G$  is Hadamard-closed.*

*Proof.* The parameterisation  $\varphi$  sends the all-one vector in the domain to the all-one vector  $\mathbf{1}$  in the target space, so  $\mathbf{1} \in \text{im } \varphi$ . Moreover, if  $\theta, \theta'$  are two parameter vectors, then  $\varphi(\theta \circ \theta') = \varphi(\theta) \circ \varphi(\theta')$ , so  $\text{im } \varphi$  is Hadamard-closed. Then so is its closure.  $\square$

Following [Sul07], we relate graph glueing to toric fibre products. We are given finite graphs  $G_1, \dots, G_s$  with node sets  $N_1, \dots, N_s$  such that  $N_i \cap N_k = N_0$  for all  $i \neq k$  in  $[s]$  and such that each  $G_i$  induces the same graph  $H$  on  $N_0$ . Moreover, for each  $j \in \bigcup_i N_i$  we fix a number  $d_j$  of states.

For each  $\beta_0 \in \prod_{j \in N_0} [d_j]$  and each  $i \in [s]$  set  $V_{i, \beta_0} := \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{j \in N_i \setminus N_0} [d_j]}$ , which we interpret as the ambient space of the part of the probability table of the variables  $X_j, j \in N_i$  where we have fixed the states of the variables in  $N_0$  to  $\beta_0$ —up to scaling, these are the conditional joint probabilities for the  $X_j, j \in N_i \setminus N_0$  given that the  $X_j, j \in N_0$  are in joint state  $\beta_0$ . For  $\beta \in \prod_{j \in N_i} [d_j]$  write  $\beta = \beta_0 \| \beta'$  where  $\beta_0, \beta'$  are the restrictions of  $\beta$  to  $N_0$  and  $N_i \setminus N_0$ , respectively. For each maximal clique  $C$  in  $G_i$  define  $C_0 = C \cap N_0$  and  $C' = C \setminus N_0$ . Correspondingly, decompose  $\alpha \in \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]$  as  $\alpha = \alpha_0 \| \alpha'$ , where  $\alpha_0, \alpha'$  are the restrictions of  $\alpha$  to  $C_0$  and  $C'$ , respectively.

Then the graphical model  $X_{G_i} := \overline{\text{im } \varphi_{G_i}}$  is the closure of the image of the parameterisation

$$\varphi_i : \mathbb{C}^{\prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_i)} \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]} \rightarrow \prod_{\beta_0 \in \prod_{j \in N_0} [d_j]} V_{i, \beta_0}, \quad (\theta_\alpha^C)_{C, \alpha} \mapsto \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_i)} \theta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0})}^C \| (\beta'|_{C'}) \right)_{\beta'} \right)_{\beta_0}.$$

Setting  $r := \prod_{j \in N_0} d_j$ , we are exactly in the setting of the previous sections: for each  $i, k \in [s]$ , we have the bilinear map

$$* : \prod_{\beta_0} V_{i, \beta_0} \times \prod_{\beta_0} V_{k, \beta_0} \rightarrow \prod_{\beta_0} (V_{i, \beta_0} \otimes V_{k, \beta_0}), \quad ((v_{i, \beta_0})_{\beta_0}, (v_{k, \beta_0})_{\beta_0}) \mapsto (v_{i, \beta_0} \otimes v_{k, \beta_0})_{\beta_0},$$

and we can take iterated products of this type. The space on the right is naturally isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^{\prod_{j \in N_1 \cup N_2} [d_j]}$ , the space of probability tables for the joint distribution

of the variables labelled by the vertices in the glued graph  $G_i +_H G_k$ . Under this identification we have the following.

**Proposition 25.** *For  $G := \sum_H^{a_1} G_1 +_H \cdots +_H \sum_H^{a_s} G_s$  we have  $X_G = X_{G_1}^{*a_1} * \cdots * X_{G_s}^{*a_s}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove this for the gluing of two graphs. Note that a clique in  $G := G_1 +_H G_2$  is contained entirely in either  $G_1$  or  $G_2$ , or in both but then already in  $H$ . Let  $\theta, \eta$  be a parameter vectors in the domains of  $\varphi_{G_1}, \varphi_{G_2}$ , respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \varphi_{G_1}(\theta) * \varphi_{G_2}(\eta) \\
&= \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_1)} \theta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta'} \right)_{\beta_0} * \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_2)} \eta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta'} \right)_{\beta_0} \\
&= \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_1)} \theta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta' \in \prod_{j \in N_1 \setminus N_0} [d_j]} \otimes \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_2)} \eta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta' \in \prod_{j \in N_2 \setminus N_0} [d_j]} \right)_{\beta_0} \\
&= \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_1)} \theta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \cdot \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G_2)} \eta_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta' \in \prod_{j \in (N_1 \cup N_2) \setminus N_0} [d_j]} \right)_{\beta_0} \\
&= \left( \left( \prod_{C \in \text{mcl}(G)} \mu_{(\beta_0|_{C_0}) \parallel (\beta'|_{C'})}^C \right)_{\beta' \in \prod_{j \in (N_1 \cup N_2) \setminus N_0} [d_j]} \right)_{\beta_0} = \varphi_G(\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

where, for  $C \in \text{mcl}(G)$  and  $\alpha \in \prod_{j \in C} [d_j]$ , the parameter  $\mu_\alpha^C$  is defined as

$$\mu_\alpha^C := \begin{cases} \theta_\alpha^C & \text{if } C \subseteq N_1 \text{ and } C \not\subseteq N_0, \\ \eta_\alpha^C & \text{if } C \subseteq N_2 \text{ and } C \not\subseteq N_0, \text{ and} \\ \theta_\alpha^C \eta_\alpha^C & \text{if } C \subseteq N_0. \end{cases}$$

This computation proves that  $X_{G_1} * X_{G_2} \subseteq X_G$ . Conversely, given any parameter vector  $\mu$  for  $G$ , we can let  $\theta$  be the restriction of  $\mu$  to maximal cliques of the first and third type above, and set  $\eta_\alpha^C$  equal to  $\mu_\alpha^C$  if  $C$  is of the second type above and equal to 1 if it is of the third type. This yields the opposite inclusion.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* By Proposition 25, the ideal  $I_G$  is the ideal of the iterated toric fibre product  $X_{G_1}^{*a_1} * \cdots * X_{G_s}^{*a_s}$ . By Lemma 24, each of the varieties  $X_{G_i}$  is Hadamard closed. Hence Theorem 7 applies, and  $I_G$  is generated by polynomials of degree less than some  $D$ , which is independent of  $a_1, \dots, a_s$ . Then it is also generated by the binomials of at most degree  $D$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [DK14] Jan Draisma and Jochen Kuttler. Bounded-rank tensors are defined in bounded degree. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(1):35–63, 2014.
- [Dra10] Jan Draisma. Finiteness for the k-factor model and chirality varieties. *Adv. Math.*, 223:243–256, 2010.
- [DS98] Persi Diaconis and Bernd Sturmfels. Algebraic algorithms for sampling from conditional distributions. *Ann. Stat.*, 26(1):363–397, 1998.

- [EKS14] Alexander Engström, Thomas Kahle, and Seth Sullivant. Multigraded commutative algebra of graph decompositions. *J. Algebr. Comb.*, 39(2):335–372, 2014.
- [ES96] David Eisenbud and Bernd Sturmfels. Binomial ideals. *Duke Math. J.*, 84(1):1–45, 1996.
- [HC71] J.M. Hammersley and P. Clifford. Markov fields on finite graphs and lattices. Unpublished, <http://www.statslab.cam.ac.uk/~grg/books/hammfest/hamm-cliff.pdf>, 1971.
- [HS12] Christopher J. Hillar and Seth Sullivant. Finite Gröbner bases in infinite dimensional polynomial rings and applications. *Adv. Math.*, 221:1–25, 2012.
- [KR14] Thomas Kahle and Johannes Rauh. Toric fiber products versus Segre products. *Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hamb.*, 84(2):187–201, 2014.
- [Lau98] Steffen L. Lauritzen. *Graphical models*, volume 17 of *Oxford Statistical Science Series*. Oxford Univ. Press., Oxford, 1998.
- [Mac01] Diane MacLagan. Antichains of monomial ideals are finite. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 129(6):1609–1615, 2001.
- [Oos16] Florian M. Oosterhof. *Stabilisation of iterated toric fibre products*. 2016. Master’s thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology, <http://repository.tue.nl/855107>.
- [RS14] Johannes Rauh and Seth Sullivant. The Markov basis of  $k_{3,N}$ . <http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.5936>, 2014.
- [RS16] Johannes Rauh and Seth Sullivant. Lifting Markov bases and higher codimension toric fiber products. *J. Symb. Comp.*, 74:276–307, 2016.
- [Sam17a] Steven V. Sam. Ideals of bounded rank symmetric tensors are generated in bounded degree. *Invent. Math.*, 207(1):1–21, 2017.
- [Sam17b] Steven V. Sam. Syzygies of bounded rank symmetric tensors are generated in bounded degree. *Math. Ann.*, 368(3–4):1095–1108, 2017.
- [Shi12] Takafumi Shibuta. Gröbner bases of contraction ideals. *J. Algebr. Comb.*, 36(1):1–19, 2012.
- [SS17] Steven V. Sam and Andrew Snowden. Gröbner methods for representations of combinatorial categories. *J. Am. Math. Soc.*, 30(1):159–203, 2017.
- [Sul07] Seth Sullivant. Toric fiber products. *J. Algebra*, 316(2):560–577, 2007.

(Jan Draisma) MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF BERN, SIDLERSTRASSE 5, 3012 BERN, SWITZERLAND;  
AND EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:* [jan.draisma@math.unibe.ch](mailto:jan.draisma@math.unibe.ch)

(Florian M. Oosterhof) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY  
OF TECHNOLOGY, P.O. BOX 513, 5600 MB EINDHOVEN, THE NETHERLANDS

*E-mail address:* [f.m.oosterhof@tue.nl](mailto:f.m.oosterhof@tue.nl)