

Normal cones corresponding to credal sets of lower probabilities

Damjan Škulj

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences
Kardeljeva pl. 5, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
damjan.skulj@fdv.uni-lj.si

January 26, 2022

Abstract

Credal sets are one of the most important models describing probabilistic uncertainty. They usually arise as convex sets of probabilistic models compatible with judgments provided in terms of coherent lower previsions or more specific models such as lower probabilities or probability intervals. In finite spaces, credal sets most often have the form of convex polyhedra. Many properties of convex polyhedra can be derived from their normal cones that form polyhedral complexes called normal fans. We analyze the properties of normal cones corresponding to credal sets of lower probabilities. For two important classes of lower probabilities, 2-monotone lower probabilities and probability intervals, we provide a detailed description of the normal fan structure. These structures are related to the structure of extreme points of the credal sets. To obtain our main results, we provide some general results on triangulated normal fans of convex polyhedra and their adjacency structure.

Keywords. normal cone, credal set, convex polyhedron, extreme point, imprecise probability, lower probability

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 60A86, 52B11

1 Introduction

Applications of mathematical models involving probabilities often suffer from insufficient evidence to support a single model. Sticking with classical models consequently requires imposing unwarranted assumptions, leading to unreliable results. The lack of evidence in probabilistic models is frequently described as uncertainty or imprecision. While uncertainty can be understood as a general concept tackled via probabilistic models, imprecision is the term that more explicitly describes situations that no particular

probabilistic model can adequately describe. The theories of imprecise probabilities have been developed to provide methods capable of dealing with such probabilistic models and produce the outputs where the imprecision is faithfully reflected. The probabilistic imprecision is in most cases described with sets of probability distributions, consistent with the available information, instead of a particular precise distribution. The sets are represented by various types of constraints, ranging from the most general lower and upper previsions to more specific lower and upper probabilities, probability intervals, p -boxes, belief and possibility functions, and other models.

In recent years, methods of imprecise probabilities [3, 4, 37] have been applied to various areas of probabilistic modelling, such as stochastic processes [10, 52], game theory [26, 30], reliability theory [8, 21, 31, 49, 59], decision theory [19, 28, 46], financial risk theory [36, 51], computer science [1, 38, 48, 50], copulas [14, 32, 33, 34, 60] and others.

The multiple probabilistic models encompassed by an imprecise model most often form a set that is described via a finite number of constraints that may arise directly from the pieces of available information. If the constraints are linear, they result in convex sets, named *credal sets*. Indeed, all the models mentioned above define convex credal sets. Convexity of the models presents an advantage, as they allow efficient computations via implementing of linear programming techniques.

Beside optimization with respect to credal sets, understanding of the related structures is often important to understand the models. Thus, analysis of the extreme points of credal sets of various models is frequently a subject of interest [2, 25, 27, 57]. Nature and behaviour of the convex sets in extreme points and their neighbourhoods is important in the cases of dynamical systems, such as stochastic processes. These processes typically require solving multiple optimization tasks, where the solution at earlier time steps determine the initial conditions for the later ones. This is important in the discrete time models [10, 52, 42], and even more in the continuous time [9, 22, 53, 54]. The latter models would in principle require optimization with respect to credal set in every point of an interval, which is unfeasible. Discretization methods are then used for calculating approximate solutions [15, 22]. As an alternative to discretization, methods based on normal cones were proposed [53, 54, 55]. Their advantage over discretization methods is that in case a solution within a time interval remains in a single normal cone, the process in that interval is linear. The application of linearity within normal cones is a consequence of a general principle of normal cone additivity that we explicitly state in Proposition 6. Another well-known example is the so-called comonotonic additivity of lower expectations with respect to 2-monotone lower probabilities [13, 40]. Another application of normal cones in the theory of imprecise probabilities was proposed in [43], where a method based on normal cones is developed to estimate the maximal distance between a credal set and its approximation based on a finite

number of constraints.

The goal of the present article is to analyze the structure of complexes comprising of normal cones, also called normal fans, corresponding to credal sets generated by coherent lower probabilities. We propose several general results, and then analyze in detail normal cones corresponding to 2-monotone lower probabilities and probability intervals. The approach with normal cones allows characterization of extreme points of the credal sets. In the case of 2-monotone lower probabilities, characterization previously known from the literature is related with normal cones. However, in the case of probability intervals, whose credal sets are more complex and diverse, our approach with normal cones proves very useful, allowing a detailed analysis of their structure.

The article has the following structure. In the subsequent section we review the underlying theory of convex polyhedra and their normal cones. We are primarily concerned with the minimal cones that may correspond to extreme points. These are characterized in abstract terms of relations between support vectors, which do not depend on particular realization of a convex polyhedron. In Section 2.2, the abstract structure of all possible minimal cones is endowed by an adjacency relation, allowing a graph theoretical interpretation. In Section 3, essential elements of the models of imprecise probabilities are introduced with a specific focus to finitely generated coherent lower previsions and their credal sets. In Section 4 normal cones of credal sets of lower probabilities are introduced and studied in details in the case of 2-monotone lower probabilities in Section 4.1. Finally, in Section 5, normal cones of credal sets corresponding to probability intervals are analyzed.

2 Normal cones

2.1 Normal cones and normal fans of convex polyhedra

We first give some general elements from the theory of convex sets. Most of the notation and results are taken from [16, 17, 18, 39, 61].

Let \mathbb{R}^n be a finite dimensional vector space equipped with the standard scalar product, which we denote by xy or sometimes $x \cdot y$ for any pair of vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A *convex polyhedron* in \mathbb{R}^n is a bounded convex set \mathcal{C} with finitely many extreme points. Equivalently, a convex polyhedron can be represented as an intersection of a finite number of half spaces of the form $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: xf \geq b_f\}$, where $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector and b_f a constant. A convex polyhedron can thus be defined as

$$\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: xf \geq b_f \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}\}, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{F} is a given finite collection of vectors and $\{b_f: f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ a collection of constants. Some of the inequalities $xf \geq b_f$ may in fact be equalities. This

case, however, can be unified with the general case by replacing an equality condition $xf = b_f$ with two inequalities, $xf \geq b_f$ and $x(-f) \geq -b_f$. This will allow us to use the simple description (1) throughout the text.

The set $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ obtained by turning one or more inequalities $xf \geq b_f$ in (1) into an equality $xf = b_f$ is then a *face* of \mathcal{C} . It is also a convex polyhedron of a lower dimension. A face of \mathcal{C} that is not equal to \mathcal{C} is called a *proper face*. The set of elements of \mathcal{C} that are not contained in any proper face is called *relative interior* of \mathcal{C} and denoted by $\text{ri}(\mathcal{C})$.

Now take some point $x \in \mathcal{C}$ and define its *normal cone* to be the set

$$N(\mathcal{C}, x) = \{f \in \mathbb{R}^n : xf \leq yf \text{ for every } y \in \mathcal{C}\}. \quad (2)$$

That is, the normal cone of x is the set of all vectors f for which $x = \arg \min_{y \in \mathcal{C}} yf$. The minimum of the above expression is usually recognized as a linear programming problem where \mathcal{C} is the feasible set. Thus the normal cone of x can be understood as the set of all vectors f such that the objective function yf has an optimal solution in x . It is well-known that only points in the boundary minimize objective functions, and therefore only normal cones for those elements are non-empty. Moreover, every objective function is minimized in at least one extreme point. This implies that the union of the normal cones of extreme points is the entire space \mathbb{R}^n . Basic theory of normal cones can be found in most of the monographs on convex theory. A thorough analysis can also be found in [23], especially from the point of view of normal fans, that also play an important role in this article.

Throughout this article we will be concerned with cones generated as non-negative linear combinations of finite sets of vectors \mathcal{G} , denoted by $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$. Thus,

$$\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}) = \left\{ \sum_{f \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_f f : \alpha_f \geq 0 \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{G} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

If a cone is of the form (3), we will simply say that it is *generated* by \mathcal{G} . A cone consists of its faces and relative interior which is equal to the set of all strictly positive linear combinations of elements in \mathcal{G} :

$$\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})) = \left\{ \sum_{f \in \mathcal{G}} \alpha_f f : \alpha_f > 0 \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{G} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

The following proposition holds (see [16], Proposition 14.1).

Proposition 1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a convex polyhedron represented in the form (1) and $x \in \mathcal{C}$ a boundary point. Let $\mathcal{G}(x) = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : xf = b_f\}$. Then*

$$N(\mathcal{C}, x) = \text{cone}(\mathcal{G}(x)). \quad (5)$$

Moreover, if x is an extreme point of \mathcal{C} , then $\dim N(\mathcal{C}, x) = n$ (dimension of the vector space).

In the case where \mathcal{G} is linearly independent, $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ is called a *simplicial cone*, as the elements of \mathcal{G} form a simplex. Simplicial cones play a central role in this paper. In general, a normal cone may not be simplicial, and will therefore be subdivided into simplicial cone by means of triangulations.

Definition 1 ([20]). A collection \mathcal{P} of polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^n is a *polyhedral complex* if

- (i) all proper faces of $P \in \mathcal{P}$ are in \mathcal{P} ;
- (ii) an intersection of any two polyhedra in \mathcal{P} is a face of both.

If the polyhedra in \mathcal{P} are cones, then we have a *conical complex* or a *fan*.

According to some definitions (see [18]), polyhedral complexes as defined above are called *embedded*, and fans are then embedded conical complexes. If the union of all cones in a fan \mathcal{P} forms the entire \mathbb{R}^n , then the fan is called *complete*. A special case of a complete fan is the collection of all normal cones of a set \mathcal{C} , called *normal fan* and denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C}) = \{N(\mathcal{C}, x) : x \in \mathcal{C}\}$.

For our analysis it will be important that all cones in a fan are simplicial, in which case we are talking about a *simplicial fan*. To transform a polyhedral complex into a simplicial one, the technique called *triangulation* is used. It is a special form of *subdivision*. A *subdivision* of a polyhedral complex \mathcal{P} is another complex \mathcal{P}' such that every polyhedron in \mathcal{P} is a union of polyhedra of \mathcal{P}' . If a subdivision is a simplicial complex, then we are talking about a *triangulation* of \mathcal{P} . It is known that every polyhedral complex has a triangulation, and specifically, every fan has a triangulation. More precisely, the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1 ([18], Theorem 1.54). *Let \mathcal{P} be a conical complex and $\mathcal{F} \subset |\mathcal{P}|$, where $|\mathcal{P}|$ is the union of the cones in \mathcal{P} , be a finite set of non-zero vectors such that $\mathcal{F} \cap C$ generates C for every $C \in \mathcal{P}$. Then there exists a triangulation \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{P} such that $\text{cone}(\{f\})$, for $f \in \mathcal{F}$, are exactly the 1-dimensional faces of the elements of \mathcal{T} .*

In our case we will need triangulations whose 1-dimensional faces are exactly the elements of \mathcal{F} , where \mathcal{F} is a set of vectors generating \mathcal{C} (see (1)).

Corollary 1. *Let \mathcal{C} be a convex polyhedron of the form (1), where \mathcal{F} is a given finite set of vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . Then a conical complex \mathcal{T} exists such that for every $C_T \in \mathcal{T}$ it holds that it is contained in a single normal cone $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and is generated by a linearly independent set $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ be the normal fan of \mathcal{C} . By Proposition 1, every $C \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ is generated by $\mathcal{F} \cap C$, whence by Theorem 1, a triangulation \mathcal{T} of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ exists such that $\text{cone}(\{f\})$ are exactly the 1-dimensional faces of \mathcal{T} . It follows by the definition of triangulation that every cone $C_T \in \mathcal{T}$

is a simplicial cone, whose 1-dimensional faces are of the form $\text{cone}(\{f\})$. Further, such a simplicial cone is then generated by the linearly independent set $\mathcal{G} = \{f: \text{cone}(\{f\}) \text{ is a face of } C_T\}$. Since \mathcal{T} is a triangulation, every such C_T is a subset of some normal cone $C \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$. \square

A triangulation \mathcal{T} of a normal fan $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ is also a fan and will be called *complete normal simplicial fan*. Note that the elements of a complete fan cover entire \mathbb{R}^n . In addition to requiring that \mathcal{T} is a triangulation, we also require that all elements of \mathcal{F} are its 1-dimensional faces. That is, that no $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is in relative interior of some $C_T \in \mathcal{T}$. A characterization of the elements of complete simplicial fans follows.

Proposition 2. *Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ be an element of a complete normal simplicial fan. Then*

- (i) \mathcal{G} is linearly independent;
- (ii) for every $f \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}$ we have that $f \notin \text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$;
- (iii) if $|\mathcal{G}| = \dim \mathbb{R}^n$, then a convex set \mathcal{C} exists such that $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ is its normal cone in an extreme point;
- (iv) a convex set \mathcal{C} exists such that $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ is its normal cone.

Proof. While (i) and (ii) are direct consequences of the definitions, we only prove (iii). Take some vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and set $b_f = xf$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $b_{f'} = xf' - 1$ for $f' \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}$. The set $\mathcal{C} = \{y: yf \geq b_f, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is clearly a convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n . By the definition, $xf \geq b_f$ for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$, whence $x \in \mathcal{C}$. To see that x is an extreme point, suppose it were a convex combination of two other points in \mathcal{C} , say u and v . By the construction, $uf = vf = b_f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G}$. But the corresponding linear system has full rank and therefore x is its unique solution, whence $u = v = x$. Also by construction, $f \in \mathcal{G}$ are the only vectors in \mathcal{F} that lie in $N(\mathcal{C}, x)$, whence by Proposition 1, $N(\mathcal{C}, x) = \text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$, as claimed.

(iv). A linearly independent \mathcal{G} can be completed to a basis \mathcal{G}' . By (iii), $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})'$ is a normal cone in an extreme point. Hence, $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ as its face is a normal cone as well. \square

Definition 2. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a basis of \mathbb{R}^n , i.e. linearly independent with $|\mathcal{G}| = \dim \mathbb{R}^n$. A cone of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$, such that $f \notin \text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}$, is called a *maximal elementary simplicial cone (MESc)*.

As follows from Proposition 2, maximal elements of complete normal simplicial fans of convex polyhedra are exactly MESCs. However, this does not mean that every MESc is an element of a complete normal simplicial fan of a particular polyhedron \mathcal{C} generated by \mathcal{F} . There are two main reasons for this. The first reason is that a normal fan $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{C})$ may have multiple different

triangulations. The second, deeper reason is that different polyhedra in general have different normal fans. Moreover, if two polyhedra have the same normal fan, then they are said to be *normally equivalent* (see [11]).

In the sequel we focus on the set of possible MESC. We will analyze their structure in particular cases related to models of imprecise probabilities. Every complete normal simplicial fan contains MESC together with their lower dimensional faces as building blocks. Not all collections fit together, though. A useful tool for the analysis of possible configurations of extreme points in polyhedra is the endowment of the graph structure to the set of its extreme points. In the next section we build on this idea to generate a graph on the set of all MESC, which can reveal some structural properties of normal fans and especially their triangulated forms.

2.2 Adjacent cones and graph theoretical properties of maximal elementary simplicial cones

A convex polyhedron \mathcal{C} can be endowed a graph structure, where the extreme points are taken as vertices. An edge between two vertices is then a one dimensional face of \mathcal{C} with the given vertices as extreme points. In this section we extend the graph structure to the set of MESC. They are related to the extreme points in the sense described by Proposition 2. Every complete normal simplicial fan is obtained as a simplicial complex comprising of MESC. The graph structure introduced in the sequel will give us some insights about combining MESC to building the fans, and consequently about the possible polyhedral structures obtained in the form (1).

We start with the notion of adjacency. Two extreme points of a convex polyhedron \mathcal{C} are adjacent if they are connected by an edge. The normal cone corresponding to the edge, which is a one-dimensional face of \mathcal{C} , is a common face of the normal cones corresponding to the two extreme points. Moreover, the intersection of the two normal cones is exactly the common face of codimension 1, which means that their relative interiors are disjoint. We use this property as a definition of adjacency of two MESC.

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' be two subsets of \mathcal{F} , so that the corresponding cones $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ are MESC. Then the cones are said to be adjacent if they intersect in a common face of codimension 1.

The following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 2. Let cones $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ be adjacent MESC. Then $|\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'| = |\mathcal{G}| - 1 = |\mathcal{G}'| - 1$.

The converse of the above corollary is not true, though. That is, if we have two sets \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' differing in one element, the corresponding cones are not necessarily adjacent. The reason is that their intersection may be

larger than the common face. The following lemma gives the necessary and sufficient conditions for adjacency.

Lemma 1. *Let cones $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ be MESCs such that $|\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'| = |\mathcal{G}| - 1 = |\mathcal{G}'| - 1$. Let \mathcal{H} be the hyperplane generated by $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'$ and t its normal (non-zero) vector. Further let $f \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}'$ and $f' \in \mathcal{G}' \setminus \mathcal{G}$. Then $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ are adjacent if and only if $(f \cdot t)(f' \cdot t) < 0$, i.e. the scalar products with the normal vector have opposite signs.*

Proof. Denote the vectors in $\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'$ with f_1, \dots, f_{n-1} and without loss of generality we can assume that $\|t\| = 1$. By definition, $t \cdot f_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, t\}$ forms a basis of \mathbb{R}^n . We can therefore write

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i f_i + \alpha t, \quad (6)$$

$$f' = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i f_i + \beta t. \quad (7)$$

We have that $f \cdot t = \alpha \|t\|^2 = \alpha$ and $f' \cdot t = \beta$.

We first prove that $\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})) \cap \text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')) \neq \emptyset$ implies that $\alpha\beta > 0$. Let $h \in \text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})) \cap \text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}'))$. Then we have that for some $\gamma_i > 0, \delta_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $\gamma, \delta > 0$,

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma_i f_i + \gamma f = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma_i f_i + \gamma \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \alpha_i f_i + \alpha t \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \gamma'_i f_i + \gamma \alpha t \quad (8)$$

and

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_i f_i + \delta f' = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta_i f_i + \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i f_i + \beta t \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \delta'_i f_i + \delta \beta t. \quad (9)$$

By the uniqueness of linear combinations of the basis vectors, we obtain that $\gamma\alpha = \delta\beta$. Now, since γ and δ are strictly positive, α and β must be of equal sign. This completes the first part of the proof.

The second part of the proof is to show conversely that $\alpha\beta > 0$ implies $\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})) \cap \text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')) \neq \emptyset$. To see this, we only need to show that an h of the form (8) and (9) exists. Suppose $\gamma_i > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ are given. Then we set $\delta = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}\gamma$, which is of positive sign because of the equal sign of α and β . Now for every i equating both expression gives:

$$\gamma'_i = \gamma_i + \gamma\alpha_i = \delta'_i = \delta_i + \delta\beta_i. \quad (10)$$

Solving the above equation for δ_i gives $\delta_i = \gamma_i + \gamma\alpha_i - \delta\beta_i$, which for sufficiently large γ_i can be made positive for every $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

Corollary 3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a polyhedron and \mathcal{T} its complete normal simplicial fan. Let $C, C' \in \mathcal{T}$ be a pair of adjacent MESCs. Then exactly one of the following holds:*

- (i) *An extreme point $x \in \mathcal{C}$ exists such that $C, C' \subseteq N(\mathcal{C}, x)$.*
- (ii) *A pair of extreme points x, x' exists that lie in a common 1-dimensional face of \mathcal{T} such that $C \subseteq N(\mathcal{C}, x)$ and $C' \subseteq N(\mathcal{C}, x')$.*

Proof. Assume \mathcal{C} in the form (1). Cones C and C' are then of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ respectively where both \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' are bases of \mathbb{R}^n . Moreover, both C and C' lie within single normal cones – not necessarily the same, that correspond to extreme points, say x and x' . If $x = x'$, then (i) holds. Now assume that $x \neq x'$. By adjacency, we have that $|\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'| = n - 1$. Normal cone containing $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}')$ corresponds to a face F of \mathcal{C} satisfying $yf = b_f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{G}'$ and every $y \in F$. The face F is therefore a subset of the set of solutions of $n - 1$ independent linear equations, which is a 1-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . Consequently, F must be an at most 1-dimensional face containing x and x' , which are both particular solutions of the same set of linear equations. As assumed, $x \neq x'$, which implies that F is exactly one dimensional face containing both points. \square

With \mathbb{F} we now denote the set of all MESCs. This set represents all possible maximal simplicial cones of polyhedra in the form (1). Let $G = (\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{E})$ be the graph with the set of vertices \mathbb{F} and the set of edges $\mathbb{E} = \{(C, C') : C, C' \in \mathbb{F}, C \text{ and } C' \text{ are adjacent}\}$.

Proposition 3. *Let \mathcal{T} be a complete normal simplicial fan of a polyhedron of the form (1) and let \mathbb{T} denote the set of its n -dimensional simplices. Then the subgraph $G(\mathcal{T})$ of $G(\mathbb{F}, \mathbb{E})$ with vertices \mathbb{T} is connected and n -regular.*

Proof. To see that the graph is n -regular, recall that $|\mathbb{T}| = \mathbb{R}^n$. Every cone $C_T \in \mathbb{T}$ is simplicial and thus has exactly n faces of codimension 1. As there are no border faces, every such face is then also a part of another, adjacent cone.

It is also clear that every two simplicial cones are connected by a chain of cones where each one has a common face of codimension 1 with the neighbours in the chain. \square

Every MESC cone(\mathcal{G}) defines a unique vector x satisfying $xf = b_f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G}$. Not every such vector however is an extreme point in \mathcal{C} . A characterization follows.

Proposition 4. *A MESC cone(\mathcal{G}) lies within the normal cone of an extreme point $x \in \mathcal{C}$ of the form (1) if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $xf = b_f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{G}$;

(ii) $xf \geq b_f$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Condition (ii) implies that $x \in \mathcal{C}$, while condition (i) implies that it is a face of dimension 0. The dimension follows by linear independence of \mathcal{G} . Hence, x is an extreme point in \mathcal{C} . \square

Now let \mathcal{C} be given and let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ be a MESC within a normal cone $N(\mathcal{C}, x)$. The set \mathbb{F} contains all MESC's corresponding to extreme points in \mathcal{C} , but not every cone in \mathbb{F} corresponds to an extreme point. Additionally, we know that those cones in \mathbb{F} that are adjacent to $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ are exactly those corresponding to the same extreme point x or an adjacent one, as follows by Corollary 3. Moreover, every adjacent MESC is of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$, where, by Corollary 2, $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{G} \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{f'\}$. The following proposition shows that given $f \in \mathcal{G}$ adjacent cones must correspond to the same adjacent extreme point.

Proposition 5. *Let MESC $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ lie within a normal cone $N(\mathcal{C}, x)$ and take some $f \in \mathcal{G}$. Now suppose that for some f' and $f'' \in \mathcal{F}$ both cones $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{G} \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{f'\}$ and $\mathcal{G}'' = (\mathcal{G} \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{f''\}$ are MESC and they lie within normal cones $N(\mathcal{C}, x')$ and $N(\mathcal{C}, x'')$. Then $x' = x''$. (Possibly, $x' = x'' = x$.)*

Proof. By the assumptions, both $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}')$ and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G}'')$ are adjacent to $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$. Let t be the normal vector to the hyperplane $\text{lin}(\mathcal{G} \setminus \{f\})$. By Lemma 1, $(f' \cdot t)(f'' \cdot t) > 0$, whence the relative interiors of the corresponding cones intersect. Hence, the relative interiors of $N(\mathcal{C}, x')$ and $N(\mathcal{C}, x'')$ intersect, which is only possible if the cones are the same. \square

Remark 1. It is indeed possible that we have multiple adjacent cones to $\text{cone}(\mathcal{G})$ corresponding to the same adjacent extreme point, as they might correspond to different triangulations of $N(\mathcal{C}, x')$. Yet, when a triangulation is fixed, only one adjacent cone of the form $\text{cone}((\mathcal{G} \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{f'\})$ exists per fixed f .

The above propositions would therefore enable identification of all cones corresponding to a complete normal simplicial fan of a convex polyhedron, and consequently an identification and enumeration of its extreme points. The main steps are given by Algorithm 1.

3 Credal sets as imprecise probability models

In this section we introduce the basic concepts of imprecise probabilities used in the paper. When possible, we will stick with the standard terminology used in the theory of imprecise probabilities (see [3, 56]). The main goal

Algorithm 1 Algorithm: find complete simplicial fan and extreme points

```

1: function SIMPLICIALFAN( $\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{b}$ )
2:            $\triangleright$  Inputs: support vector and support function
3:   Initialize: find  $\mathcal{G}$ , such that cone( $\mathcal{G}$ ) is MESC
4:    $V \leftarrow \{\mathcal{G}\}, E \leftarrow \emptyset, G \leftarrow (V, E)$ 
5:            $\triangleright$  Adjacency graph of the members of complete simplicial fan
6:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{ExtremePoint}(\mathcal{G})$ 
7:            $\triangleright$  Collection of extreme points
8:   repeat
9:     Select  $\mathcal{G} \in V$  such that  $\text{deg}(\mathcal{G}) < n$ 
10:    neighbours  $\leftarrow$  Find all neighbour cones corresponding to extreme
    points
11:    neighbours  $\leftarrow$  Remove all duplicate neighbours  $\mathcal{G}'$  having the
    same intersection with  $\mathcal{G}$ 
12:     $V \leftarrow V \cup \text{neighbours}$ 
13:     $E \leftarrow E \cup \{(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}')\}$  for all  $\mathcal{G}' \in \text{neighbours}$ 
14:     $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \cup \{\text{ExtremePoint}(\mathcal{G}')\}$  for all  $\mathcal{G}' \in \text{neighbours}$ 
15:  until ( $G$  is  $n$ -regular)
16: end function

```

of this section is to relate the models of imprecise probabilities with the concepts of convex analysis.

The object of our analysis are *coherent lower previsions* [24, 47] which present one of the most general models of imprecise probabilities. They encompass several particular models, such as *coherent lower and upper probabilities* [12, 35, 58], *2- and n -monotone capacities* [5, 29, 45], *belief* and *plausibility functions* [41, 44] and others. Mathematically, coherent lower previsions are superlinear functionals that can be equivalently represented as lower envelopes of expectation functionals.

Let \mathcal{X} represent a finite set – *sample space*, and \mathbb{R}^n the set of all real-valued maps on \mathcal{X} – *gambles*. By \mathbb{I}_A we will denote the *indicator gamble* of a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$:

$$\mathbb{I}_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

We will write \mathbb{I}_x instead of $\mathbb{I}_{\{x\}}$ for singletons. A *linear prevision* P is an expectation functional with respect to some probability mass vector p on \mathcal{X} . It maps a gamble f into a real number $P(f)$:

$$P(f) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x)f(x). \quad (12)$$

Equivalently, we can write $P(f) = pf$. The set of linear previsions is therefore a subset of \mathbb{R}^n . A *coherent lower prevision* on an arbitrary set of gambles

\mathcal{F} is a mapping $\underline{P}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that allows the representation

$$\underline{P}(f) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{M}(\underline{P})} P(f) \quad (13)$$

for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{M}(\underline{P})$ is a closed and convex set of linear previsions. The set $\mathcal{M}(\underline{P})$ is called the *credal set* of \underline{P} , defined as

$$\mathcal{M}(\underline{P}) = \{P \text{ a linear prevision} : P(f) \geq \underline{P}(f) \text{ for every } f \in \mathcal{F}\}. \quad (14)$$

Given a coherent lower prevision \underline{P} on \mathcal{F} , it is possible to extend it to the set of all gambles \mathbb{R}^n in possibly several different ways. However, there is a unique minimal extension, called the *natural extension*:

$$\underline{E}(f) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{M}(\underline{P})} P(f). \quad (15)$$

As the natural extension is the *lower envelope* or the *support function* of a credal set, containing expectation functionals, we may call a coherent lower prevision defined on the entire \mathbb{R}^n a *lower expectation functional*. A mapping $\underline{P}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where \mathcal{F} is a vector space, is a coherent lower prevision if and only if it satisfies the following axioms ([24]) for all $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$:

- (P1) $\underline{P}(f) \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$ [accepting sure gains];
- (P2) $\underline{P}(\lambda f) = \lambda \underline{P}(f)$ [positive homogeneity];
- (P3) $\underline{P}(f + g) \geq \underline{P}(f) + \underline{P}(g)$ [superlinearity].

An easy consequence of the definitions is *constant additivity*:

$$\underline{P}(f + \lambda \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}) = \underline{P}(f) + \lambda \quad (16)$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. In particular, the above relations hold for a natural extension \underline{E} of a coherent lower prevision \underline{P} .

Together with a coherent lower prevision, the notion of *coherent upper prevision* \overline{P} is often introduced. Assuming the domain is a vector space, the conjugacy relation $\underline{P}(f) = -\overline{P}(-f)$ is a straightforward consequence of coherence. Therefore, instead of considering the pairs of lower and upper previsions, the set $-\mathcal{F} = \{-f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is added to the domain of \underline{P} together with the relations induced by conjugacy.

3.1 Lower probabilities and probability intervals

It follows from the definition of a lower prevision that its domain \mathcal{F} may only be a finite subset of \mathbb{R}^n . In fact, $\underline{P}(f)$ are often some judgments representing the available information regarding the expectations of gambles. According to the philosophy of imprecise probabilities, probability models

should not assume more information than provided. Hence, in general multiple probabilistic models fit given information. The natural extension then allows taking in consideration all compatible models simultaneously, which is considered the main advantage of imprecise models over classical ones.

A lower prevision whose domain \mathcal{F} consists of indicator functions \mathbb{I}_A of subsets $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ are called *lower probabilities*. A lower probability is usually denoted by $L: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{X}}$. The mapping L has the same role as \underline{P} in the previous section. The credal set of a lower probability $\mathcal{M}(L)$ is again the set of all linear previsions $\underline{P}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $P(A) \geq L(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. A lower probability is *coherent* if all bounds are reachable: $L(A) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{A}} P(A)$.

In case where $\mathcal{A} \neq 2^{\mathcal{X}}$, the corresponding lower probability is said to be partially specified. An important example of partially specified lower probability is *probability interval model (PRI)* [6, 58], where the domain \mathcal{A} only contains singletons and their complements. A more conventional way to introduce a probability interval is by a pair of mappings $l, u: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $l \leq u$. Here, $l(x)$ is interpreted as the lower probability of $\{x\}$ and $u(x)$ its upper probability. The notion of coherence applies to this case analogously. Conjugacy relation $u(x) = \overline{P}(\mathbb{I}_x) = 1 - \underline{P}(-\mathbb{I}_x) = 1 - L(\{x\}^c)$, implying $L(\{x\}^c) = 1 - u(x)$, now allows us to regard probability intervals as lower probabilities with the domain $\mathcal{A} = \{\{x\}: x \in \mathcal{X}\} \cup \{\{x\}^c: x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. In general, we will denote a PRI model by an ordered pair (l, u) , and where needed, it will be interpreted as a partially specified lower probability L with the domain \mathcal{A} . Credal sets corresponding to lower probabilities and probability interval models will be respectively denoted by $\mathcal{M}(L)$ and $\mathcal{M}(l, u)$.

3.2 Finitely generated credal sets as polyhedra

A credal set is a closed and convex set of linear previsions. Since every linear prevision can be uniquely represented as a probability mass vector, a credal set can be represented as a convex set of probability mass vectors. The set \mathcal{M} is therefore the maximal set of n -dimensional vectors p satisfying

$$pf \geq \underline{P}(f) \quad \text{for every } f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (17)$$

$$p\mathbb{I}_x \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and} \quad (18)$$

$$p\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} = 1. \quad (19)$$

In our case, \mathcal{F} is assumed finite, the corresponding credal set is therefore a convex polyhedron. A credal set that is a convex polyhedron is called a *finitely generated credal set*, and a lower prevision defined on finite set of gambles is a *finitely generated coherent lower prevision*.

According to the above, it would be suitable to extend the domain of \underline{P} with the gambles of the form \mathbb{I}_x for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Doing so, however,

may result in a non-coherent lower prevision, because other constraints may already imply that $\underline{P}(\mathbb{I}_x) \geq 0$, where the inequality may even be strict. Therefore we adopt the following convention:

Convention 1. The domain \mathcal{F} of all lower previsions used will contain all gambles of the form \mathbb{I}_x together with the value $\underline{P}(\mathbb{I}_x) = 0$, unless $\underline{P}(\mathbb{I}_x) \geq 0$ is already implied by other values of \underline{P} on \mathcal{F} .

Assuming the above convention, the credal set of a coherent lower prevision $\mathcal{M}(\underline{P})$ is the set of vectors p satisfying constraints (17) and (19).

Normal cones corresponding to credal sets of lower previsions will be equivalently denoted by $N(\underline{P}, P) = N(\mathcal{M}(\underline{P}), P) = \{f: P(f) = \underline{P}(f)\} = \text{cone}(\mathcal{F}(P))$, where $\mathcal{F}(P) = \{f \in \mathcal{F}: P(f) = \underline{P}(f)\}$. In addition to inequality constraints, credal sets satisfy the equality constraint (19). This implies that every $\mathcal{F}(P)$ contains the constant gamble $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Hence, every normal cone is of the form

$$N(\underline{P}, P) = \text{cone}(\mathcal{F}(P) \setminus \{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}\}) + \text{lin}\{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}\} \quad (20)$$

$$= \left\{ \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(P) \setminus \{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}\}} \alpha_f f + \beta \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} : \alpha_f \geq 0, \beta \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Technically, a normal cone as above is a union of two symmetrical cones, one with $\beta \geq 0$ and the other with $\beta \leq 0$. The following result is straightforward.

Proposition 6 (Normal cone additivity). *Take arbitrary vectors $g, h \in N(\underline{P}, P)$. Then $\underline{P}(g + h) = \underline{P}(g) + \underline{P}(h)$.*

Proof. The fact that g and h both belong to the same normal cone at P implies that $P(g) = \underline{P}(g)$ and $P(h) = \underline{P}(h)$. By the closure for sums of the cone, we then also have that $P(g + h) = \underline{P}(g + h)$ and therefore additivity of P implies $\underline{P}(g + h) = \underline{P}(g) + \underline{P}(h)$. \square

4 Normal cones of lower probabilities

By a normal cone corresponding to a lower probability or a PRI model, we mean a normal cone corresponding to its credal set, and denote it by $N(L, P)$ or $N((l, u), P)$ respectively. Such a cone is then a non-negative hull of a set of indicator functions corresponding to a collection of subsets of \mathcal{X} . This set includes $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$, as follows from (20). Such a normal cone can thus be represented with the corresponding collection of sets. Let \mathcal{A} be a collection of sets. Denote the cone generated by their indicator functions by $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}) := \text{cone}(\{\mathbb{I}_A: A \in \mathcal{A}\}) + \text{lin}\{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}\}$. In particular, we characterize elements of complete normal simplicial fans. The following proposition holds.

Proposition 7. *Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ correspond to an element of a complete normal simplicial fan. Then:*

(i) The vectors $\{\mathbb{I}_A : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are linearly independent.

(ii) No equation of the form $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\mathcal{X}\}} \alpha_A \mathbb{I}_A + \alpha_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbb{I}_B$, where $B \notin \mathcal{A}$, has a solution such that $\alpha_A \geq 0$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\mathcal{X}\}$.

Proof. The proposition is a direct consequence of Proposition 2. \square

Corollary 4. Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ be an element of a complete normal simplicial fan corresponding to a credal set of a lower probability $L: 2^{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then

(i) for every pair of sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, $A_1 \cap A_2 \neq \emptyset$, i.e. \mathcal{A} is an intersecting collection;

(ii) for every pair of sets $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\mathcal{X}\}$, $A \cup B \neq \mathcal{X}$.

Proof. To see (i), suppose $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ exist such that $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$. Then $\mathbb{I}_{A_1} + \mathbb{I}_{A_2} = \mathbb{I}_{A_1 \cup A_2}$. Hence, either $A_1 \cup A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, which makes it linearly dependent or $\mathbb{I}_{A_1 \cup A_2} \in \text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$, violating (ii) of Proposition 7.

To see (ii), suppose $A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathcal{X}$. Then, $A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathbb{I}_{A_1 \cup A_2} + \mathbb{I}_{A_1 \cap A_2} = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathbb{I}_{A_1 \cap A_2}$. Hence, either $A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$, which is violation of (i) or taking $B = A_1 \cap A_2$, \mathbb{I}_B is contained in $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$. Then either, \mathcal{A} is dependent, which violates Proposition 7(i) or it contains \mathbb{I}_B , violating Proposition 7(ii). \square

Even though Corollary 4 turns out useful to characterize elements of complete simplicial fans, in general, it is insufficient, as the following example shows.

Example 1. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$. Consider the collection of sets $A_1 = \{x_1, x_2\}$, $A_2 = \{x_2, x_3\}$, $A_3 = \{x_1, x_3\}$, \mathcal{X} . It is an intersecting collection, yet it does not generate an element of a complete simplicial fan. This is because $\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{I}_{A_1} + \mathbb{I}_{A_2} + \mathbb{I}_{A_3}) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}}$, which violates Proposition 7 (ii).

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. Every MESC is a cone of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{A} is a collection of exactly 3 subsets of \mathcal{X} , including \mathcal{X} . Suppose $\{x_1, x_2\} \in \mathcal{A}$. According to Corollary 4, the only possibilities for the second set (note that \mathcal{X} is always a member) in \mathcal{A} are $\{x_1\}$ and $\{x_2\}$. Indeed, both these sets correspond to adjacent MESC. Similarly, in addition to a singleton set $\{x_1\}$, the only possible sets are $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and $\{x_1, x_3\}$, that both correspond to two adjacent MESC corresponding to adjacent extreme points.

4.1 Normal cones of 2-monotone lower probabilities

A lower probability L is said to be *2-monotone* (*convex*, *supermodular*) if for every pair of sets A, B ,

$$L(A \cup B) + L(A \cap B) \geq L(A) + L(B). \quad (22)$$

A collection of subsets \mathcal{A} is a *chain* if for any pair of sets $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, at least one of the relations $A \subseteq B$ or $B \subseteq A$ holds. A maximal chain is then the one maximal with respect to set inclusion. In our finite settings, a maximal chain \mathcal{A} is of the form $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ where $A_0 = \emptyset, A_n = \mathcal{X}$ and $|A_{i+1} \setminus A_i| = 1$.

The following proposition gives a previously known result (see e.g. [5, 7, 27]).

Proposition 8. *Let L be a 2-monotone lower probability on a finite space \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{A} a maximal chain. Then there exists a linear prevision $P_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{M}(L)$ such that $P(A) = L(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Moreover, every extreme point $P \in \mathcal{M}(L)$ is of the form $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ for some maximal chain \mathcal{A} .

The important claim of the above proposition is that the linear prevision with this property belongs to $\mathcal{M}(L)$. This characterization of the extreme points of credal sets of 2-monotone lower probabilities can now be used to give a characterization of the normal cones of those credal sets. Two vectors $g, h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are said to be *comonotone* if $g(x) > g(y)$ implies that $f(x) \geq f(y)$ for every pair $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. A set of vectors \mathcal{H} is said to be *comonotone* if all pairs of its elements are.

Proposition 9 ([13]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a set of vectors. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) \mathcal{H} is comonotone;

(ii) the level set $\mathcal{L} = \{x: f(x) \leq \alpha\}: f \in \mathcal{H}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ forms a chain;

(iii) an enumeration of elements \mathcal{X} exists, denoted by x_1, \dots, x_n , such that $f(x_i) \leq f(x_{i+1})$ for every $f \in \mathcal{H}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

Lemma 2. *A set of vectors \mathcal{H} is comonotone if and only if $\text{cone}(\mathcal{H})$ is comonotone.*

Proof. The 'if' part being trivial, we prove the 'only if' part. Thus, assume \mathcal{H} being comonotone. By Proposition 9, the level set \mathcal{L} then forms a chain. As by the assumption, \mathcal{X} is finite, \mathcal{L} must be a finite chain. Moreover, every $f \in \mathcal{H}$ is of the form $f = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \alpha_L \mathbb{1}_L$ for some non-negative coefficients α_L . Clearly, every positive linear combination of positive linear combinations of the indicator sets in \mathcal{L} is again one; and its level sets belong to the same collection \mathcal{L} , which is therefore the collection of the level sets of all elements of the cone $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$. Now, since \mathcal{L} is a chain, the cone must therefore be a comonotone set. \square

Corollary 5. *Let \mathcal{A} be a collection of sets and $N_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $N_{\mathcal{A}}$ is comonotone if and only if \mathcal{A} forms a chain.*

Proof. Clearly, \mathcal{A} is a comonotone set exactly if it forms a chain, which by Lemma 2, is exactly if the cone it generates is comonotone. \square

Definition 4. A set of vectors \mathcal{H} will be called *maximal comonotone* if its level sets \mathcal{L} form a maximal chain.

The following corollary is obvious.

Corollary 6. *Let \mathcal{H} be a maximal comonotone set. Then $\text{cone}(\mathcal{H})$ is a maximal comonotone set.*

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{X} be a finite set and let $\mathbb{A} = \{\mathcal{A} \subset 2^{\mathcal{X}} : \mathcal{A} \text{ forms a chain}\}$. Denote with $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A}) = \{\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{A}\}$ the collection of cones generated by the chains. The following propositions hold:*

- (i) $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ is a complete fan.
- (ii) Let L be a 2-monotone lower probability on $2^{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{X}}$ a maximal chain. Every $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ is contained in a single normal cone $N(L, P)$.
- (iii) Every $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ is a simplicial cone.
- (iv) $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ is a complete normal simplicial fan.
- (v) The credal set $\mathcal{M}(L)$ of a 2-monotone lower probability L in the probability space $(\mathbb{R}^n, 2^{\mathbb{R}^n})$ has at most $n!$ extreme points.
- (vi) Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be a maximal chain. Then MESC $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ is adjacent to exactly n MESC $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ in \mathbb{A} generated as follows. Take some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then form \mathcal{A}_i by removing A_i and replacing it with $A'_i = A_{i-1} \cup (A_{i+1} \setminus A_i)$. (We set $A_0 = \emptyset$.)
- (vii) The graph with vertices \mathbb{A} and edges corresponding to adjacency is n -regular and connected.

Proof. The proof of (i) consists of three steps.

Step 1. Every vector in \mathbb{R}^n is contained in at least one cone in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$.

Step 2. The intersection of two cones in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ is a face of both.

Step 3. Faces of all cones are contained in $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$.

Step 1: Take arbitrary vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let \mathcal{A} be the collection of its level sets, which is always a chain. Then clearly f is a positive linear combination of elements in \mathcal{A} and therefore belongs to the cone $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$.

Step 2: Let \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 be two chains in \mathbb{A} and $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ the corresponding cones. We will show that

$$\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_1) \cap \text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_2) = \text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2). \quad (23)$$

The inclusion \supseteq is clear, whence it remains to show the \subseteq part. Thus let $f \in \text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_1) \cap \text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_2)$. Take only those members of \mathcal{A}_1 that have strictly positive coefficients in $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}_1} \alpha_A \mathbb{I}_A$. It is easy to check that the level sets of \mathcal{F} are exactly these sets. And by the same argument, the level sets must be exactly those with strictly positive coefficients in the positive linear combinations of sets from \mathcal{A}_2 . Hence, these sets must be the same, and therefore lie in the intersection $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$. It also follows by the construction of this argument that these sets form a chain, and thus generate a subcone of a possibly lower dimension that is a face both cones.

Step 3: A face of $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ is $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}')$ generated by a subset \mathcal{A}' of \mathcal{A} . Clearly a subset of a chain is again a chain, and therefore $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}')$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{A})$ by definition.

(ii) Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ be given corresponding to a maximal chain \mathcal{A} . It follows from Proposition 8 that $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an extreme point of $\mathcal{M}(L)$ such that $P_{\mathcal{A}}(A) = L(A)$ for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence, \mathcal{A} belongs to $N(L, P_{\mathcal{A}})$ and so does the cone its generates.

(iii) Let \mathcal{A} be a chain. The vectors \mathbb{I}_A for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ are then clearly linearly independent. To see this, combine the corresponding 0-1 vectors to a matrix which has clearly a triangular form. Hence $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ is simplicial by definition.

(iv) follows directly from the above.

(v) follows from (ii) and the fact that chains of subsets of \mathcal{X} are in a one-to-one correspondence with permutations. To see this, notice that each permutation σ induces the natural chain $\mathcal{A}_{\sigma} = \{A_i : A_i = \{x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(i)}\}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and that the mapping $\Sigma \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{X}}$ that maps $\sigma \mapsto \mathcal{A}_{\sigma}$ is bijective. The number of maximal chains is therefore equal to $n!$ and since every cone generated by a maximal chain is contained in an n -dimensional normal cone. This limits the number of normal cones to at most $n!$.

(vi) It follows clearly from the construction that collections \mathcal{A}_i are again chains and therefore $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}_i) \in \mathbb{A}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is also easy to see that sets A'_i are the only candidates to replace A_i so that the resulting collection is still a chain.

(vii) It follows immediately from (vi) that every $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ has exactly n neighbours. \square

A simple proof for the representation of comonotonic additive functionals with 2-monotone lower probabilities follows. This result is known in several forms ([40, 13]), yet we present it here as an application of our results presented above.

Proposition 10. *Let \underline{E} be a lower expectation functional. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) \underline{E} is comonotonic additive;

(ii) a 2-monotone lower probability L exists so that \underline{E} is its a natural extension.

Proof. We start with proving (i) \implies (ii). Let $L(A) = \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_A)$ for every subset of \mathcal{X} . Take sets A and B . Then $\mathbb{I}_{A \cap B}$ and $\mathbb{I}_{A \cup B}$ are comonotone and $\mathbb{I}_{A \cap B} + \mathbb{I}_{A \cup B} = \mathbb{I}_A + \mathbb{I}_B$. Moreover, superadditivity of coherent lower previsions implies that $\underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_A) + \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_B) \leq \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_A + \mathbb{I}_B) = \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_{A \cap B}) + \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_{A \cup B})$, which amounts to 2-monotonicity of L .

It remains to show that \underline{E} is the natural extension of L . To see this, take arbitrary vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then f can be represented as a positive linear combination of its level sets, which also form a chain, say \mathcal{A} . Now all vectors \mathbb{I}_A for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and f form a comonotone set and $f = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A \mathbb{I}_A$. By comonotonic additivity we have that $\underline{E}(f) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A \underline{E}(\mathbb{I}_A) = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \alpha_A L(A) = \underline{E}_L(f)$, where \underline{E}_L denotes the natural extension of L . Hence, both lower previsions coincide.

(ii) \implies (i) is a well known property of 2-monotone lower probabilities. It is directly implied by Theorem 2(ii) and Proposition 6. \square

5 Normal cones of probability intervals models

According to the representation of credal sets (17)–(19), the support functionals of credal sets induced by probability intervals are in the forms of \mathbb{I}_x and $\mathbb{I}_{\{x\}^c}$ respectively. In this section we propose a full characterization of the complete normal simplicial fans for PRI models. For the contrast with the case of 2-monotone lower probabilities, their structure is not unique, or in other words, they are not normally equivalent.

5.1 Maximal elementary simplicial cones corresponding to PRI models

Proposition 11. *Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ be a maximal elementary simplicial cone of a credal set corresponding to a PRI model (l, u) . Then \mathcal{A} is of the following form. Enumerate the elements of \mathcal{X} in some order and choose k so that $1 \leq k \leq n - 2$. Now the set \mathcal{A} consists of the following n sets*

- (i) singleton sets $A_i = \{x_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (ii) complements of the singletons $A_j = \{x_j\}^c$ for $k + 1 \leq j \leq n - 1$;
- (iii) indicator set $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Proof. By the construction of a PRI model, the maximal simplicial cones are generated by sets of the described form and obviously, $x_i \neq x_{i'}$ for $i \neq i'$; $i, i' \leq k$ and $x_j \neq x_{j'}$ for $j \neq j'$; $j, j' > k$. Thus, it remains to show that:

1. $x_i \neq x_j$ for every $i \leq k$ and $j > k$. Indeed, if $x_i = x_j$ for some pair of indices, then $\{x_i\} \cup \{x_i\}^c = \mathcal{X}$ and therefore the set loses linear independence.
2. $k \geq 1$. Suppose contrary that $k = 0$. Then $\mathcal{A} = \{\{x_i\}^c: x_i \in \{x_n\}^c\} \cup \{\mathcal{X}\}$. Then, $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}_A = n\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} + \mathbb{I}_{x_n}$, whence $\mathbb{I}_{x_n} = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}_A - n\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ and thus \mathbb{I}_{x_n} belongs to the cone generated by \mathcal{A} . (Notice that $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$ may appear with a negative coefficient by (20)). This contradicts Proposition 2(ii).
3. $k < n - 1$. This case is symmetrical to case 2. By assuming $k = n - 1$ we would then have $\mathcal{A} = \{\{x_i\}: 1 \leq i \leq n - 1\} \cup \{\mathcal{X}\}$, whence $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{I}_A = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_n\}^c}$ which again violates Proposition 2(ii).

□

A full characterization of elements of the cones follows.

Corollary 7. *Let $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ be a cone corresponding to a set \mathcal{A} constructed as in Proposition 11. Then $h \in \text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$ if and only if*

(i) $h(x_i) \geq h(x_n)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and

(ii) $h(x_j) \leq h(x_n)$ for $k < j \leq n - 1$.

Proof. First we notice that every vector from \mathcal{A} satisfies conditions (i) and (ii), and so does its every positive multiple. It is also clear that the sum of any two vectors complying with conditions (i) and (ii), satisfies them too. The set of functions satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) is therefore a cone that contains $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$.

To verify that every h satisfying (i) and (ii) is actually in $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$, we first notice that vectors $\mathbb{I}_{\{x_j\}^c}$ can be replaced by $-\mathbb{I}_{x_j}$, as $-\mathbb{I}_{x_j} = \mathbb{I}_{\{x_j\}^c} - \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}$. Now we take $\alpha_n = h(x_n)$, $\alpha_i = h(x_i) - h(x_n)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $\alpha_j = h(x_n) - h(x_j)$, which gives

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{x_i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_j (-\mathbb{I}_{x_j}) + \alpha_n \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \mathbb{I}_{x_i} + \sum_{j=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_j \mathbb{I}_{\{x_j\}^c} + \left(\alpha_n - \sum_{j=k+1}^{n-1} \alpha_j \right) \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}}, \quad (25)$$

where all $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. □

In the following text $f|_A \leq \alpha$ will state for $f(x) \leq \alpha$ for every $x \in A$. We adopt analogous notation for other relations.

Definition 5. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $A, B \subset \mathcal{X}$ be given such that $A \neq \emptyset, B \neq \emptyset, x \notin A \cup B$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Then we define the following set of vectors:

$$N(x, A, B) = \{f \in \mathbb{R}^n : f|_A \leq f(x) \leq f|_B, f|_{\mathcal{X} \setminus (A \cup B)} = f(x)\}. \quad (26)$$

Theorem 3. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $A, B \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be given such that $A \neq \emptyset, B \neq \emptyset$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Then the following conditions hold:

- (i) $N(x, A, B)$ is a cone.
- (ii) A PRI model (l, u) exists such that $N(x, A, B)$ is a normal cone of its credal set.
- (iii) If $A \cup B = \{x\}^c$, then $N(x, A, B)$ is MESFC.
- (iv) If $A' \subseteq A, B' \subseteq B$ then $N(x, A', B')$ is a face of $N(x, A, B)$.
- (v) $\text{ri}(N(x, A, B)) = \{f \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_A \preceq f(x) \preceq f|_B, f|_{(A \cup B)^c} = f(x)\}$.
- (vi) For every vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $f \in \text{ri}(N(x, [x]_+^f, [x]_-^f))$, where $[x]_+^f = \{y : f(y) > f(x)\}$ and $[x]_-^f = \{y : f(y) < f(x)\}$, provided that neither $[x]_+^f$ nor $[x]_-^f$ is empty. Moreover, $f \in \text{ri}(N(x, A, B))$ if and only if $A = [x]_+^f$ and $B = [x]_-^f$.
- (vii) Every vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belongs to at most $n - 2$ cones of the form (26).
- (viii) Let $N(x, A, B)$ and a cone of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{A} is a maximal chain, be given. Then either $\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})) \subseteq N(x, A, B)$ or $\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})) \cap N(x, A, B) = \emptyset$.
- (ix) Let \underline{E} be the natural extension of a PRI model (l, u) . Then \underline{E} is comonotonic additive.
- (x) A 2-monotone lower probability L exists that coincides with (l, u) in the sense that $L(\{x\}) = l(x)$ and $L(\{x\}^c) = 1 - u(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and whose natural extension coincides with the natural extension of (l, u) .

Proof. (i) is an immediate consequence of definitions and Corollary 7.

(ii) follows from Proposition 2(iv).

(iii) follows directly from Proposition 11.

(iv) the set $N(x, A', B')$ is clearly a subset of $N(x, A, B)$ where some inequality constraints are replaced by equalities. Hence, $N(x, A', B')$ is a face of $N(x, A, B)$.

(v) Suppose $f \in N(x, A, B)$ and $f(y) = f(x)$ for some $y \in A$. Then $f \in N(x, A \setminus \{y\}, B)$ which by (iv) is a face of $N(x, A, B)$.

The relation $f \in \text{ri}(N(x, [x]_+^f, [x]_-^f))$ in (vi) is a direct consequence of the construction and Corollary 7. It is also clear by the definition that

$f \in N(x, A, B)$ implies that $[x]_+^f \subseteq A$ and $[x]_-^f \subseteq B$; however, if any of these set inclusions is strict, then $N(x, [x]_+^f, [x]_-^f)$ is a proper face of $N(x, A, B)$, by (iv). But an element cannot be contained in relative interiors of a polyhedron and its proper face at the same time. Thus, the set inclusion must in fact be equality relation.

We have that $[x]_+^f = \emptyset$ if $x = \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$ and $[x]_-^f = \emptyset$ if $x = \arg \min_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)$. For those choices of x , the cones of the form (26) therefore do not exist. So, cones of this form only exist for at most $n - 2$ choices of x , and for every such choice only one such cone exists, by (vi), which consequently confirms (vii).

The set $\text{ri}(\text{cone}(\mathcal{A}))$ contains comonotone vectors with strictly different components. Let some $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be given. It is easy to see that any two such functions, say f and g satisfy $[x]_+^f = [x]_+^g$ and $[x]_-^f = [x]_-^g$ and that $[x]_+^f \cup [x]_-^f = \{x\}^c$, which makes $N(x, [x]_+^f, [x]_-^f)$ the only cone of the form $N(x, A, B)$ that contains f and g , and with them the entire relative interior. Thus (viii) is proved.

(ix) is a direct consequence of Proposition 6 and (viii).

(x) easily follows from Proposition 10 and (ix). \square

5.2 Relating normal cones to extreme points

Normal cone structure described in the above proposition is closely related to the extreme points of the credal sets corresponding the probability intervals. Their characterization is known from the literature. Let (l, u) be a probability interval model on \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{M} its credal set and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ a vector. Let P be a the extremal linear prevision such that $P(h) = \min_{P \in \mathcal{M}} P(h)$. To construct P , let x_1, \dots, x_n be an enumeration of the elements of \mathcal{X} such that $h(x_i) \leq h(x_{i+1})$. Let k be an index such that

$$l(x_k) \leq 1 - \sum_{i=k+1}^n l(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} u(x_i) \leq u(x_k). \quad (27)$$

Then take

$$P(x_i) = \begin{cases} u(x_i), & i < k; \\ l(x_i), & i > k; \\ 1 - \sum_{i=1}^k u(x_i) - \sum_{i=k+1}^n l(x_i), & i = k. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

The proof that so defined P minimizes $P(h)$ over \mathcal{M} can be found in [6]. Denote $A = \{x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n\}$ and $B = \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$. It follows directly from the construction that given another vector h' , the minimizing P is the same whenever the induced sets A and B are the same for h and h' . In our terms of normal cones, such vectors h and h' both lie in the same normal cone $N(x_k, A, B)$.

Remark 2. The case where k satisfying equation (27) equals 1 or n , deserves an additional illumination. These two cases correspond to the cones of the form $N(x, \emptyset, B)$ and $N(x, A, \emptyset)$ respectively, which have been shown not to be maximal elementary simplicial cones. The cases can be treated in a symmetric way; therefore, we only consider the case $k = 1$. Equation (27) then gives that $l(x_1) \leq 1 - \sum_{i=2}^n l(x_i) \leq u(x_1)$, which for coherent PRI model can only be satisfied if $1 - \sum_{i=2}^n l(x_i) = u(x_1)$. It follows that $l(x_2) = 1 - u(x_1) - \sum_{i=3}^n l(x_i)$. Hence, $k = 2$ also satisfies (27). The cone corresponding to this case is $N(x_2, \{x_3, \dots, x_n\}, \{x_1\})$, which is clearly a proper subcone of $N(x_1, \{x_2, \dots, x_n\}, \emptyset)$, thus confirming that the latter is not elementary. In general, the cone of the form $N(x, \emptyset, B)$ is a simplicial complex of cones $N(y, \{x\}, B \setminus \{y\})$ with non-intersecting interiors.

5.3 Graph structure of the normal cones corresponding to PRI models

We now analyze the adjacency relations for the family of cones of the form $N(x, A, B)$. The cone of this form is generated by the indicator functions of the family of sets

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\{z\} : z \in B\} \cup \{\{v\}^c : v \in A\} \cup \{\mathcal{X}\}. \quad (29)$$

The adjacent cones are formed by selecting an element of \mathcal{A} and replacing it by a suitable set to form a new cone. Not all candidates produce adjacent cones, though. To select those that do, we will make use of Lemma 1. Assume for the moment that $|A|, |B| > 1$. We will return to the borderline cases later. Take some $y \in A$ and consider possible candidates for the replacement of $\{y\}^c \in \mathcal{A}$. These are $\{y\}, \{x\}$ and $\{x\}^c$. To see which induce adjacent cones, calculate the normal vector t to the hyperplane $\text{lin}(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{\{y\}^c\})$ and denote its elements by $t(x)$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For every $\{x\}$, $\mathbb{I}_x \cdot t = 0$ implies that $t(x) = 0$. Similarly, $t \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\{x\}^c} = t \cdot (\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} - \mathbb{I}_x) = -t \cdot \mathbb{I}_x$, because of $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\{y\}^c\}$, implies $t(x) = 0$ as well. Thus, because of $t \cdot \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{X}} = 0$, we have that $t(y) + t(x) = 0$. Take the solution where $t(x) = 1$ and $t(y) = -1$. Since $\mathbb{I}_{\{y\}^c} \cdot t = 1$, the scalar product of the new vector with t must be negative. The products of the candidates identified above are the following: $\mathbb{I}_y \cdot t = -1, \mathbb{I}_x \cdot t = 1, \mathbb{I}_{\{x\}^c} \cdot t = -1$. Thus the candidates that induce adjacent cones are $\{y\}$ and $\{x\}^c$, which gives us the following adjacent cones

$$(A1) \ N(x, A \setminus \{y\}, B \cup \{y\}),$$

$$(A2) \ N(y, (A \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}, B).$$

Let us now consider the case of $z \in B$, where $\{z\} \in \mathcal{A}$. The candidates to replace $\{z\}$ are again $\{z\}^c, \{x\}$ and $\{x\}^c$. The same analysis as above now gives us a normal vector t , such that $t(x) = 1$ and $t(z) = -1$. Now we have that $t \cdot \mathbb{I}_z = -1$, whence the candidates with positive scalar product are

those inducing adjacent cones. We have $\mathbb{I}_{\{z\}^c} \cdot t = 1, \mathbb{I}_x \cdot t = 1, \mathbb{I}_{\{x\}^c} \cdot t = -1$. Now $\{z\}^c$ and $\{x\}$ fit, inducing the cones:

$$(B1) \ N(x, A \cup \{z\}, B \setminus \{z\}),$$

$$(B2) \ N(z, A, (B \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{x\}).$$

Now, in the case where $|A| = 1$, only (A2) is possible in the first case, while (B2) is the only possible neighbour if $|B| = 1$.

In particular case of a PRI model (l, u) , only one of adjacent cones (A1) or (A2) and (B1) or (B2) respectively corresponds to an extreme point. Let us again first consider the case of $y \in A$. Whether the adjacent cone is (A1) or (A2) depends on which x or y satisfies condition (27) in place of x_k . The fact that $N(x, A, B)$ corresponds to an extreme point, implies that

$$l(x) \leq 1 - \sum_{v \in A} l(v) - \sum_{z \in B} u(z) \leq u(x). \quad (30)$$

Because of $y \in A$, it easily follows that

$$l(y) \leq 1 - \sum_{v \in (A \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} l(v) - \sum_{z \in B} u(z), \quad (31)$$

which corresponds to replacing y with x in A , as in the case of (A2). On the other hand, we can either have

$$l(x) \leq 1 - \sum_{v \in A \setminus \{y\}} l(v) - \sum_{z \in B \cup \{y\}} u(z), \quad (32)$$

which is equivalent to

$$1 - \sum_{v \in (A \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} l(v) - \sum_{z \in B} u(z) \geq u(y). \quad (33)$$

or the opposite inequalities in both equations. If the first inequality holds, then (A1) is the cone corresponding to an extreme point, because x is the element satisfying (27). In the opposite case, where

$$1 - \sum_{v \in (A \setminus \{y\}) \cup \{x\}} l(v) - \sum_{z \in B} u(z) \leq u(y), \quad (34)$$

condition (27) is satisfied by y and therefore (A2) corresponds to an extreme point.

Now take some $z \in B$. Again, equation (30) implies

$$1 - \sum_{y \in A} l(y) - \sum_{v \in (B \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{x\}} u(z) \leq u(z), \quad (35)$$

corresponding to replacing z with x in B . Furthermore, we have the following pair of equivalent equations

$$1 - \sum_{y \in A \cup \{z\}} l(y) - \sum_{v \in (B \setminus \{z\})} u(v) \leq u(x) \quad (36)$$

and

$$l(z) \geq 1 - \sum_{y \in A} l(y) - \sum_{v \in (B \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{x\}} u(v). \quad (37)$$

If (36) holds, then (B1) corresponds to an extreme point and in the case of the opposite inequality

$$l(z) \leq 1 - \sum_{y \in A} l(y) - \sum_{v \in (B \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{x\}} u(v), \quad (38)$$

(B2) corresponds to an extreme point.

Let us now summarize.

Theorem 4. *Let a cone of the form $N(x, A, B)$ correspond to an extreme point of a PRI model (l, u) .*

(i) *The adjacent cones are then exactly the cones of the form*

- (A2) for every $y \in A$;
- if $|A| > 1$, (A1) for every $y \in A$;
- (B2) for every $z \in B$;
- if $|B| > 1$, (B1) for every $z \in B$.

(ii) *For a given $y \in A$, (A1) corresponds to an extreme point if (32) is satisfied; and (A2) corresponds to an extreme point if (34) is satisfied.*

(iii) *For a given $z \in B$, (B1) corresponds to an extreme point if (36) is satisfied; and (B2) corresponds to an extreme point if (38) is satisfied.*

Remark 3. The borderline case in the above theorem is if both (32) and (34) or (36) and (38) are satisfied. This case corresponds to the situation where the two cones correspond to different possible triangulations of the same normal cone.

5.4 Maximal number of extreme points

In this section we estimate the possible maximal number of extreme points of credal sets of PRI models. By Proposition 2 (iv), every MESOC is a normal cone of some convex set corresponding to an extreme point. In general however, a normal cone in an extreme point can be triangulized as a union of MESOCs. Thus, the maximal number of extreme points of a credal set is

bounded by the number of MESCs corresponding to a complete simplicial fan obtained as a triangulation of the normal fan of the credal set. Moreover, by Theorem 3(viii), every cone generated by a maximal chain is contained in a single MESC corresponding to credal set of a PRI model. As the number of maximal chains is known to be equal to $n!$, the number of MESCs and therefore the maximal number of extreme points can be estimated from the number of the chain generated cones contained in the MESCs. We start with the following simple result.

Proposition 12. *A cone of the form $N(x, A, B)$ contains exactly $|A|! \cdot |B|!$ cones of the form $\text{cone}(\mathcal{A})$, where \mathcal{A} is a maximal chain.*

Proof. By Corollary 5, there is a one-to-one correspondence between comonotone classes and chains, and thus also between maximal comonotone classes and maximal chains. Further, a maximal comonotone classes correspond to strict linear orderings in \mathcal{X} . A cone of the form $N(x, A, B)$ contains all functions f satisfying $f|_A \leq f(x) \leq f|_B$. This induces a partial ordering $A \preceq x \preceq B$, which is compatible with exactly $|A|!$ orderings of A and $|B|$ complete orderings in B , which gives exactly $|A|! \cdot |B|!$ distinct complete orderings. \square

Corollary 8. *The number m of distinct MESCs in the triangulation of a normal cone of a credal set corresponding to PRI models on a set \mathcal{X} with n elements satisfies the following inequality*

$$\frac{n!}{(n-2)!} = n(n-1) \leq m \leq \frac{n!}{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil}. \quad (39)$$

Proof. By Proposition 12, the number of maximal comonotone cones contained within a MESC is between $(n-2)!$ and $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor \cdot \lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil$, which readily implies the proposed bounds. \square

The following examples demonstrate that both bounds are reachable.

Example 3. Let $n = |\mathcal{X}| = 10$ and set $l(x) = \frac{1}{11}$ and $u(x) = \frac{1}{9}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Let x_1, \dots, x_{10} be an ordering of the elements. Taking $k = 5$ we have that $1 - \sum_6^{10} \frac{1}{11} - \sum_1^4 \frac{1}{9} = 1 - \frac{5}{11} - \frac{4}{9} = \frac{10}{99} \in [\frac{1}{11}, \frac{1}{9}]$. Hence, x_5 satisfies (27), and therefore $A = \{x_6, \dots, x_{10}\}$ and $B = \{x_1, \dots, x_4\}$, and every cone $N(x, A, B)$ then satisfies $|A| = 5$ and $|B| = 4$. It then contains $5! \cdot 4! = 2880$ maximal comonotone cones, and therefore the number of all distinct MESCs is $\frac{10!}{5! \cdot 4!} = 1260$, which is then equal to the number of extreme points. Moreover, this is the maximal number of extreme points for a credal set corresponding to a PRI model on 10 elements.

Example 4. Let this time $n = |\mathcal{X}| = 10$ and set $l(x) = \frac{1}{20}$ and $u(x) = \frac{1}{9}$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Given an ordering x_1, \dots, x_{10} of elements of \mathcal{X} , it turns out that x_9 is exactly the element satisfying (27). Due to symmetry, we

can conclude that every MESc in this case is of the form $N(x, A, B)$ where $|A| = 1$ and $|B| = 8$. By Proposition 12, all of them contain exactly $8! = 40320$ maximal comonotone cones. The number of cones must therefore be exactly $\frac{10!}{8!} = 90$, which coincides with the lower bound in Corollary 8.

Remark 4. The last inequality in (39) is known from the literature, and can be found in [6], where the same estimate for the number of extreme points of PRI on 10 points is also reported as an example.

6 Conclusions

Normal cones prove to be a useful tool for better understanding of credal sets and numerical procedures related to them. The goal of this paper is to provide a comprehensive description of the structure of normal cones corresponding to credal sets of lower probabilities. General properties introduced in the first part were then used to give a detailed description of the normal cone structure for two important families of imprecise probabilities, 2-monotone lower probabilities and probability intervals.

The methods proposed in this paper will serve to supplement and improve the existing results making use of the methods based on normal cones. Models whose analysis has been shown to benefit from such approach are computations related to imprecise stochastic processes, especially those in continuous time. Another area within the theory of imprecise probabilities that is still largely unexplored is the sensitivity analysis of lower probabilities to perturbations. The better understanding of the structure of the corresponding credal sets based on approaches presented in this paper could help with such analysis within our future research. Exploration of other important classes of lower probabilities, such as p -boxes and their multivariate generalizations, could also benefit from the here proposed approach.

Acknowledgement

The author acknowledges the financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency (research core funding No. P5-0168).

References

- [1] Joaquin Abellan, Carlos J Mantas, Javier G Castellano, and Serafin Moral-Garcia. Increasing diversity in random forest learning algorithm via imprecise probabilities. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 97:228–243, 2018.
- [2] Alessandro Antonucci and Fabio Cuzzolin. Credal sets approximation by lower probabilities: Application to credal networks. In Eyke

- Hüllermeier, Rudolf Kruse, and Frank Hoffmann, editors, *Computational Intelligence for Knowledge-Based Systems Design*, pages 716–725, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-14049-5.
- [3] Thomas Augustin, Frank PA Coolen, Gert de Cooman, and Matthias CM Troffaes. *Introduction to imprecise probabilities*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [4] Seamus Bradley. Imprecise probabilities. In *Computer Simulation Validation*, pages 525–540. Springer, 2019.
- [5] Andrew Bronevich and Thomas Augustin. Approximation of coherent lower probabilities by 2-monotone measures. In Thomas Augustin, Frank P. A. Coolen, Serafín Moral, and Matthias C. M. Troffaes, editors, *ISIPTA'09: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*, pages 61–70, Durham, UK, July 2009. SIPTA.
- [6] L.M. De Campos, J.F. Huete, and S. Moral. Probability intervals: a tool for uncertain reasoning. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 2(2), 1994.
- [7] Alain Chateauneuf and Jean-Yves Jaffray. Some characterizations of lower probabilities and other monotone capacities through the use of möbius inversion. *Mathematical social sciences*, 17(3):263–283, 1989.
- [8] FPA Coolen. On the use of imprecise probabilities in reliability. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 20(3):193–202, 2004.
- [9] Jasper De Bock. The limit behaviour of imprecise continuous-time Markov chains. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 27(1):159–196, 2017.
- [10] Gert de Cooman, Filip Hermans, and Erik Quaeghebeur. Imprecise Markov chains and their limit behavior. *Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences*, 23(4):597–635, 2009. ISSN 0269-9648. doi: 10.1017/S0269964809990039.
- [11] Jesús De Loera, Jörg Rambau, and Francisco Santos. *Triangulations: structures for algorithms and applications*, volume 25. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [12] Arthur P Dempster. Upper and lower probabilities induced by a multivalued mapping. In *Classic works of the Dempster-Shafer theory of belief functions*, pages 57–72. Springer, 2008.
- [13] Dieter Denneberg. *Non-additive measure and integral*, volume 27. Springer Science & Business Media, 1994.

- [14] David Dolžan, Damjana Kokol Bukovšek, Matjaž Omladič, and Damjan Škulj. Some multivariate imprecise shock model copulas. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 428:34–57, 2022.
- [15] Alexander Erreygers, Cristina Rottondi, Giacomo Verticale, and Jasper De Bock. Imprecise Markov models for scalable and robust performance evaluation of flexi-grid spectrum allocation policies. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 66(11):5401–5414, 2018.
- [16] Peter Gruber. *Convex and Discrete Geometry*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-71133-9. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71133-9>.
- [17] B. Grünbaum, V. Kaibel, V. Klee, and G.M. Ziegler. *Convex Polytopes*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2003. ISBN 9780387404097.
- [18] Joseph Gubeladze and Winfried Bruns. *Polytopes, Rings, and K-Theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. ISBN 978-0-387-76355-2. doi: 10.1007/b105283.
- [19] Christoph Jansen, Georg Schollmeyer, and Thomas Augustin. Concepts for decision making under severe uncertainty with partial ordinal and partial cardinal preferences. In *Proceedings of the tenth international symposium on imprecise probability: theories and applications*, pages 181–192. PMLR, 2017.
- [20] Anders Nedergaard Jensen. A non-regular grobner fan. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(3):443–453, 2007.
- [21] Nima Khakzad. System safety assessment under epistemic uncertainty: Using imprecise probabilities in bayesian network. *Safety science*, 116: 149–160, 2019.
- [22] Thomas Krak, Jasper De Bock, and Arno Siebes. Imprecise continuous-time Markov chains. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 88:452–528, 2017.
- [23] Shu Lu and Stephen M Robinson. Normal fans of polyhedral convex sets. *Set-Valued Analysis*, 16(2):281–305, 2008.
- [24] Enrique Miranda. A survey of the theory of coherent lower previsions. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 48(2):628 – 658, 2008. ISSN 0888-613X. doi: DOI:10.1016/j.ijar.2007.12.001. In Memory of Philippe Smets (1938-2005).
- [25] Enrique Miranda and Sébastien Destercke. Extreme points of the credal sets generated by comparative probabilities. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 64—65:44 – 57, 2015. ISSN

0022-2496. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmp.2014.11.004>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022249614000820>.

- [26] Enrique Miranda and Ignacio Montes. Shapley and banzhaf values as probability transformations. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems*, 26(06):917–947, 2018.
- [27] Enrique Miranda, Inés Couso, and Pedro Gil. Extreme points of credal sets generated by 2-alternating capacities. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 33(1):95–115, 2003.
- [28] Ignacio Montes, Enrique Miranda, and Susana Montes. Decision making with imprecise probabilities and utilities by means of statistical preference and stochastic dominance. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 234(1):209–220, 2014.
- [29] Ignacio Montes, Enrique Miranda, and Paolo Vicig. 2-monotone outer approximations of coherent lower probabilities. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 101:181–205, 2018.
- [30] Robert Nau. Imprecise probabilities in non-cooperative games. In *Proceedings of ISIPTA*, pages 297–306. Citeseer, 2011.
- [31] Michael Oberguggenberger, Julian King, and Bernhard Schmelzer. Classical and imprecise probability methods for sensitivity analysis in engineering: A case study. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 50(4):680–693, 2009.
- [32] Matjaž Omladič and Damjan Škulj. Constructing copulas from shock models with imprecise distributions. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 118:27–46, 2020.
- [33] Matjaž Omladič and Nik Stopar. Final solution to the problem of relating a true copula to an imprecise copula. *Fuzzy sets and systems*, 393:96–112, 2020.
- [34] Matjaž Omladič and Nik Stopar. A full scale sklar’s theorem in the imprecise setting. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 393:113–125, 2020.
- [35] Judea Pearl. On probability intervals. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 2(3):211–216, 1988.
- [36] Renato Pelesoni and Paolo Vicig. Convex imprecise previsions. *Reliable Computing*, 9(6):465–485, 2003.
- [37] Erik Quaeghebeur. Introduction to the theory of imprecise probability. In *Uncertainty in Engineering*, pages 37–50. Springer, Cham, 2022.

- [38] Benjamin Quost and Sébastien Destercke. Classification by pairwise coupling of imprecise probabilities. *Pattern Recognition*, 77:412–425, 2018.
- [39] R.T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics. Princeton University Press, 1970. ISBN 9780691015866.
- [40] D. Schmeidler. Integral representation without additivity. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 97:255–261, 1986.
- [41] Glenn Shafer. Belief functions and possibility measures. In *Anal of Fuzzy Inf*, pages 51–84. CRC Press Inc, 1987.
- [42] Damjan Škulj. Perturbation bounds and degree of imprecision for uniquely convergent imprecise Markov chains. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 533:336–356, 2017.
- [43] Damjan Škulj. Errors bounds for finite approximations of coherent lower previsions on finite probability spaces. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 105:98–111, 2019.
- [44] Philippe Smets. Belief functions: the disjunctive rule of combination and the generalized bayesian theorem. *International Journal of approximate reasoning*, 9(1):1–35, 1993.
- [45] Carl Sundberg and Carl Wagner. Characterizations of monotone and 2-monotone capacities. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 5(1):159–167, 1992.
- [46] Matthias CM Troffaes. Decision making under uncertainty using imprecise probabilities. *International journal of approximate reasoning*, 45(1):17–29, 2007.
- [47] Matthias CM Troffaes and Gert De Cooman. *Lower previsions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [48] Lev V Utkin. An imprecise extension of SVM-based machine learning models. *Neurocomputing*, 331:18–32, 2019.
- [49] Lev V Utkin and Frank PA Coolen. Imprecise reliability: an introductory overview. *Computational intelligence in reliability engineering*, pages 261–306, 2007.
- [50] Lev V Utkin, Maxim S Kovalev, and Frank PA Coolen. Imprecise weighted extensions of random forests for classification and regression. *Applied Soft Computing*, 92:106324, 2020.

- [51] Paolo Vicig. Financial risk measurement with imprecise probabilities. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 49(1):159–174, 2008.
- [52] Damjan Škulj. Discrete time Markov chains with interval probabilities. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 50(8):1314–1329, sep 2009. ISSN 0888-613X. doi: 10.1016/j.ijar.2009.06.007. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2009.06.007>.
- [53] Damjan Škulj. Efficient computation of the bounds of continuous time imprecise Markov chains. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 250(0):165 – 180, jan 2015. ISSN 0096-3003. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amc.2014.10.092>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0096300314014672>.
- [54] Damjan Škulj. Computing bounds for imprecise continuous-time markov chains using normal cones. In Massimiliano Vasile and Domenico Quagliarella, editors, *Advances in Uncertainty Quantification and Optimization Under Uncertainty with Aerospace Applications: Proceedings of the 2020 Uqop International Conf*, 2020.
- [55] Damjan Škulj. Application of normal cones to computing bounds for imprecise continuous-time markov chains. Submitted, 2022.
- [56] Peter Walley. *Statistical Reasoning with Imprecise Probabilities*. Chapman and Hall, London, New York, 1991.
- [57] Anton Wallner. Extreme points of coherent probabilities in finite spaces. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 44(3):339 – 357, 2007. ISSN 0888-613X. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2006.07.017>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0888613X06001010>.
- [58] K. Weichselberger. *Elementare Grundbegriffe einer allgemeineren Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. I: Intervallwahrscheinlichkeit als umfassendes Konzept*. Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2001.
- [59] Lanting Yu, Sébastien Destercke, Mohamed Sallak, and Walter Schon. Comparing system reliabilities with ill-known probabilities. In *International Conference on Information Processing and Management of Uncertainty in Knowledge-Based Systems*, pages 619–629. Springer, 2016.
- [60] Jiaxin Zhang and Michael Shields. On the quantification and efficient propagation of imprecise probabilities with copula dependence. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 122:24–46, 2020.
- [61] G.M. Ziegler. *Lectures on Polytopes*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2012. ISBN 9780387943657.