Submitted to the Bernoulli

A Central Limit Theorem for Adaptive and Interacting Markov Chains

G. FORT^{1,*,*}, E. MOULINES^{1,**,*}, P. PRIOURET^{2,†}, P. VANDEKERKHOVE^{3,‡}

¹LTCI, TELECOM ParisTech & CNRS, 46 rue Barrault, 75634 Paris Cedex 13, France E-mail: *gersende.fort@telecom-paristech.fr; **eric.moulines@telecom-paristech.fr

²LPMA, Univ. Pierre et Marie Curie, Boîte courrier 188
75252 PARIS Cedex 05, France
E-mail: [†]priouret@ccr.jussieu.fr

³LAMA, Univ. Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée, Cité Descartes, 5 Bd. Descartes, Champs-sur-Marne 77454 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, France E-mail: [‡]vandek@univ-mlv.fr

Adaptive and interacting Markov Chains Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms are a novel class of non-Markovian algorithms aimed at improving the simulation efficiency for complicated target distributions. In this paper, we study a general (non-Markovian) simulation framework covering both the adaptive and interacting MCMC algorithms. We establish a Central Limit Theorem for additive functionals of unbounded functions under a set of verifiable conditions, and identify the asymptotic variance. Our result extends all the results reported so far. An application to the interacting tempering algorithm (a simplified version of the equi-energy sampler) is presented to support our claims.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: primary 65C05, 60F05, 62L10; secondary 65C40, 60J05,93E35. Keywords: MCMC, interacting MCMC, Limit theorems.

^{*}This work is partially supported by the French National Research Agency, under the program ANR-08-BLAN-0218 $\rm BigMC$

1. Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods generate samples from distributions known up to a scaling factor.

In the last decade, several non-Markovian simulation algorithms have been proposed. In the so-called adaptive MCMC algorithm, the transition kernel of the MCMC algorithm depends on a finite dimensional *parameter* which is updated at each iteration from the past values of the chain and the parameters. The prototypical example is the adaptive Metropolis algorithm, introduced in Haario et al. (1999) (see Saksman and Vihola (2010) and the references therein for recent references). Many other examples of adaptive MCMC algorithms are presented in the survey papers by Andrieu and Thoms (2008); Rosenthal (2009); Atchadé et al. (2011).

In the so-called *Interacting MCMC*, several processes are simulated in parallel, each targeting different distribution. Each process might interact with the whole past of its neighboring processes. A prototypical example is the equi-energy sampler introduced in Kou et al. (2006), where the different processes target a tempered version of the target distribution. The convergence of this algorithm has been considered in a series of papers by Andrieu et al. (2007b), Andrieu et al. (2007a), Andrieu et al. (2011) and in Fort et al. (2012). Different variants of the interacting MCMC algorithm have been later introduced and studied in Bercu et al. (2009), Del Moral and Doucet (2010) and Brockwell et al. (2010). These algorithms are so far limited to specific scenarios, and the assumptions used in these papers preclude the applications of their results in the applications considered in this paper.

The analysis of the convergence of these algorithms is involved. Whereas the basic building blocks of these simulation algorithms are Markov kernels, the processes generated by these techniques are no longer Markovian. Indeed, each individual process either interacts with its distant past, or the distant past of some auxiliary processes.

The ergodicity and the consistency of additive functionals for adaptive and interacting Markov Chains have been considered in several recent papers: see Fort et al. (2012) and the references therein. Up to now, there are much fewer works addressing Central Limit Theorems (CLT). In Andrieu and Moulines (2006) the authors establish the asymptotic normality of additive functionals for a special class of adaptive MCMC algorithms in which a finite dimensional parameter is adapted using a stochastic approximation procedure. Atchadé (2011) established a CLT for general adaptive MCMC samplers under stronger conditions than in Andrieu and Moulines (2006), by assuming simultaneous ergodicity of the transition kernels involved in the adaptive algorithm. Some of the theoretical limitations of Andrieu and Moulines (2006) have been alleviated by Saksman and Vihola (2010) for the so-called adaptive Metropolis algorithm, which established a CLT for additive functionals for the Adaptive Metropolis algorithm (with a proof specially tailored for this algorithm). The results presented in this contribution contain as special cases these three earlier results.

The theory for interacting MCMC algorithms is up to now quite limited, despite the clear potential of this class of methods to sample complicated multimodal target distributions. The law of large numbers for additive functionals have been established in Andrieu et al. (2008) for some specific interacting algorithm. A wider class of interacting Markov chains has been considered in Del Moral and Doucet (2010). This paper establishes the consistency of a form of interacting tempering algorithm and provides non-asymptotic L^p -inequalities. The assumptions under which the results are derived are restrictive and the results do not cover the interacting MCMC algorithms considered in this paper. More recently, Fort et al. (2012) have established the ergodicity and law of large numbers for a wide class of interacting MCMC, under the weakest conditions known so far.

A functional CLT was derived in Bercu et al. (2009) for a specific class of interacting Markov Chains but their assumptions do not cover the interactive MCMC considered in this paper (and in particular, the interacting MCMC algorithm). A CLT for additive functionals is established by Atchadé (2010) for the interacting tempering algorithm; the proof of the main result in this paper, Theorem 3.3, contains a serious gap (p.865) which seems difficult to correct.

This paper aims at providing a theory removing the limitations mentioned above and covering both adaptive and interacting MCMC in a common unifying framework. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we derive our main theorem (Theorem 2.3) which establishes CLTs for adaptive and interacting MCMC algorithms. These results are applied in section 3.2 to the 2-chain interacting tempering algorithm which is a simplified version of the Equi-Energy sampler. All the proofs are postponed in Section 4.

Notations

Let (X, \mathcal{X}) be a general state space and P be a Markov transition kernel (see e.g. (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009, Chapter 3)). P acts on bounded functions f on X and on σ -finite positive measures μ on \mathcal{X} via

$$Pf(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int P(x, \mathrm{d}y)f(y) , \qquad \mu P(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \mu(\mathrm{d}x)P(x, A) .$$

We denote by P^n the *n*-iterated transition kernel defined inductively

$$P^{n}(x,A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int P^{n-1}(x,\mathrm{d}y)P(y,A) = \int P(x,\mathrm{d}y)P^{n-1}(y,A) ;$$

where P^0 is the identity kernel. For a function $V : \mathsf{X} \to [1, +\infty)$, define the V-norm of a function $f : \mathsf{X} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$|f|_V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} \frac{|f|(x)}{V(x)} .$$

When V = 1, the V-norm is the supremum norm denoted by $|f|_{\infty}$. Let \mathcal{L}_V be the set of measurable functions such that $|f|_V < +\infty$. For μ a finite signed measure on (X, \mathcal{X}) and $V : X \to [1, \infty)$ such that $|\mu|(V) < \infty$ where $|\mu|$ is the variation of μ , we define $\|\mu\|_V$ the V-norm of μ as

$$\|\mu\|_V = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}_V, |f|_V \le 1} |\mu(f)|.$$

When $V \equiv 1$, the V-norm corresponds to the total variation norm.

For finite signed kernels P on (X, \mathcal{X}) and $V : X \to [1, \infty)$ such that $|P(x, \cdot)|(V) < \infty$ for any $x \in X$, define

$$\|P\|_{V} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} V^{-1}(x) \, \|P(x, \cdot)\|_{V} \, . \tag{1}$$

Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence. For $p \leq q \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $x_{p:q}$ denotes the vector (x_p, \ldots, x_q) .

2. Main results

Let (Θ, \mathcal{T}) be a measurable space. Let $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ be a collection of Markov transition kernels on $(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{X})$ indexed by a parameter $\theta \in \Theta$. From here on, it is assumed that for any $A \in \mathcal{X}, (x, \theta) \mapsto P_{\theta}(x, A)$ is $\mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{T}/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ measurable, where $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ denotes the Borel σ -field. From here on Θ is not necessarily a finite-dimensional vector space. It might be a function space or a space of measures. We consider a $\mathsf{X} \times \Theta$ -valued process $\{(X_n, \theta_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \{\mathcal{F}_n, n \geq 0\}, \mathbb{P})$. It is assumed that

A1 The process $\{(X_n, \theta_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted and for any bounded measurable function h,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[h(X_{n+1}) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_n\right] = P_{\theta_n} h(X_n) \;.$$

Assumption A1 implies that conditional to the past (subsumed in the σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_n), the distribution of the next sample X_{n+1} is governed by the current value X_n and the current parameter θ_n . This assumption covers any adaptive and interacting MCMC algorithms; see Andrieu and Thoms (2008), Atchadé et al. (2011), Fort et al. (2012) for examples. This assumption on the adaptation of the parameter $(\theta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is quite weak since it only requires the parameter to be adapted to the filtration. In practice, it frequently occurs that the joint process $\{(X_n, \theta_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is Markovian but assumption A1 covers more general adaptation rules.

We assume that the transition kernels $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ satisfy a Lyapunov drift inequality and smallness conditions:

A2 For all $\theta \in \Theta$, P_{θ} is phi-irreducible, aperiodic and there exists a function $V : \mathsf{X} \to [1, +\infty)$, and for any $\theta \in \Theta$ there exist some constants $b_{\theta} \in (1, +\infty), \lambda_{\theta} \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$,

$$P_{\theta}V(x) \leq \lambda_{\theta}V(x) + b_{\theta}$$
.

In addition, for any $d \ge 1$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$, the level sets $\{V \le d\}$ are *m*-small for P_{θ} *i.e.*, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, there exist $\kappa_{\theta} > 0$ and a probability ν_{θ} such that for all $x \in \{V \le d\}, P_{\theta}^m(x, A) \ge \kappa_{\theta}\nu_{\theta}(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{X}$.

In many examples considered so far (see Andrieu and Moulines (2006), Saksman and Vihola (2010), Fort et al. (2012), Andrieu et al. (2011)) this condition is satisfied. All the results below can be established under assumptions insuring that the drift inequality and/or the smallness condition are satisfied for some *m*-iterated P_{θ}^{m} . Note that checking

assumption on the iterated kernel P_{θ}^{m} is prone to be difficult because the expression of the *m*-iterated kernel is most often rather involved.

A2 implies that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, P_{θ} possesses an invariant probability distribution π_{θ} and the kernel P_{θ} is geometrically ergodic (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009, Chapter 15). The following lemma summarizes the properties of the family $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ used hereafter (see e.g. Douc et al. (2004) and references therein for the explicit control of ergodicity; and (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009, Proposition 17.4.1.) for the Poisson equation). For $\theta \in \Theta$, denote by Λ_{θ} the operator which associates to any function $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ the function $\Lambda_{\theta} f$ given by:

$$\Lambda_{\theta} f \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n \ge 0} P_{\theta}^{n} f - \pi_{\theta}(f) .$$
⁽²⁾

Lemma 2.1. Assume A2. Then for any $\theta \in \Theta$, there exists a probability distribution π_{θ} such that $\pi_{\theta}P_{\theta} = \pi_{\theta}$ and $\pi_{\theta}(V) \leq b_{\theta}(1-\lambda_{\theta})^{-1}$. In addition, for any $\alpha \in (0,1]$, the following property holds.

 $\mathbf{P}[\alpha]$ For any $\theta \in \Theta$, there exist $C_{\theta} < \infty$ and $\rho_{\theta} \in (0, 1)$ such that, for any $\gamma \in [\alpha, 1]$,

$$\|P_{\theta}^n - \pi_{\theta}\|_{V^{\gamma}} \le C_{\theta} \rho_{\theta}^n$$

For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$, the function $\Lambda_{\theta} f$ exists and is in $\mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. The function $\Lambda_{\theta} f$ is the unique solution up to an additive constant of the Poisson equation

$$\Lambda_{\theta}f - P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta}f = f - \pi_{\theta}(f) .$$
(3)

It has been shown in Fort et al. (2012), that under appropriate assumptions, when the sequence $(\theta_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\theta_{\star} \in \Theta$ in an appropriate sense, $n^{-1}\sum_{k=1}^{n} f(X_k)$ converges almost surely to $\pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f)$, for any functions f belonging to a suitable class of functions \mathcal{M} . The objective of this paper is to derive a CLT for $n^{-1/2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \{f(X_k) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f)\}$ for functions f belonging to \mathcal{M} . To that goal, consider the following decomposition

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\{ f(X_k) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f) \right\} = S_n^{(1)}(f) + S_n^{(2)}(f) ,$$

where $S_n^{(1)}(f)$ and $S_n^{(2)}(f)$ are given by

$$S_n^{(1)}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n \left\{ f(X_k) - \pi_{\theta_{k-1}}(f) \right\} , \qquad (4)$$

$$S_n^{(2)}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \pi_{\theta_k}(f) - \pi_{\theta_\star}(f) \right\} \,. \tag{5}$$

We consider these two terms separately. For the first term, we use a classical technique based on the Poisson decomposition; this amounts to writing $S_n^{(1)}(f)$ as the sum of a martingale difference and of a remainder term converging to zero in probability; see

Andrieu and Moulines (2006); Atchadé and Fort (2010); Fort et al. (2012); Del Moral and Doucet (2010); Saksman and Vihola (2010) for law of large numbers for adaptive and interacting MCMC. Then we apply a classical CLT for martingale difference array; see for example (Hall and Heyde, 1980, Theorem 3.2).

The second term vanishes when $\pi_{\theta} = \pi_{\theta_{\star}}$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ which is the case for example, for the adaptive Metropolis algorithm (Haario et al., 1999). In scenarios where $\theta \mapsto \pi_{\theta}$ is a non trivial function of θ , the weak convergence $S_n^{(2)}(f)$ relies on conditions which are quite problem specific. The application detailed in Section 3.2, an elementary version of the interacting tempering algorithm, is a situation in which $\pi_{\theta_{\star}}$ is known but the expression of π_{θ} , $\theta \neq \theta_{\star}$, is unknown, except in very simple examples. The Wang-Landau algorithm (Wang and Landau, 2001; Liang et al., 2007) is an example of adaptive MCMC algorithm in which $\theta \mapsto \pi_{\theta}$ is explicit. The results in this paper cover the case when the expression of π_{θ} is unknown: we rewrite $S_n^{(2)}(f)$ by showing that the leading term of the difference $\pi_{\theta_k}(f) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f)$ is $\pi_{\theta_{\star}}(P_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_{\star}}) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f$ where $\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}$ is the operator defined by (2). Our approach covers much more general set-up than the one outlined in Bercu et al. (2009).

The convergence of $S_n^{(1)}(f)$ is addressed under the following assumptions which are related to the regularity in the parameter $\theta \in \Theta$ of the ergodic behavior of the kernels $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$.

- A3 There exist $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and a subset of measurable functions $\mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ satisfying the two following conditions
 - (a) for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left| P_{\theta_k} \Lambda_{\theta_k} f - P_{\theta_{k-1}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

(b) $n^{-1/2\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L_{\theta_k}^{2/\alpha} P_{\theta_k} V(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ where L_{θ} is defined by (8) for the constants $C_{\theta}, \rho_{\theta}$ given by $P[\alpha]$.

A3-a controls the regularity in the parameter θ of the Poisson solution $\Lambda_{\theta} f$. By (Fort et al., 2012, Lemma 4.2),

$$\|P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta} - P_{\theta'}\Lambda_{\theta'}\|_{V^{\alpha}} \le 5 \ (L_{\theta} \vee L_{\theta'})^6 \pi_{\theta}(V^{\alpha}) D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta, \theta') , \qquad (6)$$

where

$$D_V(\theta, \theta') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|P_\theta - P_{\theta'}\|_V , \qquad (7)$$

$$L_{\theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_{\theta} \vee (1 - \rho_{\theta})^{-1} , \qquad (8)$$

and $||P_{\theta} - P_{\theta'}||_{V}$ is defined by (1) and C_{θ} and ρ_{θ} are introduced in Lemma 2.1. This upper bound relates the regularity in θ of the function $\theta \mapsto P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta}f$ to the ergodicity constants C_{θ} and ρ_{θ} and to the regularity in θ of the function $\theta \mapsto P_{\theta}$ from the parameter space Θ to the space of Markov transition kernels equipped with the V-operator norm. Therefore,

A3-a corresponds to a diminishing adaptation condition (see Roberts and Rosenthal (2007)).

A3-b is a kind of containment condition (see Roberts and Rosenthal (2007)): when the ergodic behavior **A2** is uniform in θ so that λ_{θ} , b_{θ} and the minorization constant of the P_{θ} -smallness condition do not depend on θ , then the constant L_{θ} does not depend on θ and by **A1** and the drift inequality **A2**,

$$n^{-1/2\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[V(X_{k+1})\right] \le n^{1-1/2\alpha} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[V(X_0)\right] + (1-\lambda)^{-1}b \right\} \to 0.$$

Therefore, condition **A3-b** holds provided the ergodic constant L_{θ_k} is controlled by a slowly-increasing function of k. Lemma A.2 in Appendix A provides sufficient conditions to obtain upper bounds of $\theta \mapsto L_{\theta}$ in terms of the constants appearing in the drift inequality **A2**.

We finally introduce a condition allowing to obtain a closed-form expression for the asymptotic variance of $S_n^{(1)}(f)$. For $\theta \in \Theta$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ define

$$F_{\theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\theta} (\Lambda_{\theta} f)^2 - \left[P_{\theta} \Lambda_{\theta} f \right]^2 . \tag{9}$$

A4 For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$, $n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} F_{\theta_k}(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2(f)$, where $\sigma^2(f)$ is a deterministic constant.

Assumption A4 is typically established by using the Law of Large Numbers (LLN) for adaptive and interacting Markov Chain derived in Fort et al. (2012); see also Theorem B.1 in Appendix B. Under appropriate regularity conditions on the Markov kernels $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$, it is proved that $n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{F_{\theta_k}(X_k) - \int \pi_{\theta_k}(dx) F_{\theta_k}(x)\}$ converges in probability to zero. The second step consists in showing that $n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int \pi_{\theta_k}(dx) F_{\theta_k}(x)$ converges to a (deterministic) constant $\sigma^2(f)$: when π_{θ} is not explicitly known and the set X is Polish, Lemma A.3 in Appendix A is useful to check this convergence. In practice, this may introduce a restriction of the set of functions $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ for which this limit holds (see e.g. the example detailed in Section 3.2 where $\mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}} \neq \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$).

We can now state conditions upon which $S_n^{(1)}(f)$ is asymptotically normal.

Theorem 2.2. Assume A1 to A4. For any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left\{f(X_k) - \pi_{\theta_{k-1}}(f)\right\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(f)) .$$

The proof is in section 4.1.1. When $\pi_{\theta} = \pi$ for any θ , Theorem 2.2 provides sufficient conditions for a CLT for additive functionals to hold.

When π_{θ} is a function of $\theta \in \Theta$, we need now to obtain a joint CLT for $(S_n^{(1)}(f), S_n^{(2)}(f))$ (see (4) and (5)). To that goal, we replace **A1** by the following assumption which implies that, conditionally to the process $(\theta_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an inhomogeneous Markov chain with transition kernels $(P_{\theta_j}, j \geq 0)$:

A5 There exists an initial distribution ν such that for any bounded measurable function $f: X^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{0:n}) | \theta_{0:n}] = \int \cdots \int \nu(\mathrm{d}x_0) f(x_{0:n}) \prod_{j=1}^n P_{\theta_{j-1}}(x_{j-1}, \mathrm{d}x_j) .$$

Assumption A5 is satisfied when $\{(X_n, \theta_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an interacting MCMC algorithm. Note that A5 implies A1.

The first step in the proof of the joint CLT consists in linearizing the difference $\pi_{\theta_n} - \pi_{\theta_*}$. Under **A2**, $\pi_{\theta}(g)$ exists for any $g \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ (see Lemma 2.1), and we have

$$\pi_{\theta}(g) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(g) = \pi_{\theta} P_{\theta} g - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} P_{\theta_{\star}} g = \pi_{\theta} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) g + \left(\pi_{\theta} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right) P_{\theta_{\star}} g ,$$

which implies that $(\pi_{\theta} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}) (I - P_{\theta_{\star}}) g = \pi_{\theta} (P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}}) g$. Let $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. Then $\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ and by applying the previous equality with $g = \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f$, we have by (3)

$$\pi_{\theta}(f) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f) = \pi_{\theta} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f .$$
(10)

We can iterate this decomposition, writing

$$\pi_{\theta}(f) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f) = \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f + \pi_{\theta} \left(\left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f \right) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(\left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f \right)$$

Applying again (10), we obtain

$$\pi_{\theta}(f) - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}(f) = \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f + \pi_{\theta} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f .$$

The first term in the RHS of the previous equation is the leading term of the error $\pi_{\theta_k} - \pi_{\theta_\star}$, whereas the second term is a remainder. This decomposition naturally leads to the following assumption.

A6 For any function $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

(a) there exists a positive constant $\gamma^2(f)$ such that

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma^{2}(f)) .$$
(11)

(b)
$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_{\theta_k} \left(P_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_\star} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_\star} \left(P_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_\star} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Theorem 2.3. Assume A2 to A6. For any function $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left\{ f(X_k) - \pi_{\theta_*}(f) \right\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma^2(f) + \gamma^2(f) \right) \ .$$

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is postponed to section 4.1.2. It is worthwhile to note that, as a consequence of **A5**, the variance is additive. This result extends Bercu et al. (2009) which addresses the case when $P_{\theta}(x, A) = P_{\theta}(A)$ *i.e.* the case when conditionally to the adaptation process $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the random variables $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are independent (see (Bercu et al., 2009, Eq. (1.4))). Our result, applied in this simpler situation, yields the same asymptotic variance.

imsart-bj ver. 2009/08/13 file: fmpv_clt_short_soumis.tex date: July 24, 2012

8

3. Applications

3.1. Adaptive Metropolis (after Saksman and Vihola (2010))

In this example, $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and the densities are assumed to be w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, |x| denotes the Euclidean norm. For $\kappa > 0$, let \mathcal{C}^d_{κ} be the set of symmetric and positive definite $d \times d$ matrices whose minimal eigenvalue is larger than κ . The parameter set $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{C}^d_{\kappa}$ is endowed with the norm $|\theta|^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\mu|^2 + \text{Tr}(\Gamma^T \Gamma)$, where $\theta = (\mu, \Gamma)$. At each iteration, $X_{n+1} \sim P_{\theta_n}(X_n, \cdot)$, where P_{θ} is defined by

$$P_{\theta}(x,A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{A} \left(1 \wedge \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \right) q_{\Gamma}(y-x) \mathrm{d}y + \mathbb{1}_{A}(x) \left[1 - \int \left(1 \wedge \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \right) q_{\Gamma}(y-x) \mathrm{d}y \right], \quad (12)$$

with q_{Γ} the density of a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and covariance matrix $(2.38)^2 d^{-1}\Gamma$, and π is a density on \mathbb{R}^d . The parameter $\theta_n = (\mu_n, \Gamma_n) \in \Theta$ is the sample mean and covariance matrix

$$\mu_{n+1} = \mu_n + \frac{1}{n+1} (X_{n+1} - \mu_n) , \quad \mu_0 = 0 , \qquad (13)$$

$$\Gamma_{n+1} = \frac{n}{n+1} \Gamma_n + \frac{1}{n+1} \left\{ (X_{n+1} - \mu_n) (X_{n+1} - \mu_n)^T + \kappa \mathbf{I}_d \right\} , \qquad (14)$$

where I_d is the identity matrix, $\Gamma_0 \ge 0$ and κ is a positive constant.

By construction, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, π is the stationary distribution for P_{θ} so that $\pi_{\theta} = \pi$ for any θ . As in Saksman and Vihola (2010), we consider the following assumption:

M1 π is positive, bounded, differentiable and

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \sup_{|x| \ge r} \frac{x}{|x|^{\rho}} \cdot \nabla \log \pi(x) = -\infty ,$$

for some $\rho > 1$. Moreover, π has regular contours, *i.e.* for some R > 0,

$$\sup_{|x|\ge R} \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \frac{\nabla \pi(x)}{|\nabla \pi(x)|} < 0.$$

Saksman and Vihola (2010, Proposition 15) establishes A2: the drift function V is proprotional to π^{-s} , (for any) $s \in (0,1)$; the constant b_{θ} does not depend upon θ ; and any level set of V is 1-small for P_{θ} . Saksman and Vihola (2010, Propositions 15) also establishes that there exists a non-negative constant C such that for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\kappa_{\theta}^{-1} \vee (1 - \lambda_{\theta})^{-1} \leq C |\theta|^{d/2}$$

This upper bound combined with (Fort et al., 2012, Lemma 2.3) implies that there exist finite constants C and γ such that for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$L_{\theta} \le C |\theta|^{\gamma} , \qquad (15)$$

where L_{θ} is defined by (8).

We now prove that **A3** holds. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and set $\mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}} = \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. By (6) and (15), there exist positive constants $C, \bar{\gamma}$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} |P_{\theta_{k}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k}} f - P_{\theta_{k-1}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(X_{k})$$

$$\leq c \ n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} (1 + |\theta_{k}| + |\theta_{k-1}|)^{\bar{\gamma}} \ D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta_{k}, \theta_{k-1}) \ V^{\alpha}(X_{k}) .$$

In (Saksman and Vihola, 2010, Lemma 12), it is proved that under M1, the rate of growth of the parameters $\{\theta_n, n \ge 0\}$ is controlled. Namely, for any $\tau > 0$,

$$\sup_{n \ge 1} n^{-\tau} |\theta_n| < +\infty , \qquad \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}$$
(16)

In addition, it is established in (Fort et al., 2012, Eq.(12)) that there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that for any $n \ge 1$,

$$D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta_{n},\theta_{n-1}) \leq \frac{C}{n} \left\{ 1 + \frac{\ln n}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \ln^{2} V(X_{j}) + \ln n \left(\ln^{2} V(X_{n}) + \ln^{2} V(X_{n-1}) \right) \right\}$$

Combining the above results show that **A3-a** holds provided

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{\ln k}{k^{1-\tau\bar{\gamma}}}\left(\frac{1}{k-1}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\ln^2 V(X_j) + \ln^2 V(X_k) + \ln^2 V(X_{k-1})\right) V^{\alpha}(X_k) \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\longrightarrow} 0,$$
(17)

for some $\tau > 0$. We prove that such a convergence occurs in L^1 . To that goal, observe that the drift inequality $P_{\theta}V \leq V + b$ implies that $\mathbb{E}[V(X_n)] \leq \mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] + nb$, which in turn yields, by the Jensen inequality, $\sup_j (\ln^p j)^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\ln^p V(X_j)] < \infty$ for any $p \geq 2$. Then, by the Hölder inequality,

$$\sup_{k} (\ln^{2} k k^{\alpha})^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \ln^{2} V(X_{j}) + \ln^{2} V(X_{k}) + \ln^{2} V(X_{k-1}) \right) V^{\alpha}(X_{k}) \right] < \infty$$

Since $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and τ can be chosen arbitrarily small, (17) is established and thus yields the condition **A3-a**.

We now consider **A3-b**. By (16), it is sufficient to prove that for some $\tau > 0$ and any t > 0,

$$n^{-1/2\alpha} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L_{\theta_k}^{2/\alpha} P_{\theta_k} V(X_k) \mathbb{1}\{\sup_{\ell \ge 1} \ell^{-\tau} |\theta_\ell| \le t\} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

$$(18)$$

By (Fort et al., 2012, Lemma 2.5), there exist a constant C (depending upon τ and t) such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[V(X_n)\mathbb{1}\left\{\sup_{\ell\leq n-1}\ell^{-\tau}|\theta_\ell|\leq t\right\}\right]\leq C\left(\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)]+n^{\tau\gamma}\right)$$

where γ is defined in (15). Since $1/(2\alpha) > 1$, Eqs. (15) and (16) imply (18). This concludes the proof of **A3-b**.

Let us consider A4. The proof of this condition is a consequence of the convergence of $\{\theta_n, n \ge 0\}$ and the regularity in θ of F_{θ} . Under M1 and the condition $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < \infty$, $n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} f(X_k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \pi(f)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^a}$ and $a \in (0, 1)$ (see (Fort et al., 2012, Theorem 2.10)). Since under M1 $\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} \ln V(x)/|x| > 0$, this implies that the strong Law of Large Numbers holds for functions f with quadratic growth at infinity. Therefore, $\{\theta_n, n \ge 0\}$ converges w.p.1 to $\theta_{\star} = (\mu_{\star}, \Gamma_{\star})$ given by

$$\mu_{\star} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int x \ \pi(x) \ \mathrm{d}x , \qquad \Gamma_{\star} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int (x - \mu_{\star}) \ (x - \mu_{\star})' \ \pi(x) \mathrm{d}x + \kappa \mathrm{I} .$$

 Set

$$\sigma^{2}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int F_{\theta_{\star}}(x) \, \mathrm{d}x = \int \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}(\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}f)^{2}(x) - \left[P_{\theta_{\star}}\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}f \right]^{2}(x) \right) \, \mathrm{d}x \,. \tag{19}$$

The proof of A4 is given in the material Fort et al. (2011). Combining the results above yields

Theorem 3.1. Assume M1 and $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < +\infty$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \{f(X_k) - \pi(f)\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_f^2) ,$$

where $\sigma^2(f)$ is given by (19).

3.2. Interacting Tempering algorithm

We consider the simplified version of the equi-energy sampler (Kou et al., 2006) introduced in Andrieu et al. (2011). This version is referred to as the Interacting-tempering (IT) sampler. Recently, convergence of the marginals and strong law of large numbers results have been established under general conditions (see Fort et al. (2012)). In this section, we derive a CLT under similar assumptions.

Let $\{\pi^{\beta_k}, k \in \{1, \dots, K\}\}$ be a sequence of tempered densities on X, where $0 < \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_K = 1$. At the first level, a process $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with stationary distribution proportional to π^{β_1} is run. At the second level, a process $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with stationary distribution proportional to π^{β_2} is constructed: at each iteration the next value is obtained from a Markov kernel depending on the occupation measure of the chain $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ up to the current time-step. This 2-stages mechanism is then repeated to design a process targeting π^{β_k} by using the occupation measure of the process targeting $\pi^{\beta_{k-1}}$.

For ease of exposition, it is assumed that (X, \mathcal{X}) is a Polish space equipped with its Borel σ -field, and the densities are w.r.t. some σ -finite measure on (X, \mathcal{X}) . We address the case K = 2 and discuss below possible extensions to the case K > 2.

We start with a description of the IT (case K = 2). Denote by Θ the set of the probability measures on (X, \mathcal{X}) equipped with the Borel sigma-field \mathcal{T} associated to the topology of weak convergence. Let P be a transition kernel on (X, \mathcal{X}) with unique invariant distribution π (typically, P is chosen to be a Metropolis-Hastings kernel). Denote by $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ the probability of interaction. Let $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a discrete-time (possibly non-stationary) process and denote by θ_n the empirical probability measure:

$$\theta_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{Y_k} \ . \tag{20}$$

Choose $X_0 \sim \nu$. At the *n*-th iteration of the algorithm, two actions may be taken:

- 1. with probability $(1-\epsilon)$, the state X_{n+1} is sampled from the Markov kernel $P(X_n, \cdot)$,
- 2. with probability ϵ , a tentative state Z_{n+1} is drawn uniformly from the past of the auxiliary process $\{Y_k, k \leq n\}$. This move is accepted with probability $r(X_n, Z_{n+1})$, where the acceptance ratio r is given by

$$r(x,z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 \wedge \frac{\pi(z)\pi^{1-\beta}(x)}{\pi^{1-\beta}(z)\pi(x)} = 1 \wedge \frac{\pi^{\beta}(z)}{\pi^{\beta}(x)} .$$

$$(21)$$

Define the family of Markov transition kernels $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ by

$$P_{\theta}(x,A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1-\epsilon)P(x,A) + \epsilon \left(\int_{A} r(x,y)\theta(\mathrm{d}y) + \mathbb{1}_{A}(x) \int \{1-r(x,y)\}\theta(\mathrm{d}y) \right) . \quad (22)$$

Then, the above algorithmic description implies that the bivariate process $\{(X_n, \theta_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is such that for any bounded function h on X^{n+1}

$$\mathbb{E}[h(X_{0:n})|\theta_{0:n}] = \int \nu(\mathrm{d}x_0) P_{\theta_0}(x_0, \mathrm{d}x_1) \cdots P_{\theta_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}, \mathrm{d}x_n) h(x_{0:n}) \, .$$

We apply the results of Section 2 in order to prove that the IT process $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies a CLT. To that goal, it is assumed that the target density π and the transition kernel Psatisfy the following conditions:

- I1 π is a continuous positive density on X and $|\pi|_{\infty} < +\infty$.
- I2 (a) P is a phi-irreducible aperiodic Feller transition kernel on (X, X) such that $\pi P = \pi$.
 - (b) There exist $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $b < +\infty$ such that

$$PV(x) \le \lambda V(x) + b$$
 with $V(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\pi(x)/|\pi|_{\infty})^{-\tau}$. (23)

- (c) For any $p \in (0, |\pi|_{\infty})$, the sets $\{\pi \ge p\}$ are 1-small (w.r.t. the transition kernel P).
- (d) For any $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and any equicontinuous set of functions $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{V^{\gamma}}$, the set of functions $\{Ph : h \in \mathcal{F}, |h|_{V^{\gamma}} \leq 1\}$ is equicontinuous.

From the expression of the acceptance ratio r (see Eq. (21)) and the assumption I2-a, it holds

$$\pi P_{\theta_{\star}} = \pi , \qquad (24)$$

where $\theta_{\star} \propto \pi^{1-\beta}$. Therefore, when θ_n converges to θ_{\star} , it is expected that $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ behaves asymptotically as π ; see Fort et al. (2012).

Drift conditions for the symmetric random walk Metropolis (SRWM) algorithm are discussed in Roberts and Tweedie (1996), Jarner and Hansen (2000) and Saksman and Vihola (2010). Under conditions which imply that the target density π is super-exponential in the tails and have regular contours, Jarner and Hansen (2000) and Saksman and Vihola (2010) show that any functions proportional to π^{-s} with $s \in (0, 1)$ satisfies a Foster-Lyapunov drift inequality (Jarner and Hansen, 2000, Theorems 4.1 and 4.3). Under this condition, I2-b is satisfied with any τ in the interval (0, 1). Assumptions I2-c and I2-d hold for the SRWM kernel under weak conditions on the symmetric proposal distribution : the minorization condition is verified whenever the proposal is positive and continuous (see e.g. (Mengersen and Tweedie, 1996, Lemma 1.2)) and the following lemma gives sufficient conditions for I2-d. The proof is in section 4.2.1.

Lemma 3.2. Assume I1. Let P be a Metropolis kernel with invariant distribution π and a symmetric proposal distribution $q : \mathsf{X} \times \mathsf{X} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\sup_{(x,y)\in\mathsf{X}^2} q(x,y) < +\infty$ and the function $x \mapsto q(x, \cdot)$ is continuous from $(\mathsf{X}, |\cdot|)$ to the set of probability densities equipped with the total variation norm. Then P satisfies I2-d with any function $V \propto \pi^{-\tau}$, $\tau \in [0, 1)$, such that $\pi(V) < +\infty$.

For a measurable function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta_{\star}(|f|) < +\infty$, define the following sequence of random processes on [0, 1]:

$$t \mapsto S_n(f;t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \{f(Y_j) - \theta_\star(f)\}$$
 (25)

It is assumed that the auxiliary process $\{Y_n, n \ge 0\}$ converges to the probability distribution θ_{\star} in the following sense:

- **I3** (a) $\theta_{\star}(V) < +\infty$ and $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[V(Y_n)] < +\infty$.
 - (b) There exists a space \mathcal{N} of real-valued measurable functions defined on X such that $V \in \mathcal{N}$ and for any function $f \in \mathcal{N}$, $\theta_n(f) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \theta_\star(f)$.
 - (c) For any function $f \in \mathcal{N}$, the sequence of processes $(S_n(f,t), n \ge 1, t \in [0,1])$ converges in distribution to $(\tilde{\gamma}(f)B(t), t \in [0,1])$, where $\tilde{\gamma}(f)$ is a non-negative constant and $(B(t): t \in [0,1])$ is a standard Brownian motion.

(d) For any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, there exist constants ϱ_0 and ϱ_1 such that, for any integers $n, k \geq 1$, for any measurable function $h : \mathsf{X}^k \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $|h(y_1, \ldots, y_k)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k V^{\alpha}(y_i)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\int\cdots\int\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left[\theta_{n}(\mathrm{d}y_{j})-\theta_{\star}(\mathrm{d}y_{j})\right]h(y_{1},\ldots,y_{k})\right)^{2}\leq A_{k}\,n^{-k}\,,$$

with $\limsup_k \ln A_k / (k \ln k) < \infty$.

I3 is satisfied when $(Y_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. with distribution θ_{\star} such that $\theta_{\star}(V) < +\infty$. In that case, I3-b to I3-c hold for any measurable function f such that $\theta_{\star}(|f|^2) < +\infty$. I3-d is satisfied using (Serfling, 1980, Lemma A, pp. 190).

I3 is also satisfied when $(Y_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a geometrically ergodic Markov chain with transition kernel Q. In that case, I3-a to I3-c are satisfied for any measurable function fsuch that $\theta_{\star} \left(\left| f \left[(I-Q)^{-1} f \right] \right| \right) < +\infty$ (see e.g. (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009, Chapter 17)). Condition I3-d for a (non-stationary) geometrically ergodic Markov chain is established in the supplementary paper (Fort et al., 2012).

The following proposition shows that under I1 and I2, condition **A2** holds with the drift function V given by A2-b. It also provides a control of the ergodicity constants $C_{\theta}, \rho_{\theta}$ in Lemma 2.1. The proof is a direct consequence of (Fort et al., 2012, Proposition 3.1, Corollary 3.2), Lemmas 2.1 and A.2, and is omitted.

Proposition 3.3. Assume I1 and I2a-b-c. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, P_{θ} is phi-irreducible, aperiodic. In addition, there exist $\tilde{\lambda} \in (0, 1)$ and $\tilde{b} < +\infty$ such that, for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$P_{\theta}V(x) \le \tilde{\lambda}V(x) + \tilde{b}\,\theta(V) \,, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathsf{X}.$$
⁽²⁶⁾

The property $P[\alpha]$ holds for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, and there exists C such that for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $L_{\theta} \leq C\theta(V)$.

Assume in addition I3a and $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < +\infty$. Then, $\sup_{n\geq 0} \mathbb{E}[V(X_n)] < +\infty$.

The next step is to check assumptions A3 and A4.

Proposition 3.4. Assume I1, I2, I3a-b and $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < +\infty$. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, set $\mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$ be the set of continuous functions belonging to $\mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{N}$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, the conditions A3 and A4 hold with

$$\sigma^2(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int \pi(\mathrm{d}x) F_{\theta_\star}(x) , \qquad (27)$$

where F_{θ} is given by (9).

The proof is postponed to Section 4.2.2. We can now apply Theorem 2.3 and prove a CLT for the 2-levels IT.

imsart-bj ver. 2009/08/13 file: fmpv_clt_short_soumis.tex date: July 24, 2012

14

Theorem 3.5. Assume 11, 12, 13 and $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < +\infty$. Then, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and any continuous function $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{N}$ such that the function G_f given by

$$G_f(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \int \pi(\mathrm{d}x) r(x,z) \left(\Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(z) - \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(x)\right) \,,$$

is in \mathcal{N} :

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(f(X_k) - \pi(f)\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2(f) + 2\tilde{\gamma}^2(G_f)) ,$$

where $\sigma^2(f)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^2(G_f)$ are given by (27) and I3-c.

The proof is postponed to Appendix 4.2.3.

It may be possible to repeat the above argument to show a CLT for the K-level IT when K > 2 (see Fort et al. (2012) for a similar approach in the proof of the ergodicity and the LLN for IT). Nevertheless, the main difficulty is to iterate the control of the L^2 -moment for the V-statistics (see I3-d) when $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is not a Markov chain or, more generally, a process satisfying some mixing conditions. A similar difficulty has been reported in Andrieu et al. (2011).

Theorem 3.5 shows that the asymptotic variance of sample path averages of the process $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$ for the functional f is the sum of two terms. The first term $\sigma^2(f)$ is the asymptotic variance of sample path averages of a Markov chain with transition kernel $P_{\theta_{\star}}$ and functional f (see e.g. (Meyn and Tweedie, 2009, Chapter 17)). The second term $\tilde{\gamma}^2(G_f)$ is the asymptotic variance of sample path averages of the auxiliary process $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$ for the functional G_f . The expression of this asymptotic variance can help in the choice of the probability of interaction ϵ . For example, given the kernel P, a question is: is the asymptotic variance reduced when replacing the classical MCMC chain with kernel P by the interacting process satisfying (1) with P_{θ} given by (22)? to answer this question, first note that the derivative with respect to ϵ of $\sigma^2(f) + 2\tilde{\gamma}^2(G_f)$ at $\epsilon = 0$ is equal to the derivative of $\sigma^2(f)$ at $\epsilon = 0$. In addition, this derivative is of the sign of

$$-\int \pi(\mathrm{d}x) \ \bar{h}(x) \ \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P - K_{\theta_{\star}}\right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} \ \bar{h}(x) = -\langle \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} \ \bar{h}, \left(P - K_{\theta_{\star}}\right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} \ \bar{h} \rangle_{L^{2}(\pi)}$$

where K_{θ} is defined by $P_{\theta} = (1 - \epsilon)P + \epsilon K_{\theta}$ and $\bar{h} = h - \pi(h)$. Therefore, if $P - K_{\theta_{\star}}$ is a positive operator on $L_0^2(\pi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h : \pi(h) = 0, \pi(h^2) < \infty\}$, the 2-level IT algorithm with ϵ small enough will improve on the MCMC sampler P. A sufficient condition for $P - K_{\theta_{\star}}$ to be a positive operator is $P \leq K_{\theta_{\star}}$ in the Peskun ordering of transition kernels (see e.g. (Tierney, 1998, Lemma 3)). Note that under this Peskun order assumption on P and $K_{\theta_{\star}}$, the function $\epsilon \mapsto \sigma^2(f)$ is non-increasing on [0,1] for any function $f \in L_0^2(\pi)$ (see the proof of (Tierney, 1998, Theorem 4)). Figure 1 below shows that this non-increasing property is balanced by the behavior of $\epsilon \mapsto 2\tilde{\gamma}^2(G_f)$. Figure 1 displays an estimation of the variance of $\sqrt{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \{f(X_k) - \pi(f)\}$, obtained from 300 independent run of the process $\{X_n, n \geq 0\}$. In this numerical application, N = 400k; π is a mixture of five \mathbb{R}^5 -valued Gaussian distribution with means drawn in the range $[-3; 3]^5$ and covariance

matrix identity; $f : \mathbb{R}^5 \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $x = (x_1, \dots, x_5) \mapsto x_5$; P is a SRWM algorithm with proposal kernel $q(x, \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}_5(x, \mathbf{I})$; and $\{Y_k, k \ge 0\}$ is a SRWM with proposal kernel $q(x, \cdot) \sim \mathcal{N}_5(x, \mathbf{I})$ and invariant measure $\pi_{\theta_*}^{0,2}$. Figure 1 shows that the variance is minimal for some ϵ in [0.05; 0.15] and corroborates previous empirical results on the choice of ϵ (see e.g. Kou et al. (2006)).



Figure 1. Estimation of the variance of $\sqrt{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \{f(X_k) - \pi(f)\}\)$, as a function of the probability of interaction ϵ . The plots have been obtained with 20 linearly spaced values of ϵ in the range [0, 0.45]; and 6 linearly spaced values in the range [0.5, 1].

4. Proofs

Note that under **A2**, for any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$|\Lambda_{\theta}f|_{V^{\alpha}} \le |f|_{V^{\alpha}} \ L^{2}_{\theta} \tag{28}$$

where L_{θ} is defined by (8).

4.1. Proofs of the results in Section 2

4.1.1. Proof of Theorem 2.2

Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_{V^{\alpha}}$. Eq. (3) yields $S_n^{(1)}(f) = \Xi_n(f) + R_n^{(1)}(f) + R_n^{(2)}(f)$ with

$$\Xi_n(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \{ \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f(X_k) - P_{\theta_{k-1}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f(X_{k-1}) \} ,$$

$$R_n^{(1)}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n \{ P_{\theta_k} \Lambda_{\theta_k} f(X_k) - P_{\theta_{k-1}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f(X_k) \} ,$$

$$R_n^{(2)}(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1/2} P_{\theta_0} \Lambda_{\theta_0} f(X_0) - n^{-1/2} P_{\theta_n} \Lambda_{\theta_n} f(X_n) .$$

We first show that the two remainders terms $R_n^{(1)}(f)$ and $R_n^{(2)}(f)$ converge to zero in probability. We have

$$|P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta}f(x) - P_{\theta'}\Lambda_{\theta'}f(x)| \le |P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta}f(x) - P_{\theta'}\Lambda_{\theta'}f(x)|_{V^{\alpha}}V^{\alpha}(x) .$$

Assumption A3 implies that $R_n^{(1)}(f)$ converges to zero in probability. The drift inequality **A2** combined with the Jensen's inequality imply $P_{\theta}V^{\alpha} \leq \lambda_{\theta}^{\alpha}V^{\alpha} + b_{\theta}^{\alpha}$. By (28) and this inequality,

$$|P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta}f(x)| \leq |f|_{V^{\alpha}} L^{2}_{\theta} P_{\theta}V^{\alpha}(x) \leq |f|_{V^{\alpha}} L^{2}_{\theta} (V^{\alpha}(x) + b^{\alpha}_{\theta}).$$

Then, $P_{\theta_0}\Lambda_{\theta_0}f(X_0)$ is finite w.p.1. and $n^{-1/2}P_{\theta_0}\Lambda_{\theta_0}f(X_0) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$. By **A3-b** and (28), $n^{-1/2}P_{\theta_n}\Lambda_{\theta_n}f(X_n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Hence, $R_n^{(2)}(f) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$.

We now consider $\Xi_n(f)$. Set $D_k(f) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f(X_k) - P_{\theta_{k-1}} \Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}} f(X_{k-1})$. Observe that under **A1**, $D_k(f)$ is a martingale-increment w.r.t. the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k \ge 0\}$. The limiting distribution for $\Xi_n(f)$ follows from martingale CLT (see *e.g.* (Hall and Heyde, 1980, Corollary 3.1.)). We check the conditional Lindeberg condition. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Under **A2**, we have by (28)

$$D_{k}(f) \leq |f|_{V^{\alpha}} \left| L^{2}_{\theta_{k-1}} \left\{ V^{\alpha}(X_{k}) + P_{\theta_{k-1}}V^{\alpha}(X_{k-1}) \right\} \right|$$

Set $\tau \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1/\alpha - 2 > 0.$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[D_{k}^{2}(f)\mathbb{1}_{|D_{k}(f)|\geq\epsilon\sqrt{n}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \leq \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\tau} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[D_{k}^{2+\tau}(f) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \\
\leq |f|_{V^{\alpha}}^{2+\tau} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\tau} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[L_{\theta_{k-1}}^{2(2+\tau)} \left\{V^{\alpha}(X_{k}) + P_{\theta_{k-1}}V^{\alpha}(X_{k-1})\right\}^{2+\tau} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] \\
\leq 2^{2+\tau} |f|_{V^{\alpha}}^{2+\tau} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\tau} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L_{\theta_{k}}^{2(2+\tau)} P_{\theta_{k}}V(X_{k}).$$

Under **A3-b**, the RHS converges to zero in probability thus concluding the proof of the conditional Lindeberg condition. For the limiting variance condition, observe that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[D_{k}^{2}(f) \, \big| \, \mathcal{F}_{k-1}\right] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} F_{\theta_{k}}(X_{k})$$

where F_{θ} is given by (9) and, under A4, $n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left[D_k^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2(f)$. This concludes the proof.

4.1.2. Proof of Theorem 2.3

We start by establishing a joint CLT for $(S_n^{(1)}(f), S_n^{(2)}(f))$, where $S_n^{(1)}(f)$ and $S_n^{(2)}(f)$ are defined in (4) and (5), respectively. Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2, we write $S_n^{(1)}(f) = \Xi_n(f) + R_n^{(1)}(f) + R_n^{(2)}(f)$ and prove that $R_n^{(1)}(f) + R_n^{(2)}(f) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. We thus consider the convergence of $\Xi_n(f) + S_n^{(2)}(f)$. Set $\mathcal{F}_n^{\theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(\theta_k, k \leq n)$. Under **A5**,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}(u_{1}\Xi_{n}(f)+u_{2}S_{n}^{(2)}(f))}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}u_{1}\Xi_{n}(f)} \left| \mathcal{F}_{n}^{\theta}\right] \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}u_{2}S_{n}^{(2)}(f)}\right]\right]$$

Applying the conditional CLT (Douc and Moulines, 2008, Theorem A.3.) with the filtration $\mathcal{F}_{n,k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(Y_1, \cdots, Y_n, X_1, \cdots, X_k)$, yields:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{iu_1 \Xi_n(f)} \left| \mathcal{F}_n^{\theta} \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} e^{-u_1^2 \sigma^2(f)/2} ;$$
(29)

observe that under A5, the conditions (31) and (32) in Douc and Moulines (2008) can be proved following the same lines as in the proof of Theorem 2.2; details are omitted. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\mathrm{i}(u_1\Xi_n(f)+u_2S_n^{(2)}(f))}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\mathrm{i}u_1\Xi_n(f)} \left| \mathcal{F}_n^{\theta}\right] - e^{-u_1^2\sigma^2(f)/2}\right)e^{\mathrm{i}u_2S_n^{(2)}(f)}\right] + e^{-u_1\sigma^2(f)/2}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\mathrm{i}u_2S_n^{(2)}(f)}\right] \right]$$

By (29), the first term in the RHS of the previous equation converges to zero. Under **A6**, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[e^{iu_2 S_n^{(2)}(f)}\right] = e^{-u_2^2 \gamma^2(f)/2}$ and this concludes the proof.

4.2. Proofs of Section 3.2

Note that by (24), $\pi_{\theta_{\star}} = \pi$.

4.2.1. Proof of Lemma 3.2

Let $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and \mathcal{F} be an equicontinuous set of functions in $\mathcal{L}_{V^{\gamma}}$. Let $h \in \mathcal{F}$, $|h|_{V^{\gamma}} \leq 1$. By construction, the transition kernel of a symmetric random walk Metropolis with proposal transition density $q(x, \cdot)$ and target density π may be expressed as

$$Ph(x) = \int r(x,y)h(y)q(x,y)\,dy + h(x)\int \{1 - r(x,y)\}\,q(x,y)dy$$

where $r(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 \wedge (\pi(y)/\pi(x))$ is the acceptance ratio. Therefore, the difference Ph(x) - Ph(x') may be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |Ph(x) - Ph(x')| &\leq 2 |h(x) - h(x')| \\ &+ \int |h(y) - h(x')| |r(x, y) - r(x', y)| q(x, y) dy \\ &+ \left| \int (h(y) - h(x')) r(x', y) (q(x, y) - q(x', y)) dy \right| .\end{aligned}$$

Since $|r(x,y) - r(x',y)| \le \pi(y)|\pi^{-1}(x) - \pi^{-1}(x')|$,

$$\int |h(y) - h(x')| |r(x, y) - r(x', y)| q(x, y) dy$$

$$\leq |\pi^{-1}(x) - \pi^{-1}(x')| \int |h(y) - h(x')| \pi(y) q(x, y) dy$$

$$\leq \left(\sup_{(x,y) \in \mathsf{X}^2} q(x, y) \right) |\pi^{-1}(x) - \pi^{-1}(x')| (\pi(V^{\gamma}) + V^{\gamma}(x'))$$

In addition,

$$\begin{split} & \left| \int \left(h(y) - h(x') \right) \ r(x', y) \left(q(x, y) - q(x', y) \right) \mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\{y: \pi(y) \le \pi(x')\}} \left(h(y) - h(x') \right) \ \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x')} \left(q(x, y) - q(x', y) \right) \mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{\{y: \pi(y) > \pi(x')\}} \left(h(y) - h(x') \right) \ \left(q(x, y) - q(x', y) \right) \mathrm{d}y \right| \\ &\leq 4 \ \pi^{-1}(x') \ \|q(x, \cdot) - q(x', \cdot)\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \ \sup_{y \in \mathsf{X}} |h(y) \ \pi(y)| \ . \end{split}$$

Since $V \propto \pi^{-\tau}$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $\sup_{\mathsf{X}} |h| \pi \leq 1$ under I1. Therefore, there exists a constant C such that for any $h \in \{h \in \mathcal{F}, |h|_{V^{\gamma}} \leq 1\}$ and any $x, x' \in \mathsf{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Ph(x) - Ph(x')| &\leq 2 |h(x) - h(x')| \\ &+ C \left(\left| \pi^{-1}(x) - \pi^{-1}(x') \right| + \|q(x, \cdot) - q(x', \cdot)\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \right) \left(V^{\gamma}(x') + \pi^{-1}(x') \right) \,, \end{aligned}$$

thus concluding the proof.

4.2.2. Proof of Proposition 3.4

The proof is prefaced by several lemmas. The proof of Lemma 4.1 is omitted for brevity and can be found in the supplementary paper (Fort et al. (2011)) The proof of Lemma 4.2 is adapted from (Fort et al., 2012, Lemma 5.1.) and is omitted.

G. Fort et al.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Assume I1, I2a-b-c, I3a-b, and $\mathbb{E}[V(X_0)] < +\infty$. Then for any $\gamma, \gamma' \in (0,1)$ and any $\delta > \gamma$,

$$n^{-\delta} \sum_{k=1}^n D_{V^{\gamma}}(\theta_k, \theta_{k-1}) V^{\gamma'}(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 \ .$$

Lemma 4.2. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, any measurable function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ and any $x, x' \in X$ such that $\pi(x) \leq \pi(x')$

$$|P_{\theta}f(x) - P_{\theta}f(x')| \le |Pf(x) - Pf(x')| + |f(x) - f(x')| + \sup_{\mathsf{X}} \pi |f|_{V^{\alpha}} |\pi^{-\beta}(x) - \pi^{-\beta}(x')| (V^{\alpha}(x') + \theta(V^{\alpha})) .$$

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. By Proposition 3.3, **A2** and P[α] hold. By I3-b,

$$\limsup_{n} L_{\theta_n} < +\infty , \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}$$
(30)

where L_{θ} is given by (8) with $C_{\theta}, \rho_{\theta}$ defined by $P[\alpha]$.

We first check **A3-a**. Let $f \in \mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. By Lemma A.1,

$$\left|P_{\theta_k}\Lambda_{\theta_k}f - P_{\theta_{k-1}}\Lambda_{\theta_{k-1}}f\right|_{V^{\alpha}} \leq 5 \left(L_{\theta_k} \vee L_{\theta_{k-1}}\right)^6 \pi_{\theta_k}(V^{\alpha})D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta_k, \theta_{k-1}) |f|_{V^{\alpha}}.$$

By Lemma 2.1, Proposition 3.3 and Assumptions I1, I2 and I3-b,

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \pi_{\theta_n}(V) \le \tilde{b} \ (1 - \tilde{\lambda})^{-1} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \theta_n(V) < \infty \ , \ \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.} \ . \tag{31}$$

Therefore, by (30) and (31), it suffices to prove that

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta_k, \theta_{k-1}) V^{\alpha}(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 ,$$

which follows from Lemma 4.1. We now check A3-b. By Proposition 3.3, it holds

$$n^{-1/(2\alpha)} \sum_{k=1}^{n} L_{\theta_k}^{2/\alpha} P_{\theta_k} V(X_k) \le n^{-1/(2\alpha)} \sum_{k=1}^{n} L_{\theta_k}^{2/\alpha} \left[V(X_k) + \tilde{b}\theta_k(V) \right] .$$

Under the stated assumptions, $\limsup_n [\theta_n(V) + L_{\theta_n}] < +\infty$ w.p.1. and by Proposition 3.3, $\sup_k \mathbb{E}[V(X_k)] < +\infty$. Since $2\alpha < 1$, this concludes the proof.

The proof of A4 is in two steps: it is first proved that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}F_{\theta_k}(X_k) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\int \pi_{\theta_k}(\mathrm{d}x)F_{\theta_k}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0 , \qquad (32)$$

and then it is established that

$$\int \pi_{\theta_k}(\mathrm{d}x) F_{\theta_k}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{a.s.}} \int \pi_{\theta_\star}(\mathrm{d}x) F_{\theta_\star}(x) .$$
(33)

Theorem B.1 in Appendix B applied with $\gamma = 2\alpha$ implies (32). The main tools for checking the assumptions of Theorem B.1 are (30), (31), Lemma 4.1 and Lemmas A.1 and A.3. A detailed proof can be found in the supplementary paper, see Fort et al. (2011).

The second step is to prove (33). To that goal, we have to strengthen the conditions on f by assuming that f is continuous. For any $\theta \in \Theta$, $\int \pi_{\theta}(\mathrm{d}x)F_{\theta}(x) = \int \pi_{\theta}(\mathrm{d}x)H_{\theta}(x)$ with

$$H_{\theta}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left(\Lambda_{\theta} f\right)^{2} (x) - \left(P_{\theta} \Lambda_{\theta} f\right)^{2} (x) .$$
(34)

We have to prove that there exists Ω_{\star} with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\star}) = 1$ and for any $\omega \in \Omega_{\star}$,

- (I) for any continuous bounded function h, $\lim_{n \to \theta_n(\omega)} (h) = \pi_{\theta_*}(h)$,
- (II) the set $\{H_{\theta_n(\omega)}, n \ge 0\}$ is equicontinuous,
- (III) $\sup_{n} \pi_{\theta_n(\omega)} (|H_{\theta_n(\omega)}|^{1/(2\alpha)}) < +\infty,$ (IV) $\lim_{n} H_{\theta_n(\omega)}(x) = H_{\theta_\star}(x)$ for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$,
- (V) $\pi_{\theta_{\star}}(|H_{\theta_{\star}}|) < +\infty.$

The proof is then concluded by application of Lemma A.3. Details of these steps are omitted for brevity and can be found in the supplementary paper, see Fort et al. (2011).

4.2.3. Proof of Theorem 3.5

We check the conditions of Theorem 2.3. A2 to A5 hold (see Propositions 3.3 and 3.4) and we now prove A6. We first check condition A6-a. For any function $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{N}$, define

$$G_f(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon \iint \left(\delta_z(\mathrm{d}z') - \theta_\star(\mathrm{d}z') \right) \pi_{\theta_\star}(\mathrm{d}x) r(x, z') \left(\Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(z') - \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(x) \right) \,. \tag{35}$$

Let $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}} \cap \mathcal{N}$; note that $G_f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. Recall that by Eq. (22), for any θ such that $\theta(V^{\alpha}) < +\infty,$

$$P_{\theta}f(x) - P_{\theta_{\star}}f(x) = \epsilon \int \left[\theta(\mathrm{d}y) - \theta_{\star}(\mathrm{d}y)\right] r(x,y) \left(f(y) - f(x)\right) \,. \tag{36}$$

Then, using (35),

$$\pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f$$

= $\epsilon \iint \pi_{\theta_{\star}} (\mathrm{d}x) \left[\theta_{k} (\mathrm{d}z) - \theta_{\star} (\mathrm{d}z) \right] r(x, z) \left[\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f(z) - \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f(x) \right] = \theta_{k}(G_{f}) .$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{n}{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{k} G_{f}(Y_{j})$$
$$= \int_{0}^{1} t^{-1} S_{n}(G_{f}, t) dt + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_{k/n}^{(k+1)/n} \left(\frac{n}{k} - \frac{1}{t} \right) S_{n}(G_{f}, t) dt + \frac{1}{n} S_{n}(G_{f}, 1) ,$$

with $S_n(G_f, t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} G_f(Y_j)$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_{k/n}^{(k+1)/n} \left(\frac{n}{k} - \frac{1}{t}\right) S_n(G_f, t) dt\right|\right] \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k+1} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}\left[|G_f(Y_j)|\right] .$$

Since $G_f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$, I3-a implies that $\sup_{k\geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|G_f|(Y_k)] < \infty$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_{k/n}^{(k+1)/n} \left(\frac{n}{k} - \frac{1}{t}\right) S_n(G_f, t) \mathrm{d}t + \frac{1}{n} S_n(G_f, 1) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Using I3-c, I3-d and the Continuous mapping Theorem ((van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Theorem 1.3.6)), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\pi_{\theta_{\star}}\left(P_{\theta_{k}}-P_{\theta_{\star}}\right)\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}f \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \tilde{\gamma}^{2}(f)\int_{0}^{1}t^{-1}B_{t}\mathrm{d}t$$

Since $\int_0^1 t^{-1} B_t dt = \int_0^1 \log(t) dB_t$, $\int_0^1 t^{-1} B_t dt$ is a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and variance $\int_0^1 \log^2(t) dt = 2$.

We now check condition A6-b. Note that

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_{\theta_k} \left(P_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_\star} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_\star} \left(P_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_\star} \right) \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f = n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_{\theta_k} (G^f_{\theta_k}) ,$$

where

$$G^{f}_{\theta}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}}) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} (P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}}) \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}} f(x) .$$
(37)

We write for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$ and any $\ell_k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\pi_{\theta_k}(G^f_{\theta_k}) = \left(\pi_{\theta_k} - P^{\ell_k}_{\theta_k}\right) G^f_{\theta_k}(x) + \left(P^{\ell_k}_{\theta_k} - P^{\ell_k}_{\theta_\star}\right) G^f_{\theta_k}(x) + P^{\ell_k}_{\theta_\star} G^f_{\theta_k}(x) \ .$$

By Proposition 3.3, $P[\alpha]$ holds and there exist $C_{\theta}, \rho_{\theta}$ such that $\|P_{\theta}^n - \pi_{\theta}\|_{V^{\alpha}} \leq C_{\theta}\rho_{\theta}^n$. Furthermore, Lemma A.2 and I3b imply that $\limsup_n C_{\theta_n} < +\infty$ w.p.1. and there exists a constant $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that $\limsup_n \rho_{\theta_n} \leq \rho$, w.p. 1. Set $\ell_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \ell \ln k \rfloor$ with ℓ such that $1/2 + \ell \ln \rho < 0$. Let $x \in X$ be fixed.

By Lemma 4.3 and I3-b, there exists an almost surely finite random variable C_1 s.t.

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\pi_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_k}^{\ell_k} \right) G_{\theta_k}^f(x) \right| \le C_1 V^{\alpha}(x) n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \rho^{\ell_k} .$$

Since $n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \rho^{\ell_k} \leq \rho^{-1} n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} k^{\ell \ln \rho} \to_{n \to \infty} 0$, it holds

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\pi_{\theta_k} - P_{\theta_k}^{\ell_k}\right) G_{\theta_k}^f(x) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0 .$$

imsart-bj ver. 2009/08/13 file: fmpv_clt_short_soumis.tex date: July 24, 2012

22

By Lemma 4.5, there exist some positive constants C_2, κ_{\star}, a such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \{P_{\theta_{k}}^{\ell_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell_{k}}\}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)\right)^{2}\right]^{1/2} \le C_{2} |f|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(x) \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_{k}-1} \left(\frac{\kappa_{\star}\ell_{k}}{k^{1/(2a)}}\right)^{at}.$$

Since $\lim_k \ell_k^a/k^{1/2} = 0$, there exists k_\star such that for $k \ge k_\star$, $(\kappa_\star \ell_k)^a/k^{1/2} \le 1/2$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{\ell_k} \left(\frac{\kappa_\star \ell_k}{k^{1/(2a)}} \right)^{at} \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{k_\star} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{\lceil \ell \ln k \rceil} \left(\frac{\kappa_\star \ell_k}{k^{1/(2a)}} \right)^{at} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=k_\star+1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k=1}^{\ell_\star} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{$$

The RHS tends to zero when $n \to +\infty$, which proves that $n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \{P_{\theta_k}^{\ell_k} - P_{\theta_\star}^{\ell_k}\} G_{\theta_k}^f(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$

Finally, by Lemma 4.6, there exists a constant C_3 such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n}P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell_{k}}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)\right)^{2}\right]^{1/2} \leq C_{3}V^{\alpha}(x) \ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{\ell_{k}^{\alpha}}{k} \to_{n \to \infty} 0 ,$$

thus implying that $n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{n} P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell_{k}} G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$

Lemma 4.3. Assume I1 and I2a-b-c. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. For any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$G_{\theta}^{f}(x) = \int (\theta - \theta_{\star})^{\otimes 2} (\mathrm{d}z_{1:2}) \ F^{(0)}(x, z_{1}, z_{2}) ,$$

where G_{θ}^{f} is defined by (37); and there exists a constant C such that for any $x \in X$,

$$\left|F^{(0)}(x,z_1,z_2)\right| \le C \left|f\right|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha \wedge (\beta/\tau)}(x) \left(V^{\alpha}(z_1) + V^{\alpha}(z_2)\right)$$

In addition, there exists some constant C' such that for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, any $\theta \in \Theta$ and any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$\left| \left(\pi_{\theta} - P_{\theta}^{\ell} \right) G_{\theta}^{f} \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \leq C' \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \left\| P_{\theta}^{\ell} - \pi_{\theta} \right\|_{V^{\alpha}} \left| \theta(V^{\alpha}) \right|.$$

Proof. Set $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha \wedge (\beta/\tau)$. Throughout this proof, let L_{θ} be the constant given by $P[\gamma]$. We have

$$F^{(0)}(x, z_1, z_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon^2 r(x, z_2) \left[\int \Lambda_{\theta_\star}(z_2, \mathrm{d}y) r(y, z_1) \left(\Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(z_1) - \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(y) \right) - \int \Lambda_{\theta_\star}(x, \mathrm{d}y) r(y, z_1) \left(\Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(z_1) - \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(y) \right) \right] \,.$$

G. Fort et al.

Note that $|r(\cdot, z_1)|_{V^{\gamma}} \leq 1$ for any z_1 so that by (28),

$$\left|\int \Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}(z_2, \mathrm{d}y)r(y, z_1)\Lambda_{\theta_{\star}}f(z_1)\right| \leq L_{\theta_{\star}}^4 |f|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(z_1) V^{\gamma}(z_2).$$

In addition, since $\gamma - \beta/\tau \leq 0$, we have by definition of the acceptance ratio r (see (21))

$$r(x, z_2)V^{\gamma}(z_2) \leq V^{\gamma}(x)$$
.

Then, there exists a constant C such that

$$\epsilon^2 r(x, z_2) \left| \int \Lambda_{\theta_\star}(z_2, \mathrm{d}y) r(y, z_1) \Lambda_{\theta_\star} f(z_1) \right| \le C \left| f \right|_{V^\alpha} V^\alpha(z_1) \ V^\gamma(x) \ .$$

Similar upper bounds can be obtained for the three remaining terms in $F^{(0)}$, thus showing the upper bounds on $F^{(0)}$.

In addition, by $\mathbf{P}[\gamma]$

$$\left| \left(\pi_{\theta} - P_{\theta}^{\ell} \right) G_{\theta}^{f} f(x) \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \leq \left\| \pi_{\theta} - P_{\theta}^{\ell} \right\|_{V^{\alpha}} \left\| G_{\theta}^{f} f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(x) .$$

The proof is concluded upon noting that $|G_{\theta}^{f}(x)| \leq C |f|_{V^{\alpha}} \theta(V^{\alpha}).$

Lemma 4.4. Assume I1 and I2a-b-c. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. There exist some constants C, κ_{\star} and $\rho_{\star} \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $t \geq 1$, any integers u_1, \cdots, u_t and any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$,

$$(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}}) \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \cdots \left(P_{\theta} - P_{\theta_{\star}} \right) \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{1}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right) G_{\theta}^{f}(x)$$

= $\int \cdots \int \left(\theta - \theta_{\star} \right)^{\otimes (t+2)} (\mathrm{d}z_{1:t+2}) F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(x, z_{1}, \cdots, z_{t+2})$

where G_{θ}^{f} is defined in (37), and

$$\left| F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(x, z_1, \cdots, z_{t+2}) \right| \le C \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \kappa_{\star}^t \rho_{\star}^{\sum_{j=1}^t u_j} V^{\alpha \wedge (\beta/\tau)}(x) \sum_{j=1}^{t+2} V^{\alpha}(z_j) .$$
(38)

Proof. By repeated applications of Eq. (36), it can be proved that the functions $F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}$ are recursively defined as follows

$$F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(x, z_1, \cdots, z_{t+2}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon r(x, z_{t+2}) \times \int \left(P_{\theta_\star}^{u_t}(z_{t+2}, \mathrm{d}y) - P_{\theta_\star}^{u_t}(x, \mathrm{d}y) \right) F_{u_{1:t-1}}^{(t-1)}(y, z_1, \cdots, z_{t+1}) , \quad (39)$$

where $F_{u_{1:0}}^{(0)} = F^{(0)}$ and $F^{(0)}$ is given by Lemma 4.3.

imsart-bj ver. 2009/08/13 file: fmpv_clt_short_soumis.tex date: July 24, 2012

24

The proof of the upper bound is by induction. The property holds for t = 1. Assume it holds for $t \ge 2$. Set $\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha \land (\beta/\tau)$; by Proposition 3.3 and the property $P[\gamma]$, there exist some constants C_{\star} and $\rho_{\star} \in (0, 1)$ such that $\left\| P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right\|_{V^{\gamma}} \le C_{\theta_{\star}} \rho_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}$. Then,

$$\left| F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(x, z_{1:t+2}) \right| \leq C \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \kappa_{\star}^{t-1} \rho_{\theta_{\star}}^{\sum_{j=1}^{t-1} u_{j}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{t+1} V^{\alpha}(z_{j}) \right)$$

$$\times r(x, z_{t+2}) \left[\left\| P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right\|_{V^{\gamma}} V^{\gamma}(z_{t+2}) + \left\| P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}} \right\|_{V^{\gamma}} V^{\gamma}(x) \right]$$

$$\leq C \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} \kappa_{\star}^{t-1} \epsilon C_{\theta_{\star}} \rho_{\theta_{\star}}^{\sum_{j=1}^{t} u_{j}} r(x, z_{t+2}) \left\{ V^{\gamma}(z_{t+2}) + V^{\gamma}(x) \right\} .$$

Since $\gamma \leq \beta/\tau$, $r(x, z_{t+2})V^{\gamma}(z_{t+2}) \leq V^{\gamma}(x)$ thus showing (38) with $\kappa_{\star} = 2C_{\theta_{\star}}\epsilon$.

Lemma 4.5. Assume I1, I2a-b-c and I3. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. There exist positive constants C, κ, a such that for any $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$, any $k, \ell \geq 1$ and any $x \in X$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left\{P_{\theta_{k}}^{\ell}-P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}\right\}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)\right)^{2}\right]^{1/2} \leq C\left|f\right|_{V^{\alpha}}\frac{V^{\alpha}(x)}{k}\sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1}\left(t\kappa k^{-1/(2a)}\right)^{at},$$

where G_{θ}^{f} is given by (37).

Proof. For any $g \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}, k, \ell \geq 1$ and $x \in X$,

$$P_{\theta_{k}}^{\ell}g(x) - P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}g(x)$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{u_{1:t}\in\mathcal{U}_{t}} P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell-t-\sum_{j=1}^{t}u_{j}} \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}}\right) P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}} \cdots \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}}\right) P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{1}}g(x)$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{u_{1:t}\in\mathcal{U}_{t}} P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell-t-\sum_{j=1}^{t}u_{j}} \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}}\right) \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}\right)$$

$$\times \cdots \left(P_{\theta_{k}} - P_{\theta_{\star}}\right) \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{1}} - \pi_{\theta_{\star}}\right) g(x) ,$$

where $\mathcal{U}_t = \{u_{1:t}, u_j \in \mathbb{N}, \sum_{j=1}^t u_j \leq \ell - t\}$. Fix $t \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ and $u_{1:t} \in \mathcal{U}_t$. Then by Lemma 4.4,

$$P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell-t-\sum_{j=1}^{t}u_{j}}\left(P_{\theta_{k}}-P_{\theta_{\star}}\right)\left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{t}}-\pi_{\theta_{\star}}\right)\cdots\left(P_{\theta_{k}}-P_{\theta_{\star}}\right)\left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{u_{1}}-\pi_{\theta_{\star}}\right)G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)$$
$$=\int\left(\theta_{k}-\theta_{\star}\right)^{\otimes\left(t+2\right)}\left(\mathrm{d}z_{1:t+2}\right)\int P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell-t-\sum_{j=1}^{t}u_{j}}(x,\mathrm{d}y)F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(y,z_{1},\cdots,z_{t+2}).$$

G. Fort et al.

Assumptions I3-b and I3-d and Lemma 4.4 show that there exist constants $C, \kappa_{\star}, \rho_{\star} \in$ (0,1) such that

$$\begin{split} \left\| \int \left(\theta_k - \theta_\star\right)^{\otimes (t+2)} \left(\mathrm{d}z_{1:t+2} \right) \int P_{\theta_\star}^{\ell - t - \sum_{j=1}^t u_j} (x, \mathrm{d}y) F_{u_{1:t}}^{(t)}(y, z_1, \cdots, z_{t+2}) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq \frac{C}{k^{1+t/2}} A_t \left| f \right|_{V^\alpha} \kappa_\star^t \, \rho_\star^{\sum_{j=1}^t u_j} \, P_{\theta_\star}^{\ell - t - \sum_{j=1}^t u_j} V^\alpha(x) \, . \end{split}$$

Finally, Proposition 3.3 implies that $\sup_{j\geq 0} \left| P_{\theta_{\star}}^{j} V^{\alpha} \right|_{V^{\alpha}} < +\infty$. By combining these results, we have for some constant C

$$\left\| P_{\theta_k}^{\ell} G_{\theta_k}^f(x) - P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell} G_{\theta_k}^f(x) \right\|_2 \le Ck^{-1} \left\| f \right\|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(x) \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} A_t \kappa_{\star}^t k^{-t/2} \sum_{u_{1:t} \in \mathcal{U}_t} \rho_{\star}^{\sum_{j=1}^t u_j}$$

Note that $\sum_{u_{1:t} \in \mathcal{U}_t} \rho_{\star}^{\sum_{j=1}^t u_j} \leq (1 - \rho_{\star})^{-t}$. Furthermore, there exists a > 0 such that $A_t \leq t^{at}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{split} \left\| P_{\theta_k}^{\ell} G_{\theta_k}^f(x) - P_{\theta_\star}^{\ell} G_{\theta_k}^f(x) \right\|_2 \\ & \leq Ck^{-1} \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}} V^{\alpha}(x) \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \left(t\kappa^{1/a} (1-\rho_\star)^{-1/a} k^{-1/(2a)} \right)^{at} \,. \end{split}$$

This concludes the proof.

Lemma 4.6. Assume I1, I2a-b-c and I3. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}_{V^{\alpha}}$. Then, there exists a constant C such that for any $k, \ell \geq 1$ and any $x \in X$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)\right)^{2}\right]^{1/2} \leq C \ \ell^{\alpha} \ |f|_{V^{\alpha}} \ k^{-1}V^{\alpha}(x) \ .$$

Proof. We have

$$P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x) = \iint \left(\theta_{k} - \theta_{\star}\right)^{\otimes 2} \left(\mathrm{d}z_{1:2}\right) H_{\ell}(x, z_{1}, z_{2}) ,$$

with $H_{\ell}(x, z_1, z_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}(x, F^{(0)}(\cdot, z_1, z_2))$ where $F^{(0)}$ is given by Lemma 4.3. Lemma 4.3 also implies that there exists a constant C such that

$$|H_{\ell}(x, z_1, z_2)| \le C |f|_{V^{\alpha}} (V^{\alpha}(z_1) + V^{\alpha}(z_2)) P^{\ell}_{\theta_{\star}} V^{\alpha}(x) .$$
(40)

By I3, the variance of $P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell}G_{\theta_{k}}^{f}(x)$ is upper bounded by

$$C \left| f \right|_{V^{\alpha}}^{2} \left(P_{\theta_{\star}}^{\ell} V^{\alpha}(x) \right)^{2} k^{-2}$$

The proof is concluded by application of the drift inequality (26) and I3-a.

Appendix A: Technical lemmas

The following lemma is (slightly) adapted from (Fort et al., 2012, Lemma 4.2.)

Lemma A.1. Assume A2. For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_{\theta} - \pi_{\theta'}\|_{V^{\alpha}} &\leq 2(L_{\theta'} \vee L_{\theta})^{4} \pi_{\theta}(V^{\alpha}) \ D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta, \theta') ,\\ \|\Lambda_{\theta} - \Lambda_{\theta'}\|_{V^{\alpha}} &\leq 3 \ (L_{\theta} \vee L_{\theta'})^{6} \pi_{\theta}(V^{\alpha}) D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta, \theta') \\ \|P_{\theta}\Lambda_{\theta} - P_{\theta'}\Lambda_{\theta'}\|_{V^{\alpha}} &\leq 5 \ (L_{\theta} \vee L_{\theta'})^{6} \pi_{\theta}(V^{\alpha}) D_{V^{\alpha}}(\theta, \theta') . \end{aligned}$$

where L_{θ} and Λ_{θ} are given by (8) and (2).

The following lemma can be obtained from Roberts and Rosenthal (2004), Fort and Moulines (2003), Douc et al. (2004) or Baxendale (2005) (see also the proof of (Saksman and Vihola, 2010, Lemma 3) for a similar result).

Lemma A.2. Let $\{P_{\theta}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ be a family of phi-irreducible and aperiodic Markov kernels. Assume that there exist a function $V : \mathsf{X} \to [1, +\infty)$, and for any $\theta \in \Theta$ there exist some constants $b_{\theta} < +\infty$, $\delta_{\theta} > 0$, $\lambda_{\theta} \in (0, 1)$ and a probability measure ν_{θ} on X such that for any $x \in \mathsf{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\theta}V(x) &\leq \lambda_{\theta}V(x) + b_{\theta} , \\ P_{\theta}(x, \cdot) &\geq \delta_{\theta} \ \nu_{\theta}(\cdot) \ \mathbb{1}_{\{V \leq c_{\theta}\}}(x) \qquad c_{\theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2b_{\theta}(1 - \lambda_{\theta})^{-1} - 1 . \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists $\gamma > 0$ and for any θ , there exist some finite constants C_{θ} and $\rho_{\theta} \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\|P_{\theta}^{n}(x,\cdot) - \pi_{\theta}\|_{V} \leq C_{\theta} \rho_{\theta}^{n} V(x)$$

and

$$C_{\theta} \vee (1 - \rho_{\theta})^{-1} \leq C \left\{ b_{\theta} \vee \delta_{\theta}^{-1} \vee (1 - \lambda_{\theta})^{-1} \right\}^{\gamma}.$$

Lemma A.3 is proved in (Fort et al., 2012, Section 4).

Lemma A.3. Let X be a Polish space endowed with its Borel σ -field X. Let μ and $(mu_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be probability distributions on (X, X). Let $(h_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an equicontinuous family of functions from X to \mathbb{R} . Assume

- (i) the sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges weakly to μ ,
- (ii) for any $x \in X$, $\lim_{n \to \infty} h_n(x)$ exists, and there exists $\gamma > 1$ such that $\sup_n \mu_n(|h_n|^{\gamma}) + \mu(|\lim_n h_n|) < +\infty$.

Then, $\mu_n(h_n) \to \mu(\lim_n h_n)$.

Appendix B: Weak law of large numbers for adaptive and interacting MCMC algorithms

The proof of the theorem below is along the same lines as the proof of (Fort et al., 2012, Theorem 2.7), which addresses the strong law of large numbers and details are omitted. Note that in this generalization, we relax the condition $\sup_{\theta} |F(\cdot, \theta)|_V < +\infty$ of Fort et al. (2012). The proof is provided in the supplementary paper (Fort et al., 2012).

Theorem B.1. Assume A1, A2 and let $a \in (0,1)$. Let $F : X \times \Theta \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function. Assume that there exists a sequence of stopping-times $\{\tau_m, m \ge 1\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\bigcup_m \{\tau_m = +\infty\}) = 1$ and

- (i) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} L_{\theta_n} < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. where L_{θ} is defined in Lemma 2.1 applied with the closed interval [a, 1].
- (*ii*) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \pi_{\theta_n}(V^a) < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s.
- (*iii*) $\limsup_{n\to\infty} |F_{\theta_n}|_{V^a} < +\infty, \mathbb{P}$ -a.s.
- (iv) for any $m \ge 1$, there exists t < 1/a 1 such that $\sup_{n\ge 1} n^{-t} \mathbb{E}\left[V(X_n)\mathbb{1}_{\{n-1<\tau_m\}}\right] < \infty$.
- (v) $n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n} D_{V^a}(\theta_k, \theta_{k-1}) V^a(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$

(vi)
$$n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left| F_{\theta_k} - F_{\theta_{k-1}} \right|_{V^a} V^a(X_k) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Then,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}F_{\theta_k}(X_k) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\int \pi_{\theta_k}(\mathrm{d}x)F_{\theta_k}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$$

References

- Andrieu, C., A. Jasra, A. Doucet, and P. Del Moral (2007a). Convergence of the equienergy sampler. In *Conference Oxford sur les méthodes de Monte Carlo séquentielles*, Volume 19 of *ESAIM Proc.*, pp. 1–5.
- Andrieu, C., A. Jasra, A. Doucet, and P. Del Moral (2007b). Non-linear Markov chain Monte Carlo. In Conference Oxford sur les méthodes de Monte Carlo séquentielles, Volume 19 of ESAIM Proc., pp. 79–84.
- Andrieu, C., A. Jasra, A. Doucet, and P. Del Moral (2008). A note on convergence of the equi-energy sampler. Stoch. Anal. Appl. 26(2), 298–312.
- Andrieu, C., A. Jasra, A. Doucet, and P. Del Moral (2011). On nonlinear Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Bernoulli* 17(3), 987–1014.
- Andrieu, C. and E. Moulines (2006). On the ergodicity property of some adaptive MCMC algorithms. Ann. Appl. Probab. 16(3), 1462–1505.
- Andrieu, C. and J. Thoms (2008). A tutorial on adaptive MCMC. Statistics and Computing 18(4), 343–373.
- Atchadé, Y. (2010). A cautionary tale on the efficiency of some adaptive Monte Carlo schemes. Ann. Appl. Probab. 20(3), 841–868.

- Atchadé, Y. (2011). Kernel Estimators of asymptotic variance for adaptive Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Ann. Statist. 39(2), 990–1011.
- Atchadé, Y. and G. Fort (2010). Limit theorems for some adaptive MCMC algorithms with subgeometric kernels. *Bernoulli* 16(1), 116–154.
- Atchadé, Y., G. Fort, E. Moulines, and P. Priouret (2011). Inference and Learning in Dynamic Models, Chapter Adaptive Markov chain Monte Carlo: Theory and Methods, pp. 33–53. Cambridge University Press.
- Baxendale, P. H. (2005). Renewal theory and computable convergence rates for geometrically ergodic Markov chains. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 15(1A), 700–738.
- Bercu, B., P. Del Moral, and A. Doucet (2009). A Functional Central Limit Theorem for a class of Interacting Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods. *Electron. J. Probab.* 14, 2130–2155.
- Brockwell, A., P. Del Moral, and A. Doucet (2010). Sequentially interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Ann. Statist.* 38(6), 3387–3411.
- Del Moral, P. and A. Doucet (2010). Interacting Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods for solving nonlinear measure-valued equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 20(2), 593–639.
- Douc, R. and E. Moulines (2008). Limit theorems for weighted samples with applications to sequential Monte Carlo methods. Ann. Statist. 36(5), 2344–2376.
- Douc, R., E. Moulines, and J. Rosenthal (2004). Quantitative bounds for geometric convergence rates of Markov chains. Ann. Appl. Probab. 14(4), 1643–1665.
- Fort, G. and E. Moulines (2003). Polynomial ergodicity of Markov transition kernels, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications 103, 57–99.
- Fort, G., E. Moulines, and P. Priouret (2012). Convergence of adaptive and interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms. Ann. Statist. 39(6), 3262–3289.
- Fort, G., E. Moulines, P. Priouret, and P. Vandekerkhove (2011). Supplementary paper: A central limit theorem for adaptive and interacting Markov chains. Revised June 2012.
- Fort, G., E. Moulines, P. Priouret, and P. Vandekerkhove (2012). A simple variance inequality for U-statistics of a Markov chain with applications. *Statistics & Probability Letters 82*, 1193–1201.
- Haario, H., E. Saksman, and J. Tamminen (1999). Adaptive proposal distribution for random walk Metropolis algorithm. *Computational Statistics* 14, 375–395.
- Hall, P. and C. C. Heyde (1980). *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application*. New York, London: Academic Press.
- Jarner, S. and E. Hansen (2000). Geometric ergodicity of Metropolis algorithms. Stoch. Process. Appl. 85, 341–361.
- Kou, S. C., Q. Zhou, and W. H. Wong (2006). Equi-energy sampler with applications in statistical inference and statistical mechanics. *Ann. Statist.* 34(4), 1581–1619.
- Liang, F., C. Liu, and R. J. Carroll (2007). Stochastic approximation in Monte Carlo computation. J. Am. Statist. Assoc. 102, 305–320.
- Mengersen, K. and R. L. Tweedie (1996). Rates of convergence of the Hastings and Metropolis algorithms. Ann. Statist. 24, 101–121.
- Meyn, S. P. and R. L. Tweedie (2009). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- Roberts, G. O. and J. S. Rosenthal (2004). General state space Markov chains and MCMC algorithms. *Probab. Surv.* 1, 20–71.
- Roberts, G. O. and J. S. Rosenthal (2007). Coupling and ergodicity of adaptive Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms. J. Appl. Probab. 44(2), 458–475.
- Roberts, G. O. and R. L. Tweedie (1996). Geometric convergence and central limit theorems for multidimensional Hastings and Metropolis algorithms. *Biometrika* 83(1), 95–110.
- Rosenthal, J. S. (2009). MCMC Handbook, Chapter Optimal Proposal Distributions and Adaptive MCMC, pp. 157–169. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- Saksman, H. and M. Vihola (2010). On the ergodicity of the adaptive Metropolis algorithm on unbounded domains. Ann. Appl. Probab. 20, 2178–2203.
- Serfling, R. J. (1980). Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics. New York: Wiley.
- Tierney, L. (1998). A note on Metropolis-Hastings kernels for general state spaces. Ann. Appl. Probab. 8, 1–9.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and J. A. Wellner (1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Wang, F. and D. P. Landau (2001). An efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate the density of states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86, 2050–2053.