

A NOTE ON CONVERGENCE OF THE EQUI-ENERGY SAMPLER

BY CHRISTOPHE ANDRIEU, AJAY JASRA,

ARNAUD DOUCET & PIERRE DEL MORAL

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON,

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA & UNIVERSITY OF NICE

ABSTRACT. In a recent paper ‘The equi-energy sampler with applications statistical inference and statistical mechanics’ [*Ann. Stat.* **34** (2006) 1581–1619], Kou, Zhou & Wong have presented a new stochastic simulation method called the equi-energy (EE) sampler. This technique is designed to simulate from a probability measure π , perhaps only known up to a normalizing constant. The authors demonstrate that the sampler performs well in quite challenging problems but their convergence results (Theorem 2) appear incomplete. This was pointed out, in the discussion of the paper, by Atchadé & Liu (2006) who proposed an alternative convergence proof. However, this alternative proof, whilst theoretically correct, does not correspond to the algorithm that is implemented. In this note we provide a new proof of convergence of the equi-energy sampler based on the Poisson equation and on the theory developed in Andrieu et al. (2007) for *Non-Linear* Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC). The objective of this note is to provide a proof of correctness of the EE sampler when there is only one feeding chain; the general case requires a much more technical approach than is suitable for a short note. In addition, we also seek to highlight the difficulties associated with the analysis of this type of algorithm and present the main techniques that may be adopted to prove the convergence of it.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this note we consider the convergence properties of a new stochastic simulation technique, the equi-energy sampler introduced in (Kou, et al. 2006). This is a method designed to draw samples from a probability measure $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ (where $\mathcal{P}(E)$ denotes the class of probability measures) on measurable space (E, \mathcal{E}) , where E may be a high dimensional space and the density, is known pointwise up to a potentially unknown constant. In particular, the algorithm generates a non-Markovian stochastic process $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ whose stationary distribution is ultimately π ; this algorithm is described fully in Section 2.

Date: February 9, 2022.

¹**AMS 2000 Subject Classification:** Primary 82C80; Secondary 60F99, 62F15

Key words: Equi-Energy Sampler, Non-Linear Markov chain Monte Carlo, Poisson Equation, Uniform Ergodicity.

In the paper of Kou et al. (2006), an attempt to analyze the algorithm is made (in Theorem 2). However, it was noticed in the discussion by Atchadé & Liu (2006) that this result is incomplete. We note the points that were stated by Atchadé & Liu and further expand upon their point; see Section 3. An important remark is that Atchadé & Liu attempt to provide an alternative convergence result, via a Strong Law of Large Numbers (SLLN) for bounded measurable functions. Although this proof is correct, the authors study a stochastic process which does not correspond to the algorithm; this problem is outlined in Section 3.

The objective of this note is to provide some convergence proofs for the EE sampler in a simple scenario (one feeding chain). We also note the difficulties associated with the analysis of this type of algorithm and present the main methods that can be used to prove the SLLN. To avoid unnecessary technicalities and focus on the ‘essence’ of the proof, strong assumptions are made: including the uniform ergodicity of some transition kernels. Our proof strategy is via the Poisson equation (e.g. Glynn & Meyn (1996)) and the techniques developed for Non-Linear MCMC (Andrieu et al. 2007). That is, the EE sampler is a non-linear MCMC algorithm and may be analyzed in a similar manner. Our results can be found in Section 4.

2. NOTATION AND ALGORITHM

We now outline the notation that is adopted throughout the paper as well as the algorithm that is analyzed.

2.1. Notation. Define a measurable space (E, \mathcal{E}) , with $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ (recall $\mathcal{P}(E)$ denotes the class of probability measures on (E, \mathcal{E})) a target probability measure of interest.

For a stochastic process $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ on $(E^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{E}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$, $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(X_0, \dots, X_n)$ is the natural filtration. \mathbb{P}_μ is taken as a probability law of a stochastic process with initial distribution μ and \mathbb{E}_μ the associated expectation. If $\mu = \delta_x$ (with δ the Dirac measure) \mathbb{P}_x (resp. \mathbb{E}_x) is adopted instead of \mathbb{P}_{δ_x} (resp. \mathbb{E}_{δ_x}). We use $X_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} X$ to denote almost sure convergence of X_n to X . The equilibrium sampler generates a stochastic process on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , which is defined in the next Section.

Let $\|\eta - \mu\|_{\text{tv}} := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{E}} |\eta(A) - \mu(A)|$ denote the total variation distance between $\eta, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Throughout, $K : E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ is taken as a generic Markov kernel; the standard notations, for measurable $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $K(f)(x) := \int_E f(y) K(x, dy)$ and for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ $\mu K(f) := \int_E K(f)(x) \mu(dx)$ are used. Let $f : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $\mu(f)(x) := \int_E f(x, y) \mu(dy)$, with an obvious extension to higher dimensional spaces. $\mathcal{B}_b(E)$ is used to represent the bounded measurable functions and for $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$, $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in E} |f(x)|$ is used to denote the supremum norm.

We will denote by $K_\mu : \mathcal{P}(E) \times E \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$ a generic *non-linear* Markov kernel and its invariant measure (given its existence) as $\omega(\mu)$ ($\omega : \mathcal{P}(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(E)$). For a sequence of probability measures $\{\mu_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ we denote the composition $\int_{E^{n-1}} K_{\mu_1}(x, dy_1) \dots K_{\mu_n}(y_{n-1}, A)$ as $K_{\mu_1:\mu_n}(x, A)$. The empirical measure of an arbitrary stochastic process $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is defined, at time n , as:

$$S_n(du) := \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n \delta_{x_i}(du).$$

In addition, $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$ (resp. $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$). The indicator function of $A \in \mathcal{E}$ is written $\mathbb{I}_A(x)$. Note also that $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\mathbb{T}_m := \{1, \dots, m\}$.

2.2. Algorithm. We introduce a sequence of probability measures, for $r \geq 2$, $\{\pi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{T}_r}$, $\pi_n \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, $n \in \mathbb{T}_r$ and $\pi_r \equiv \pi$ which are assumed to be absolutely continuous, wrt some reference measure λ^* , and, in an abuse of notation, write the Radon-Nikodym derivatives as $d\pi_n/d\lambda^*(x) = \pi_n(x)$ also. The EE sampler will generate a stochastic process $\{Y_n^r\}_{n \geq 0}$, with $Y_n^r = (X_n^1, \dots, X_n^r)$, with $X_n^i : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, $i \in \mathbb{T}_r$, $k \geq 1$ (that is $\{Y_n^r\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a stochastic process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) = ((E^r)^\mathbb{N}, (\mathcal{E}^{\otimes r})^{\otimes \mathbb{N}})$). Central to the construction of the EE sampler is the concept of the energy rings; this will correspond to the partition $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^d E_i$.

For each X_n^i we associate a non-linear Markov kernel $\{K_{\mu,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{T}_r}$ with $K_{\mu,1} \equiv K_1$ (i.e. K_1 is an ordinary Markov kernel) and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$. Additionally, assume that for $i = 2, \dots, r-1$:

$$(2.1) \quad \omega_i(\pi_{i-1})K_{\pi_{i-1},i}(dy) = \omega_i(\pi_{i-1})(dy) = \pi_i(dy)$$

and that $\pi_1 K_1 = \pi_1$. Here, it is assumed that, given that we input the invariant probability measure for $K_{\pi_{i-2},i-1}$ into the non-linear kernel $K_{\mu,i}$, the target probability measure π_i is obtained. Define:

$$(2.2) \quad K_{\mu,i}(x, dy) := (1 - \epsilon)K_i(x, dy) + \epsilon Q_{\mu,x,i}(x, dy)$$

$i = 2, \dots, r$, $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, with K_i a Markov kernel of invariant distribution π_i and also:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\mu,x,i}(x, dy) &:= \int_E \mu_x(dz) K_i^S(K_i(dy))(x, z) \\ \mu_x(A) &:= \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x) \frac{\mu(E_i \cap A)}{\mu(E_i)} \end{aligned}$$

where it is assumed $\mu(E_i) > 0$; let $\mathcal{P}_d(E) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E) : \mu(E_i) > 0 \ \forall i \in \mathbb{T}_d\}$. Finally define:

$$\begin{aligned} K_i^S((x, y), d(x', y')) &:= \delta_x(dy') \delta_y(dx') \alpha_i(x, y) + \delta_x(dx') \delta_y(dy') [1 - \alpha_i(x, y)] \\ \alpha_i(x, y) &= 1 \wedge \frac{\pi_i(y) \pi_{i-1}(x)}{\pi_i(x) \pi_{i-1}(y)} \end{aligned}$$

which is the swapping kernel. It is easily seen that the kernels (2.2) satisfy the equation (2.1). However, it is often the case that such a system cannot be simulated exactly. The idea is to approximate the correct probability measures π_n via the empirical measures generated by the previous chain.

The algorithm which corresponds to the equi-energy sampler is as follows. Define predetermined integers N_1, \dots, N_r and assume that for all $i \in \mathbb{T}_r$, $j = \mathbb{T}_d$ (recall d corresponds to the number of energy levels) we have $S_{N_{1:i}}^i(E_j) > 0$ with S^i the empirical measure of the i^{th} process and $N_{1:i} = \sum_{j=1}^i N_j$. The algorithm is in Figure 1.

- 0.: Set $n = 0$ and $X_0^{1:r} = x_0^{1:r}$, $S_0^l = \delta_{x_0^l}$, $l = 1, \dots, r$. Set $i = 1$.
- 1.: Perform the following for $i = 1$ until $i = r$. Set $j = 1$.
- 2.: Perform the following for $j = 1$ until $j = N_i$, then set $i = i + 1$ and go to 1.
- 3.: Set $n = n + 1$, $k = 1$.
- 4.: Perform the following for $k = 1$ until $k = i$, then set $k = i + 1$ and go to 5.
- $X_n^k \sim K_{S_{n-1}^{k-1}, k}(x_{n-1}^k, \cdot)$, $S_n^k = S_{n-1}^k + \frac{1}{n+1}[\delta_{x_n^k} - S_{n-1}^k]$, set $k = k + 1$ and go to 4.
- 5.: Perform the following for $k = i + 1$ until $k \geq r$, then set $j = j + 1$ and go to 2.
- 6.: $X_n^k \sim \delta_{x_{n-1}^k}(\cdot)$ then set $k = k + 1$ and go to 5.

Figure 1: An equi-energy sampler.

Remark 1. We point out here that our algorithm is slightly different from that of Kou et al. There, the EE jump can be seen as using a Metropolis-Hastings (M-H) independence sampler with proposal π_{i-1} constrained to the set E_i currently occupied by the current state (the kernel is then approximated). We have preferred to do this in a selection/mutation type format (see Del Moral (2004)) where a value is selected from the empirical measure of the lower chain and then put through a M-H exchange step. We then allow a possibility of mutation (sampling from K_i). This has been done in order to fit our proof in the framework of Andrieu et al. (2007), which allows us, below, to refer to minor technical results from that work and hence reduce the length of this note. It should be noted that, from a technical point of view, changing the algorithm back to the EE sampler presents no difficulties, in terms of the following arguments. Indeed, the only real changes to the proofs are some of the technical assumptions in Andrieu et al. (2007) and the uniform in time drift condition presented there (Proposition 4.1).

Remark 2. In our view, the non-linear kernel interpretation of the equi-energy sampler allows us to intuitively understand some practical issues associated to the algorithm, whilst perhaps not

requiring a full technical understanding. For example, if there is only one feeding chain, and it is stopped at some point, then we can observe from equation (2.1) that this algorithm is then biased (contrary to the point of Kou et al. (2006) pp-1647, 5th par, although we realize that it is not possible to store an infinite number of samples).

3. DISCUSSION OF THE PREVIOUS PROOFS

The difficulties of the convergence proofs of Kou et al (2006) and Atchadé & Liu (2006) are now discussed.

3.1. Theorem 2 of Kou et al. (2006). We begin with the proof of Theorem 2 of Kou et al. Recall that the Theorem states, under some assumptions, that the steady state distribution of $\{X_n^i\}_{n \geq 0}$ is π_i . The authors use induction and start by using the ergodicity of the M-H chain which verifies the case $r = 1$ and continue from there.

Atchadé & Liu state that equation (5) of the proof is not clear, however, we note that the equation can indeed be verified (and as stated by Kou et al. (2006) in the rejoinder to the discussion (pp-1649)) by using the SLLN (via the induction hypothesis) and bounded convergence theorem.

The main difficulty of the proof is as follows, quoting Kou et al (2006), pp-1590:

Therefore, under the induction assumption, $X^{(i)}$ is asymptotically equivalent to a Markovian sequence governed by $S^{(i)}(x, \cdot)$.

Here the kernel $S^{(i)}(x, \cdot)$ is the theoretical kernel corresponding to $K_{\pi_{i-1}, i}$. The authors then state that $S^{(i)}(x, \cdot)$ is an ergodic Markov kernel which then yields the convergence of $X^{(i)}$. This is the difficulty of the proof: the authors verify that the transitions of the stochastic process are asymptotically equivalent to that of an ergodic Markov kernel, however, this is not enough to provide the required convergence of the process. That is, Kou et al. (2006) prove that (suppressing the notation $N_{1:i-1}$)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |K_{S_n^{i-1}, i}(x, A) - K_{\pi_{i-1}, i}(x, A)| \xrightarrow[\mathbb{P}^{(i-1)}]{a.s.} 0$$

where $\mathbb{P}^{(i-1)}$ is the probability law of the process with $i - 1$ chains. However, this convergence property essentially means that when the input probability measure S_n^{i-1} is converging to the ‘correct’ probability measure π_{i-1} then a set-wise convergence of the non-linear kernel $K_{\cdot, i}$ is induced. This is far from sufficient as the law of the process at iteration n is, for $A \in \mathcal{E}$

$$K_{S_1^{i-1}, i}[K_{S_2^{i-1}, i}[\cdots K_{S_n^{i-1}, i}(A)]],$$

where $S_1^{i-1}, S_2^{i-1}, \dots, S_n^{i-1}$ are empirical distributions constructed from the same realisation of the process at level $i-1$. It is clear that if the algorithm is to converge, then the joint distributions of $X_{n-\tau}^{(i)}, \dots, X_n^{(i)}$ for any (in fact increasing with n) lag τ should converge to

$$K_{\pi_{i-1}, i} \times K_{\pi_{i-1}, i} \times \dots \times K_{\pi_{i-1}, i},$$

which as we shall see is far from trivial. This remark indicates an appropriate approach to a proof; via standard Markov chain convergence theorems. As a result, using the arguments of Kou et al. (2006), we cannot even say that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |K_{S_1: S_{n+N_{1:i-1}}, i}(x, A) - \pi_i(A)| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}^{(i-1)}} 0$$

via the ergodicity of $K_{\pi_{i-1}, i}(x, A)$; i.e. a set-wise convergence of the kernel that is *simulated*.

3.2. Theorem 3.1 of Atchadé & Liu (2006). Atchadé & Liu state (pp-1625, in the proof of Theorem 3.1):

Note that the i^{th} chain is actually a non-homogeneous Markov chain with transition kernels $K_0^{(i)}, K_1^{(i)}, \dots$, where $K_n^{(i)}(x, A) = \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1}^{(i)} \in A | X_n^{(i)} = x)$.

This statement is not quite accurate. The i^{th} chain is a non-homogeneous Markov chain only conditional upon a realization of the previous chain; unconditionally, it is not a Markov chain. As a result, Atchadé & Liu analyze the process of kernel:

$$K_n^{(i)}(x, dy) = (1 - \epsilon)K_i(x, dy) + \epsilon \mathbb{E} \left[R_n^{(i)}(x, dy) \right]$$

where $R_n^{(i)}$ is defined in Atchadé & Liu. This is not the kernel corresponding to the algorithm; the algorithm simulates:

$$Q_{S_x^{i-1}, i}(x, dy) = \int_E S_x^{i-1}(dy) K_i^S(K_i(dy))(x, y)$$

that is, we do not integrate over the process $\{X_n^{i-1}\}$, we condition upon it. Therefore, the proofs of Atchadé & Liu do not provide a theoretical validation of the equi-energy sampler.

4. ERGODICITY RESULTS

The SLLN is now presented: *we have only proved the case when $r = 2$ and this is assumed hereafter.* There are some difficulties in extending our proof to the case $r \geq 3$; this will be outlined after the proofs. Note that our proof is non-trivial and relies on a SLLN for U -statistics of stationary ergodic stochastic processes (Aaronson et al. 1996).

4.1. Assumptions. We make the following assumptions (it is assumed that for any $i \in \mathbb{T}_r$, $j \in \mathbb{T}_d$, $\pi_i(E_j) > 0$ throughout).

(A1) • (*Stability of Algorithm*): There is a universal constant $\theta > 0$, such that for any $n \geq 0$, $j \in \mathbb{T}_d$, $i \in \mathbb{T}_{r-1}$ we have, recalling that $N_{1:i} = \sum_{j=1}^i N_j$:

$$S_{N_{1:i}+n}^i(E_j) \geq \theta \quad \mathbb{P}_{x_0^{1:r}} - a.s.$$

(A2) • (*Uniform Ergodicity*): The $\{K_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{T}_r}$ are uniformly ergodic Markov kernels with a one step minorization condition. That is: $\forall n \in \mathbb{T}_r$, $\exists(\phi_n, \nu_n) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $\forall(x, A) \in E \times \mathcal{E}$:

$$K_n(x, A) \geq \phi_n \nu_n(A).$$

(A3) • (*State-Space Constraint*): E is polish (separable complete metrisable topological space).

4.2. Discussion of Assumptions. The assumptions we make are quite strong. The first assumption (A1) is used to allow us to bound:

$$\frac{1}{S_{m+1}^i(E_i)} - \frac{(m+2)}{(m+1)S_m^i(E_i)}$$

which will appear in the proof below. This assumption, on the empirical measure, is removed in Andrieu et al. (2007); however, this is at the cost of a significant increase in the technicalities of the proof. As a result, (A1) is adopted as an intuitive assumption as it states:

- (1) Make sure that $\pi_i(E_j)$ for all i, j is non-negligable.
- (2) Let N_1, \dots, N_{r-1} be reasonably large so that we can expect convergence.

The second assumption (A2) might appear strong, but allows us to significantly simplify both notation and our proofs whilst preserving the ‘essence’ of the general proof. In addition, this condition will often be satisfied on finite state spaces. More general assumptions could be used, at the expense of significant notational and technical complexity. The assumption allows us to use the following facts:

- (1) For any fixed $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$, $\exists \omega_i(\mu) \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ such that $\omega_i(\mu)K_{\mu,i} = \omega_i(\mu)$.
- (2) For any fixed $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$, $i \in \mathbb{T}_r$, $\exists \rho \in (0, 1)$, $M < \infty$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\sup_{x \in E} \|K_{\mu,i}^n(x, \cdot) - \omega_i(\mu)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq M\rho^n$.

These properties will help to simplify our proofs below.

The final assumption (A3) will be related to some technical arguments in the proof.

4.3. SLLN. We are to establish the convergence of $S_n^r(f) \xrightarrow{a.s.}_{\mathbb{P}_{x_0^{1:r}}} \pi_r(f)$ for some f to be defined in the proof and $n \geq N_{1:r-1}$.

4.3.1. *Strategy of the Proof.* Our approach is to consider $S_{n,r}^\omega = 1/(n - N_{1:r-1} + 1) \sum_{j=N_{1:r-1}}^n \omega_r(S_j^{r-1})$ and adopt the decomposition:

$$(4.3) \quad S_n^r(f) - \pi_r(f) = S_n^r(f) - S_{n,r}^\omega(f) + S_{n,r}^\omega(f) - \pi_r(f).$$

The analysis of the first term on the RHS of (4.3) relies upon a Martingale argument using the classical Poisson's equation solution:

$$f(X_n^r) - \omega(S_n^{r-1})(f) = \hat{f}_{S_n^{r-1}}^r(X_n^r) - K_{S_n^{r-1},r}(\hat{f}_{S_n^{r-1}}^r)(X_n^r)$$

where $\hat{f}_{S_n^{r-1}}^r$ is a solution of the Poisson equation. Indeed, the first term on the RHS of (4.3) can be rewritten:

$$(4.4) \quad (n - N_{1:r-1} + 1)[S_n^i - S_{n,r}^\omega](f) = M_{n+1}^r + \sum_{m=N_{1:r-1}}^n [\hat{f}_{S_{m+1}^{r-1}}^r(X_{m+1}^r) - \hat{f}_{S_m^{r-1}}^r(X_{m+1}^r)] + \hat{f}_{S_{N_{1:r-1}}^{r-1}}^r(X_0^r) - \hat{f}_{S_{n+1}^{r-1}}^r(X_{n+1}^r)$$

where

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} M_{n+1}^r &= \sum_{m=N_{1:r-1}}^n [\hat{f}_{S_m^{r-1}}^r(X_{m+1}^r) - K_{S_m^{r-1},r}(\hat{f}_{S_m^{r-1}}^r)(X_m^r)] \\ \hat{f}_{S_m^{r-1}}^r(X_{m+1}^r) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} [K_{S_m^{r-1},r}^n(f)(X_{m+1}^r) - \omega_r(S_m^{r-1})(f)] \end{aligned}$$

and $\{M_n^r, \mathcal{G}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale and $M_n^r := 0$, for $0 \leq n \leq N_{1:r-1}$. Recall that (4.5) is a solution to the Poisson equation, which will exist under our assumptions above.

The proof will deal with the Martingale via the Burkholder inequality and the fluctuations of the solution of the Poisson equation due to the evolution of the empirical measure (4.5) using continuity properties of the kernel Q_μ . The bias term $S_{n,r}^\omega(f) - \pi_r(f)$ is controlled by a SLLN for U -statistics of stationary ergodic stochastic processes.

4.3.2. Main Result.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume (A1-2). Then for any $p \geq 1$, $\exists B_p < \infty$ such that for any $n \geq N_{1:r-1}$ and $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$ we have that:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[|S_n^r - S_{n,r}^\omega(f)|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \frac{B_p \|f\|_\infty}{(n - N_{1:r-1} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

if, in addition, (A3) holds then for any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$:

$$S_n^2(f) \xrightarrow{a.s.}_{\mathbb{P}_{x_0^{1:2}}} \pi_2(f).$$

Proof. Our proof relies heavily upon the theory of Andrieu et al. (2007). Note that, under (A2) and, for any fixed $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$, the uniform ergodicity of the kernel $K_{\mu,i}$ allows us to use the methods of Andrieu et al. (2007). We will follow the proof of Theorem 6.5 of that paper. In order to prove the SLLN in the paper, the authors combine a series of technical results. The first of which is the Lipschitz continuity of the kernel Q_μ ; we establish the result for bounded functions and the particular kernel considered here. To simplify the notation, we remove the sub/superscripts from the various objects below.

Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$ and $\mu, \xi \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_{\mu_x}(f)(x) - Q_{\xi_x}(f)(x)| &= \sup_{(x,y) \in E^2} \|K^S(K(f))(x,y) - Q_{\mu_x}(f)(x)\|_\infty \\ &\quad \times \left| \int_{E \times E} \frac{K^S(K(f))(x',y) - Q_{\mu_x}(f)(x')}{\sup_{(x,y) \in E^2} \|K^S(K(f))(x,y) - Q_{\mu_x}(f)(x)\|_\infty} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mu_x(dy) \times \delta_x(dx') - \xi_x(dy) \times \delta_x(dx') \right| \\ &\leq 2\|f\|_\infty \sup_{x \in E} \|\mu_x - \xi_x\|_{\text{tv}} \end{aligned}$$

We then note that Propositions 6.1 and 6.2 (bounding the solution of the Poisson equation and Martingale in the \mathbb{L}_p norm) of Andrieu et al. (2007) are proved in the same manner. That is, in a similar way to the proofs constructed there, we can show that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[|\widehat{f}_{S_m}(X_{m+1})|^p \right]^{1/p} &\leq M\|f\|_\infty \\ \mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} [|M_n|^p]^{1/p} &\leq M\|f\|_\infty n^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the verification of Proposition 6.3 (bounding the fluctuations of the Poisson equation due to the evolution of the empirical measure) and Theorem 6.5 (the SLLN) are required.

We begin with the equation (4.5); the bound is proved by establishing:

$$(4.6) \quad |S_{m+1,x}(f) - S_{m,x}(f)| \leq \frac{M\|f\|_\infty}{m+2}$$

for $M < \infty$ some constant and any $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{m+1,x}(f) - S_{m,x}(f)| &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x) \left[\frac{S_{m+1}(\mathbb{I}_{E_i}f)}{S_{m+1}(E_i)} - \frac{S_m(\mathbb{I}_{E_i}f)}{S_m(E_i)} \right] \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x) \left[\frac{f(x_{m+1})\mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x_{m+1})}{(m+2)S_{m+1}(E_i)} + \frac{1}{m+2} \sum_{j=0}^m f(x_j)\mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x_j) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \left\{ \frac{1}{S_{m+1}(E_i)} - \frac{m+2}{(m+1)S_m(E_i)} \right\} \right] \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{S_{m+1}(E_i)} - \frac{(m+2)}{(m+1)S_m(E_i)} \right| &= \frac{|(m+1)S_m(E_i) - \delta_{x_{m+1}}(E_i) - (m+1)S_m(E_i)|}{(m+1)S_m(E_i)S_{m+1}(E_i)} \\
&= \frac{\delta_{x_{m+1}}(E_i)}{(m+1)S_m(E_i)S_{m+1}(E_i)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(m+1)\theta^2}
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|S_{m+1,x}(f) - S_{m,x}(f)| &\leq \frac{\|f\|_\infty}{(m+2)} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x) \left[\frac{1}{\theta} + \frac{1}{\theta^2} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{M\|f\|_\infty}{m+2}
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

To bound the fluctuations of the Poisson equation, the decomposition (Proposition B.5) in Andrieu et al. (2007) is adopted, along with Minkowski's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[|\widehat{f}_{S_{m+1}}(X_{m+1}) - \widehat{f}_{S_m}(X_{m+1})|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \\
&\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left[\mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[\left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} [K_{S_{m+1}}^i - \omega(S_{m+1})](K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m})[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)(X_{m+1})|^p \right] \right]^{1/p} + \\
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[|\omega(S_{m+1}) - \omega(S_m)| (K_{S_m}^n - \omega(S_m))^p \right]^{1/p}
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the first expression on the RHS, we can use the fact that, for a fixed (deterministic) pair of empirical measures $S_m, S_{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$ and for any $x \in E$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|[K_{S_{m+1}}^i - \omega(S_{m+1})](K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m})[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)(x)| \leq \\
&M\rho^i \|(K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m})[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)\|_\infty
\end{aligned}$$

and further, for any $x \in E$:

$$|(K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m})[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)(x)| \leq \frac{M\|[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)\|_\infty}{m+2}$$

due to the Lipschitz continuity of Q and the bound (4.6); therefore:

$$\|[K_{S_{m+1}}^i - \omega(S_{m+1})](K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m})[K_{S_m}^{n-i-1} - \omega(S_m)](f)\|_\infty \leq \frac{M\rho^{n-1}}{m+2}.$$

Since, due to (A1), this property holds almost surely, it is possible to bound the first expression. The second expression is dealt with in a similar manner, using the inequality (see Andrieu et al. (2007)):

$$\|[\omega(S_{m+1}) - \omega(S_m)](f)\|_\infty \leq M\|[K_{S_{m+1}} - K_{S_m}](f)\|_\infty.$$

This result can be obtained by the continuity of invariant measures of uniformly ergodic Markov kernels indexed by a parameter.

To complete the first part of the proof, we can use the manipulations of Del Moral & Miclo (2004), Proposition 3.3, to yield:

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0^{1:r}} \left[|S_n^r - S_{n,r}^\omega(f)|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \frac{B_p \|f\|_\infty}{(n - N_{1:r-1} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

To control the bias $S_{n,r}^\omega(f) - \pi_r(f)$ when $r = 2$, the following decomposition is adopted:

$$|\omega(S_m) - \omega(\pi_1)](f)| \leq |K_{S_m}^q - K_{\pi_1}^q](f)| + |\omega(S_m) - K_{S_m}^q](f)| + |K_{\pi_1}^q - \omega(\pi_1)](f)|.$$

Due to the uniform ergodicity bound $\|K_\mu^q - \omega(\mu)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq M\rho^k$ we will show that for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |K_{S_m}^q - K_{\pi_1}^q](f)| = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}_{x_0^{1:r}} - a.s.$$

Let $\epsilon = 1$; the general case is dealt with below. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_d(E)$, and for simplicity write $K^S(K(f) \times 1)(x, y) := P(f)(x, y)$, $f \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$, then we will prove by induction that:

$$(4.8) \quad \underbrace{Q_{\mu_x} Q_{\mu} \dots Q_{\mu}}_{q \text{ times}}(f)(x) = \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_q) \in \mathbb{T}_d^q} \frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^q \mu(E_{i_j})} \mu^{\otimes q} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) \underbrace{P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_3}} \dots P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P(f))))}_{q-1 \text{ terms}} \right\}(x)$$

where a composition of the P kernels is defined as:

$$P^q(f)(x, x_{1:q}) := \int_{E^{q+1}} P((x, x_1), dy_1) P((y_1, x_2), dy_2) \dots P((y_{q-1}, x_q), dy_q) f(y_q).$$

For $q = 1$ (4.8) clearly holds, so assume for $q - 1$ and consider q :

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\mu_x} Q_{\mu} \dots Q_{\mu}(f)(x) &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{q-1}) \in \mathbb{T}_d^{q-1}} \frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mu(E_{i_j})} \mu^{\otimes (q-1)} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} \dots P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_{q-1}}} P(Q_{\mu}(f)))) \right\}(x) \end{aligned}$$

To continue the proof, consider:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Q_{\mu}(f))(x, x_1) &= \int_E P((x, x_1), dy_1) \int_E \mu_{y_1}(dx_2) P(f)(y_1, x_2) \\ &= \int_E P((x, x_1), dy_1) \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(y_1) \frac{\int \mathbb{I}_{E_i}(x_2) P(f)(y_1, x_2) \mu(dx_2)}{\mu(E_i)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\mu(\mathbb{I}_{E_i} P(\mathbb{I}_{E_i} P(f)))}{\mu(E_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, due to the above equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\mu_x} Q_{\mu} \dots Q_{\mu} (f)(x) &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{q-1}) \in \mathbb{T}_d^{q-1}} \frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mu(E_{i_j})} \mu^{\otimes(q-1)} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} \dots P \left[\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_{q-1}}} \sum_{i_q=1}^d \frac{\mu(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P(f))}{\mu(E_{i_q})} \right] \right) \right\} (x) \\
&= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_q) \in \mathbb{T}_d^q} \frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^q \mu(E_{i_j})} \mu^{\otimes(q-1)} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^{q-1} \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} \dots P \left[\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_{q-1}}} \mu(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P(f)) \right] \right) \right\} (x).
\end{aligned}$$

Application of Fubini's theorem yields the desired result.

To prove, for $\epsilon = 1$, that (4.7) holds, observe that:

$$\begin{aligned}
|[K_{S_m}^q - K_{\pi_1}^q](f)| &= \left| \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_q) \in \mathbb{T}_d^q} \left[\frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^q S_m(E_{i_j})} S_m^{\otimes q} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_3}} \dots P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P(f)))) \right\} (x) - \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. \frac{\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_1}}(x)}{\prod_{j=1}^q \pi_1(E_{i_j})} \pi_1^{\otimes q} \left\{ \left(\prod_{j=1}^q \mathbb{I}_{E_{i_j}} \right) P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_2}} P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_3}} \dots P(\mathbb{I}_{E_{i_q}} P(f)))) \right\} (x) \right] \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Application of Theorem U and Proposition 2.8 of Aaronson et al. (1996) (along with the Theorem for almost sure convergence of continuous transformations of almost surely convergent random variables) yields the desired result. Firstly, note that these are results associated to the almost sure convergence of U - and V - (Von Mises) statistics; this is where (A3) is required. Secondly, we remark that it is not required that the auxiliary process is started in its stationary regime (as stated in the result of Aaronson et al. (1996)): We can adopt a coupling argument for uniformly ergodic Markov chains, along the lines of Andrieu et al. (2007) (Theorem 6.5 and Proposition C.1). To complete the proof for $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we note the following decomposition for iterates of mixtures of Markov kernels K and P :

$$((1 - \epsilon)K + \epsilon P)^n(x, dy) = \sum_{l=0}^n \epsilon^l (1 - \epsilon)^{n-l} \sum_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{S}_l} K^{1-\alpha_1} P^{\alpha_1} \dots K^{1-\alpha_n} P^{\alpha_n}(x, dy).$$

where $\mathcal{S}_l = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = l\}$; there is no difficulty to extend the result, using the bounded convergence theorem where required. \square

Remark 3. In the proof we have adopted a decomposition that has naturally led to the use of SLLN for U -statistics. Essentially, the algorithm requires that the invariant measures converge to the desired distribution, and this is manifested, in our proof, via the iterates of the non-linear kernel. This is the main difficulty in proving the SLLN for the equi-energy sampler. An alternative approach, via uniform SLLN, may also be adopted, possibly at the cost of more

abstract assumptions; see Del Moral (2004) for example, in the case of particle approximations of Feynman-Kac formulae.

Remark 4. We note that it is possible to extend our proof, via a density argument (see Del Moral (1998)), for a related algorithm, (NL3) of Andrieu et al. (2007), with $r-1$ feeding chains, but that this cannot be used for the equi-energy sampler, due to the fact that the indicator functions in the definition of the kernel (2.2) are not continuous. In general, a proof by induction requires more complicated arguments and as a result, we feel that the convergence of the equi-energy sampler, as well as the convergence rate (as brought up in the discussion of Kou et al. (2006)) are non-trivial research problems.

REFERENCES

- AARONSON, J., BURTON, R., DEHLING, H., GILHAT, D., HILL, T. & WEISS B. (1996). Strong laws for L - and U - statistics. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **348**, 2845–2866.
- ANDRIEU, C., JASRA, A., DOUCET, A. & DEL MORAL P. (2007). Non-Linear Markov chain Monte Carlo via self interacting approximations. Technical Report, University of Bristol.
- ATCHADÉ, Y. & LIU, J. S. (2006). Discussion of Kou, Zhou & Wong. *Ann. Statist.*, **34**, 1620–1628.
- DEL MORAL, P. (1998). Measure valued processes and interacting particle systems. Application to non linear filtering problems. *Ann. Appl. Prob.*, **8**, 438–495.
- DEL MORAL, P. (2004). *Feynman-Kac Formulae: Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications*. Springer: New York.
- DEL MORAL, P. & MICLO L. (2004). On convergence of chains with occupational self-interactions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, **460**, 325–346.
- GLYNN, P. W. & MEYN S. P. (1996). A Liapounov bound for solutions of the Poisson equation. *Ann. Prob.*, **24**, 916–931.
- KOU, S. C, ZHOU, Q., & WONG, W. H. (2006). Equi-energy sampler with applications to statistical inference and statistical mechanics (with discussion). *Ann. Statist.*, **34**, 1581–1619.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL
BRISTOL
ENGLAND
E-MAIL: c.andrieu@bris.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON
LONDON
ENGLAND
E-MAIL: a.jasra@ic.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

VANCOUVER

CANADA

E-MAIL: arnaud@stat.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

UNIVERSITY OF NICE

NICE

FRANCE

E-MAIL: delmoral@math.unice.fr