

Asymptotic Bias of Stochastic Gradient Search

Vladislav B. Tadić *

Arnaud Doucet†

Abstract. The asymptotic behavior of the stochastic gradient algorithm with a biased gradient estimator is analyzed. Relying on arguments based on the dynamic system theory (chain-recurrence) and the differential geometry (Yomdin theorem and Lojasiewicz inequality), tight bounds on the asymptotic bias of the iterates generated by such an algorithm are derived. The obtained results hold under mild conditions and cover a broad class of high-dimensional nonlinear algorithms. Using these results, the asymptotic properties of the policy-gradient (reinforcement) learning and adaptive population Monte Carlo sampling are studied. Relying on the same results, the asymptotic behavior of the recursive maximum split-likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models is analyzed, too.

Keywords. Stochastic gradient search, biased gradient estimation, chain-recurrence, Yomdin theorem, Lojasiewicz inequalities, reinforcement learning, adaptive Monte Carlo sampling, system identification.

AMS Subject Classification. Primary 62L20; Secondary 90C15, 93E12, 93E35.

1. Introduction

Many problems in automatic control, system identification, signal processing, machine learning, operations research and statistics can be posed as a stochastic optimization problem, i.e., as a minimization (or maximization) of an unknown objective function whose values are available only through noisy observations. Such a problem can efficiently be solved by stochastic gradient search (also known as the stochastic gradient algorithm). Stochastic gradient search is a procedure of the stochastic approximation type which iteratively approximates the minima of the objective function using a statistical or Monte Carlo estimator of the gradient (of the objective function). Often, the estimator is biased, since the consistent gradient estimation is usually computationally expensive or not available at all. As a result of the biased gradient estimation, the stochastic gradient search is biased, too, i.e., the corresponding algorithm does not converge to the minima, but to their vicinity. In order to interpret the results produced by such an algorithm and to tune the algorithm's parameters (e.g., to achieve a better bias/variance balance and a better convergence rate), the knowledge about the asymptotic behavior and the asymptotic bias of the algorithm iterates is crucially needed.

Despite its practical and theoretical importance, the asymptotic behavior of the stochastic gradient search with biased gradient estimation (also referred to as the biased stochastic gradient search) has not attracted much attention in the literature on stochastic optimization and stochastic approximation. To the best of the present authors' knowledge, the asymptotic properties of the biased stochastic gradient search (and the biased stochastic approximation) have only been analyzed in [14], [19], [20] and [21]. Although the results of [14], [19], [20], [21] provide a good insight into the asymptotic behavior of the biased gradient search, they hold under restrictive conditions which are very hard to verify for complex stochastic gradient algorithms. Moreover, unless the objective function is of a simple form (e.g., convex or polynomial), none of [14], [19], [20], [21] offers explicit bounds on the asymptotic bias of the algorithm iterates.

In this paper, we study the asymptotic behavior of the biased gradient search. Using arguments based on the dynamic system theory (chain-recurrence) and the differential geometry (Yomdin theorem and Lojasiewicz inequalities), we prove that the algorithm iterates converge to a vicinity of the set of minima. Relying on the same arguments, we also derive relatively tight bounds on the radius of the vicinity, i.e., on the asymptotic

*Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom (email: v.b.tadic@bristol.ac.uk).

†Department of Statistics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom (doucet@stats.ox.ac.uk).

bias of the algorithm iterates. The obtained results hold under mild and easily verifiable conditions and cover a broad class of complex stochastic gradient algorithms. In this paper, we show how the obtained results can be applied to the asymptotic analysis of policy-gradient (reinforcement) learning and adaptive population Monte Carlo sampling. We also demonstrate how the obtained results can be used to assess the asymptotic bias of the recursive maximum split-likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models.

The paper is organized as follows. The main results are presented in Section 2, where the stochastic gradient search with additive noise is analyzed. In Section 3, the asymptotic bias of the stochastic gradient search with Markovian dynamics is studied. Sections 4 – 6 provide examples of the results of Sections 2 and 3. In Section 4, the policy-gradient (reinforcement) learning is considered, while the adaptive population Monte Carlo sampling is analyzed in Section 5. Section 6 is devoted to the recursive maximum split-likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models. The results of Sections 2 – 6 are proved in Sections 7 – 12.

2. Main Results

In this section, the asymptotic behavior of the following algorithm is analyzed:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n - \alpha_n (\nabla f(\theta_n) + \xi_n), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

Here, $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a differentiable function, while $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers. θ_0 is an \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued random variable defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , while $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued stochastic process defined on the same probability space. To allow more generality, we assume that for each $n \geq 0$, ξ_n is a random function of $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n$. In the area of stochastic optimization, recursion (1) is known as a stochastic gradient search (or stochastic gradient algorithm). The recursion minimizes function $f(\cdot)$, which is usually referred to as the objective function. Term $\nabla f(\theta_n) + \xi_n$ is interpreted as a gradient estimator (i.e., an estimator of $\nabla f(\theta_n)$), while ξ_n represents the estimator's noise (or error). For further details, see [39], [47] and references given therein.

Throughout the paper, the following notation is used. $\|\cdot\|$ and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ stand for the Euclidean norm and the distance induced by the Euclidean norm (respectively). For $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $n \geq 0$, $a(n, t)$ is the integer defined as

$$a(n, t) = \max \left\{ k \geq n : \sum_{i=n}^{k-1} \alpha_i \leq t \right\}.$$

\mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ are the sets of stationary points and critical values of $f(\cdot)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : \nabla f(\theta) = 0\}, \quad f(\mathcal{S}) = \{f(\theta) : \theta \in \mathcal{S}\}. \quad (2)$$

For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\pi(\cdot; \theta)$ is the solution to the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ satisfying $\pi(0; \theta) = \theta$. \mathcal{R} denotes the set of chain-recurrent points of this ODE, i.e., $\theta \in \mathcal{R}$ if and only if for any $\delta, t \in (0, \infty)$, there exist an integer $N \geq 1$, real numbers $t_1, \dots, t_N \in [t, \infty)$ and vectors $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_N \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ (each of which can depend on θ, δ, t) such that

$$\|\vartheta_1 - \theta\| \leq \delta, \quad \|\pi(t_N; \vartheta_N) - \theta\| \leq \delta, \quad \|\vartheta_{k+1} - \pi(t_k; \vartheta_k)\| \leq \delta \quad (3)$$

for $1 \leq k < N$.

Elements of \mathcal{R} can be considered as limits to slightly perturbed solutions to the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$. As the piecewise linear interpolation of sequence $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ falls into the category of such solutions, the concept of chain-recurrence is tightly connected to the asymptotic behavior of stochastic gradient search. In [5], [6], it has been shown that for unbiased gradient estimates, all limit points of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ belong to \mathcal{R} and that each element of \mathcal{R} can potentially be a limit point of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with a non-zero probability.

If $f(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuously differentiable, it can be established that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. If additionally $f(\mathcal{S})$ is of a zero Lebesgue measure (which holds when $f(\mathcal{S})$ is discrete or when $f(\cdot)$ is d_θ -times continuously differentiable), then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}$. However, if $f(\cdot)$ is only Lipschitz continuously differentiable, then it is possible to have $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$

(see [28, Section 4]). Hence, in general, a limit point of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is in \mathcal{R} but not necessarily in \mathcal{S} . For more details on chain-recurrence, see [5], [6], [14] and references therein. Given these results, it will prove useful to involve both \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} in the asymptotic analysis of biased stochastic gradient search.

The algorithm (1) is analyzed under the following assumptions:

Assumption 2.1. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = 0$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty$.

Assumption 2.2. $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ admits the decomposition $\xi_n = \zeta_n + \eta_n$ for each $n \geq 0$, where $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued stochastic processes (defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P)) satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k < a(n,t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| < \infty \quad (4)$$

almost surely on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\}$ for any $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumption 2.3.a. $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Assumption 2.3.b. $f(\cdot)$ is p -times differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , where $p > d_\theta$.

Assumption 2.3.c. $f(\cdot)$ is real-analytic on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Remark 2.1. Due to Assumption 2.1, $a(n, t)$ is well-defined, finite and satisfies

$$t \geq \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i = \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)} \alpha_i - \alpha_{a(n,t)} \geq t - \alpha_{a(n,t)} \quad (5)$$

for all $t \in (0, \infty)$, $n \geq 0$. Consequently, Assumption 2.1 yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)} \alpha_i = t \quad (6)$$

for each $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Assumption 2.1 corresponds to the step-size sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and is commonly used in the asymptotic analysis of stochastic gradient and stochastic approximation algorithms. In this or similar form, it is an ingredient of practically any asymptotic analysis of stochastic gradient search and stochastic approximation. Assumption 2.1 is satisfied if $\alpha_n = n^{-a}$ for $n \geq 1$, where $a \in (0, 1]$.

Assumption 2.2 is a noise condition. It can be interpreted as a decomposition of the gradient estimator's noise $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ into a zero-mean sequence $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (which is averaged out by step-sizes $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$) and the estimator's bias $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. Assumption 2.2 is satisfied if $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale-difference or mixingale sequence, and if $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are continuous functions of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. It also holds for gradient search with Markovian dynamics (see Section 3). If the gradient estimator is unbiased (i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_n = 0$ almost surely), Assumption 2.2 reduces to the well-known Kushner-Clark condition, the weakest noise assumption under which the almost sure convergence of (1) can be demonstrated.

Assumptions 2.3.a, 2.3.b and 2.3.c are related to the objective function $f(\cdot)$ and its analytical properties. Assumption 2.3.a is involved in practically any asymptotic result for stochastic gradient search (as well as in many other asymptotic and non-asymptotic results for stochastic and deterministic optimization). Although much more restrictive than Assumption 2.3.a, Assumptions 2.3.b and 2.3.c hold for a number of algorithms routinely used in engineering, statistics, machine learning and operations research. In Sections 4 – 6, Assumptions 2.3.b and 2.3.c are shown for policy-gradient (reinforcement) learning, adaptive population Monte Carlo sampling and recursive maximum split-likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models. In [50], Assumption 2.3.c (which is a special case of Assumption 2.3.b) has been demonstrated for recursive maximum (full) likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models. In [51], the same assumption has also been demonstrated for supervised and temporal-difference learning, online principal component analysis, Monte Carlo optimization of controlled Markov chains and recursive parameter estimation in linear stochastic systems. In [52], we show

Assumptions 2.3.b and 2.3.c for sequential Monte Carlo methods for the parameter estimation in non-linear non-Gaussian state-space models. It is also worth mentioning that the objective functions associated with online principal and independent component analysis (as well as with many other adaptive signal processing algorithms) are often polynomial or rational, and hence, smooth and analytic, too (see e.g., [23] and references cited therein).

As opposed to Assumption 2.3.a, Assumptions 2.3.b and 2.3.c allow some sophisticated results from the differential geometry to be applied to the asymptotic analysis of stochastic gradient search. More specifically, Yomdin theorem (qualitative version of Morse-Sard theorem; see [53] and Proposition 8.1 in Section 8) can be applied to functions satisfying Assumption 2.3.b, while Lojasiewicz inequalities (see [35], [36]; see also [12], [32] and Proposition 8.2 in Section 8) hold for functions fulfilling Assumption 2.3.c. Using Yomdin theorem and Lojasiewicz inequalities, a more precise characterization of the asymptotic bias of the stochastic gradient search can be obtained (see Parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2.1).

In order to state the main results of this section, we need some further notation. η is the asymptotic magnitude of the gradient estimator's bias $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, i.e.,

$$\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\|. \quad (7)$$

For a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, Λ_Q denotes the event

$$\Lambda_Q = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\theta_n \in Q\} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=n}^{\infty} \{\theta_k \in Q\}. \quad (8)$$

With this notation, our main result on the asymptotic bias of the recursion (1) can be stated as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *If $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.3.a, there exists a (deterministic) non-decreasing function $\psi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_Q(t) = \psi_Q(0) = 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) \leq \psi_Q(\eta) \quad (9)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

- (ii) *If $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.3.b, there exists a real number $K_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq K_Q \eta^{q/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq K_Q \eta^q \quad (10)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q , where $q = (p - d_\theta)/(p - 1)$.

- (iii) *If $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.3.c, there exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $L_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq L_Q \eta^{1/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), \mathcal{S}) \leq L_Q \eta, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) \leq L_Q \eta^{r_Q} \quad (11)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

Theorem 2.1 is proved in Sections 7 and 8, while its global version is provided in Appendix 1.

Remark. *If Assumption 2.3.b (or Assumption 2.3.c) is satisfied, then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}$. Hence, under Assumption 2.3.b, (9) still holds if \mathcal{R} is replaced with \mathcal{S} .*

Remark 2.2. *Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $f(\cdot)$ in the following two ways. First, $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $f(\cdot)$ through the chain-recurrent set \mathcal{R} and its geometric properties. In addition to this, $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $f(\cdot)$ through upper bounds of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ and Lipschitz constants of $\nabla f(\cdot)$. An explicit construction of $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ is provided in the proof of Part (i) of Theorem 2.1 (Section 7).*

Remark 2.3. As $\psi_Q(\cdot)$, constants K_Q and L_Q depend on $f(\cdot)$ through upper bounds of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ and Lipschitz constants of $\nabla f(\cdot)$. K_Q and L_Q also depend on $f(\cdot)$ through the Yomdin and Lojasiewicz constants (quantities M_Q , $M_{1,Q}$, $M_{2,Q}$ specified in Propositions 8.1, 8.2). Explicit formulas for K_Q and L_Q are included in the proof of Parts (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2.1 (Section 8).

According to the literature on stochastic optimization and stochastic approximation, stochastic gradient search with unbiased gradient estimates (the case when $\eta = 0$) exhibits the following asymptotic behavior. Under mild conditions, sequences $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{f(\theta_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ converge to \mathcal{R} and $f(\mathcal{R})$ (respectively), i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{R})) = 0 \quad (12)$$

almost surely on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\}$ (see [6, Proposition 4.1, Theorem 5.7] which hold under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.a). Under more restrictive conditions, sequences $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{f(\theta_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ converge to \mathcal{S} and a point in $f(\mathcal{S})$ (respectively), i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla f(\theta_n) = 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})) = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \quad (13)$$

almost surely on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\}$ (see [6, Corollary 6.7] which holds under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.b). The same asymptotic behavior occurs when Assumptions 2.1, 2.3.a hold and $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a martingale-difference sequence (see [11, Proposition 1]). When the gradient estimator is biased (the case where $\eta > 0$), this is not true any more. Now, the quantities

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}), \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})), \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \quad (14)$$

are strictly positive and depend on η (it is reasonable to expect these quantities to decrease in η and to tend to zero as $\eta \rightarrow 0$). Hence, the quantities (14) and their dependence on η can be considered as a sensible characterization of the asymptotic bias of the gradient search with biased gradient estimation (i.e., these quantities describe how biased stochastic gradient search deviates from the nominal behavior). In the case of algorithm (1), such a characterization is provided by Theorem 2.1. The theorem includes tight, explicit bounds on the quantities (14) in the terms of the gradient estimator's bias η and analytical properties of $f(\cdot)$.

The results of Theorem 2.1 are of a local nature. They hold only on the event where algorithm (1) is stable (i.e., where sequence $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ belongs to a compact set Q). Stating results on the asymptotic bias of stochastic gradient search in such a local form is quite sensible due to the following reasons. The stability of stochastic gradient search is based on well-understood arguments which are rather different from the arguments used here to analyze the asymptotic bias. Moreover and more importantly, as demonstrated in Appendix 1, it is relatively easy to get a global version of Theorem 2.1 by combining the theorem with the methods for verifying or ensuring the stability (e.g., with the results of [13] and [21]). It is also worth mentioning that local asymptotic results are quite common in the areas of stochastic optimization and stochastic approximation (e.g., most of the results of [9, Part II], similarly as Theorem 2.1, hold only on set Λ_Q).

Gradient algorithms with biased gradient estimation are extensively used in system identification [2], [25], [26], [29], [34], discrete-event system optimization [22], [27], [43], [44], machine learning [4], [10], [15], [31], [41], and statistics [1], [16], [25], [40] [46]. To interpret results obtained by such an algorithm and to tune the algorithm parameters (e.g., to achieve better bias/variance balance and convergence rate), it is crucially important to understand the asymptotic properties of the biased stochastic gradient search. Despite its importance, the asymptotic behavior of the stochastic gradient search with biased gradient estimation has not received much attention in the literature on stochastic optimization and stochastic approximation. To the best of the present authors' knowledge, the asymptotic properties of the biased stochastic gradient search and biased stochastic approximation have been studied only in [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7]. Although these results provide a good insight into the asymptotic behavior of the biased gradient search, they are based on restrictive conditions. More specifically, the results of [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7] hold only if $f(\cdot)$ is unimodal or if $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ belongs to the domain of an asymptotically stable attractor of $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$. In addition to this, the results of [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7] do not provide any explicit bound on the asymptotic bias of the stochastic gradient search unless $f(\cdot)$ is of a simple

form (e.g., convex or polynomial). Unfortunately, in the case of complex stochastic gradient algorithms (such as those studied in Sections 4 – 6), $f(\cdot)$ is usually multimodal with lot of unisolated local extrema and saddle points. For such algorithms, not only it is hard to verify the assumptions adopted in [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7], but these assumptions are likely not to hold at all.

Relying on the chain-recurrence, Yomdin theorem and Łojasiewicz inequalities, Theorem 2.1 overcomes the described difficulties. The theorem allows the objective function $f(\cdot)$ to be multimodal (with manifolds of unisolated extrema and saddle points) and does not require $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ to have an asymptotically stable attractor which is infinitely often visited by $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. In addition to this, Theorem 2.1 provides relatively tight explicit bounds on the asymptotic bias of algorithm (1). Furthermore, as demonstrated in Sections 4 – 6 and [52], the theorem covers a broad class of stochastic gradient algorithms used in machine learning, Monte Carlo sampling and system identification.

3. Stochastic Gradient Search with Markovian Dynamics

In order to illustrate the results of Section 2 and to set up a framework for the analysis carried out in Sections 4 – 6, we apply Theorem 2.1 to stochastic gradient algorithms with Markovian dynamics. These algorithms are defined by the following difference equation:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n - \alpha_n (F(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) + \eta_n), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

In this recursion, $F : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is a Borel-measurable function, while $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers. θ_0 is an \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued random variable defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an \mathbb{R}^{d_z} -valued stochastic process defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , while $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued stochastic process defined on the same probability space. $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a Markov process controlled by $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, i.e., there exists a family of transition probability kernels $\{\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}}$ defined on \mathbb{R}^{d_z} such that

$$P(Z_{n+1} \in B | \theta_0, Z_0, \dots, \theta_n, Z_n) = \Pi_{\theta_n}(Z_n, B) \quad (16)$$

almost surely for any Borel-measurable set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ and $n \geq 0$. $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are random function of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, i.e., η_n is a random function of $\theta_0, \dots, \theta_n$ for each $n \geq 0$. In the context of stochastic gradient search, $F(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) + \eta_n$ represents a gradient estimator (i.e., an estimator of $\nabla f(\theta_n)$).

The algorithm (15) is analyzed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 3.1. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\alpha_{n+1}^{-1} - \alpha_n^{-1}| < \infty$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n = \infty$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 < \infty$.

Assumption 3.2. There exist a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a Borel-measurable function $\tilde{F} : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ such that $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous and

$$F(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta) = \tilde{F}(\theta, z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) \quad (17)$$

for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, where $(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = \int \tilde{F}(\theta, z') \Pi_\theta(z, dz')$.

Assumption 3.3. For any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a Borel-measurable function $\varphi_Q : \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\|F(\theta, z)\|, \|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} &\leq \varphi_Q(z), \\ \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| &\leq \varphi_Q(z) \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. Moreover,

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} E \left(\varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} | \theta_0 = \theta, Z_0 = z \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, where τ_Q is the stopping time defined by $\tau_Q = \inf(\{n \geq 0 : \theta_n \notin Q\} \cup \{\infty\})$.

Assumption 3.4. $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| < \infty$ almost surely on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\}$.

Let \mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ have the same meaning as in (2) ($f(\cdot)$ is now specified in Assumption 3.2), while \mathcal{R} is the set of chain-recurrent points of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ (for details on chain-recurrence, see Section 2). Moreover, let η have the same meaning as in (7). Then, our results on the asymptotic behavior of the recursion (15) read as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 – 3.4 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.a, Part (i) of Theorem 2.1 holds.*
- (ii) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.b, Part (ii) of Theorem 2.1 holds.*
- (iii) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.c, Part (iii) of Theorem 2.1 holds.*

Theorem 3.1 is proved in Section 9, while its global version is provided in Appendix 2.

Assumption 3.1 is related to the sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. It is satisfied if $\alpha_n = 1/n^a$ for $n \geq 1$, where $a \in (1/2, 1]$ is a constant. Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3 correspond to the stochastic process $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and are standard for the asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms with Markovian dynamics. Basically, Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3 require the Poisson equation associated with algorithm (15) to have a solution which is Lipschitz continuous in θ . They hold if the following is satisfied: (i) $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, (ii) the convergence rate of $\Pi_\theta^n(\cdot, \cdot)$ is locally uniform in θ , and (iii) $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} (for further details see, [9, Chapter II.2], [38, Chapter 17] and references cited therein). Assumptions 3.2 and 3.3 have been introduced by Métivier and Priouret in [37] (see also [9, Part II]), and later generalized by Kushner and his co-workers (see [33] and references cited therein). However, none of these results cover the scenario where biased gradient estimates are used. Theorem 3.1 fills this gap in the literature on stochastic optimization and stochastic approximation.

Regarding Theorem 3.1, the following note is in order. As already mentioned in the beginning of the section, the purpose of the theorem is illustrating the results of Section 2 and providing a framework for studying the examples presented in the next few sections. Since these examples perfectly fit into the framework developed by Metivier and Priouret, more general assumptions and settings of [33] are not considered here in order to keep the exposition as concise as possible.

4. Example 1: Reinforcement Learning

In this section, Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 are applied to the asymptotic analysis of policy-gradient search for average-cost Markov decision problems. Policy-gradient search is one of the most important classes of reinforcement learning (for further details, see e.g., [10], [41]).

In order to define controlled Markov chains with parametrized randomized control and to formulate the corresponding average-cost decision problems, we use the following notation. $d_\theta \geq 1$, $N_x > 1$, $N_y > 1$ are integers, while \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} are the sets

$$\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, N_x\}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, N_y\}.$$

$\phi(x, y)$ is a non-negative (real-valued) function of $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. $p(x'|x, y)$ and $q_\theta(y|x)$ are non-negative (real-valued) functions of $(\theta, x, x', y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with the following properties: $q_\theta(y|x)$ is differentiable in θ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} p(x'|x, y) = 1, \quad \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} q_\theta(y'|x) = 1$$

for the same θ , x , y . For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ -valued Markov chain which is defined on a (canonical) probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_\theta)$ and which admits

$$P_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta = x', Y_{n+1}^\theta = y' | X_n^\theta = x, Y_n^\theta = y) = q_\theta(y'|x')p(x'|x, y)$$

for each $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. $f(\cdot)$ is a function defined by

$$f(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi(X_i^\theta, Y_i^\theta) \right) \quad (18)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. With this notation, an average-cost Markov decision problem with parameterized randomized control can be defined as the minimization of $f(\cdot)$. In the literature on reinforcement learning and operations research, $\{X_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ are referred to as a controlled Markov chain, while $\{Y_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ are called control actions. $p(x'|x, y)$ is referred to as the (chain) transition probability, while $q_\theta(y|x)$ is called the (control) action probability. θ is a parameter indexing the action probability. For further details on Markov decision processes, see [10], [41], and references cited therein.

Since $f(\cdot)$ and its gradient rarely admit a close-form expression, $f(\cdot)$ is minimized using methods based on stochastic gradient search and Monte Carlo gradient estimation. Such a method can be derived as follows. Let

$$s_\theta(x, y) = \frac{\nabla_\theta q_\theta(y|x)}{q_\theta(y|x)}$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. If $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic, we have

$$\nabla f(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta \left(\phi(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_\theta(X_{n-i}^\theta, Y_{n-i}^\theta) \right)$$

(see the proof of Lemma 10.2 and in particular (56)). Hence, quantity

$$\phi(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_\theta(X_{n-i}^\theta, Y_{n-i}^\theta)$$

is an asymptotically consistent estimator of $\nabla f(\theta)$. To reduce its variance (which is usually very large for $n \gg 1$), term $s_\theta(X_{n-i}^\theta, Y_{n-i}^\theta)$ is ‘discounted’ by λ^i , where $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ is a constant referred to as the discounting factor. This leads to the following gradient estimator:

$$\phi(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i s_\theta(X_{n-i}^\theta, Y_{n-i}^\theta). \quad (19)$$

Gradient estimator (19) is biased and its bias is of the order $O(1 - \lambda)$ when $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ (see Lemma 10.2). Combining gradient search with estimator (19), we get the policy-gradient algorithm proposed in [4]. This algorithm is defined by the following difference equations:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n+1} &= \lambda W_n + s_{\theta_n}(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}), \\ \theta_{n+1} &= \theta_n - \alpha_n \phi(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) W_{n+1}, \quad n \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

In the recursion (20), $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of positive reals, while $\theta_0, W_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ are any (deterministic) vectors. $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} valued stochastic processes (respectively) generated through the following Monte Carlo simulations:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n+1} | \theta_n, X_n, Y_n, \dots, \theta_0, X_0, Y_0 &\sim p(\cdot | X_n, Y_n), \\ Y_{n+1} | X_{n+1}, \theta_n, X_n, Y_n, \dots, \theta_0, X_0, Y_0 &\sim q_{\theta_n}(\cdot | X_{n+1}), \quad n \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $X_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $Y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ are deterministic quantities.¹ Hence, $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies

$$P(X_{n+1} = x, Y_{n+1} = y | \theta_n, X_n, Y_n, \dots, \theta_0, X_0, Y_0) = q_{\theta_n}(y|x) p(x | X_n, Y_n)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 1$.

Algorithm (20) is analyzed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 4.1. For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\{X_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is irreducible and aperiodic.

¹In (21), X_{n+1} is simulated from $p(\cdot | X_n, Y_n)$ independently of $\theta_n, \theta_{n-1}, X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}, \dots, \theta_0, X_0, Y_0$, while Y_{n+1} is simulated from $q_{\theta_n}(\cdot | X_{n+1})$ independently of $X_n, Y_n, \theta_{n-1}, X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}, \dots, \theta_0, X_0, Y_0$.

Assumption 4.2. For all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $s_\theta(x, y)$ is well-defined (and finite). Moreover, for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $s_\theta(x, y)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Assumption 4.3.a. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ is p -times differentiable in θ on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , where $p > d_\theta$.

Assumption 4.3.b. For each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ is real-analytic in θ on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Assumption 4.1 is related to the stability of the controlled Markov chain $\{X_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$. In this or similar form, it is often involved in the asymptotic analysis of reinforcement learning algorithms (see e.g., [10], [41]). Assumptions 4.2, 4.3.a and 4.3.b correspond to the parameterization of the action probabilities $q_\theta(y|x)$. They are satisfied for many commonly used parameterizations (such as natural, exponential and trigonometric).

Let \mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ have the same meaning as in (2) ($f(\cdot)$ is now defined in (18)), while \mathcal{R} is the set of chain-recurrent points of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ (for details on chain-recurrence, see Section 2). Moreover, for a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, let Λ_Q have the same meaning as in (8). Then, our results on the asymptotic behavior of the recursion (20) read as follows.

Theorem 4.1. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:

- (i) There exists a (deterministic) non-decreasing function $\psi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (independent of λ and depending only on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_Q(t) = \psi_Q(0) = 0$ and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) \leq \psi_Q(1 - \lambda)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

- (ii) If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2) Assumption 4.3.a is satisfied, there exists a real number $K_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of λ and depending only on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq K_Q(1 - \lambda)^{q/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq K_Q(1 - \lambda)^q$$

almost surely on Λ_Q , where $q = (p - d_\theta)/(p - 1)$.

- (iii) If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1, 4.1 and 4.2) Assumption 4.3.b is satisfied, there exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $L_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of λ and depending only on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq L_Q(1 - \lambda)^{1/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})) \leq L_Q(1 - \lambda), \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) \leq L_Q(1 - \lambda)^{r_Q}$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

Theorem 4.1 is proved in Section 10.

Remark. Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (18)) and its properties (see Remark 2.2 for details). Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ also depends on $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through the ergodicity properties of $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ (see Lemma 10.1). In addition to this, $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $\phi(x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through upper bounds of $|\phi(x, y)|$, $\|s_\theta(x, y)\|$. Further details can be found in the proofs of Lemmas 10.1, 10.2 and Theorem 4.1 (Section 10).

Remark. As $\psi_Q(\cdot)$, constants K_Q and L_Q depend on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (18)) and its properties (see Remark 2.3 for details). K_Q and L_Q also depend on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through the ergodicity properties of $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$. In addition to this, K_Q and L_Q depend on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through upper bounds of $|\phi(x, y)|$, $\|s_\theta(x, y)\|$. For further details, see the proofs of Lemmas 10.1, 10.2 and Theorem 4.1 (Section 10).

Although gradient search with ‘discounted’ gradient estimation (19) is widely used in reinforcement learning (besides policy-gradient search, temporal-difference and actor-critic learning also rely on the same approach), the available literature does not give a quite satisfactory answer to the problem of its asymptotic behavior. To the best of the present authors’ knowledge, the existing results do not offer even the guarantee that the asymptotic bias of recursion (20) goes to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ (i.e., that $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ converges to a vicinity of \mathcal{S} whose

radius tends to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$).² The main difficulty stems from the fact that reinforcement learning algorithms are so complex that the existing asymptotic results for biased stochastic gradient search and biased stochastic approximation [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7] cannot be applied. Relying on the results presented in Sections 2 and 3, Theorem 4.1 overcomes these difficulties. Under mild and easily verifiable conditions, Theorem 4.1 guarantees that the asymptotic bias of algorithm (20) converges to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$ (Part (i)). Theorem 4.1 also provides relatively tight polynomial bounds on the rate at which the bias goes to zero (Parts (ii), (iii)). In addition to this, Theorem 4.1 can be extended to other reinforcement learning algorithms such as temporal-difference and actor-critic learning.

5. Example 2: Adaptive Monte Carlo Sampling

In this section, Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 are used to analyze the asymptotic behavior of adaptive population Monte Carlo methods.

In order to describe the population Monte Carlo methods and explain how their performance can adaptively be improved, we use the following notation. $d_\theta \geq 1$, $d_x \geq 1$, $N > 1$ are integers. $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is an open set, while $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is a Borel-set. $p(x)$ is a probability density on \mathcal{X} , while $q(x)$ is a non-negative function proportional to $p(\cdot)$ (i.e., $p(x) \geq 0$, $q(x) \geq 0$, $p(x) = q(x)/\int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x')dx'$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$). $p_\theta(x'|x)$ is a non-negative (real-valued) function of $(\theta, x, x') \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ which satisfies $\int_{\mathcal{X}} p_\theta(x'|x)dx' = 1$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (notice that $p_\theta(\cdot|x)$ is a transition density on \mathcal{X}). $w_\theta(x, \tilde{x})$ is the function defined by

$$w_\theta(x, \tilde{x}) = \frac{q(\tilde{x})}{p_\theta(\tilde{x}|x)}$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, \tilde{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. $\tilde{r}_{N,\theta}(\cdot|x_{1:N})$ is the transition density on \mathcal{X}^N defined as

$$\tilde{r}_{N,\theta}(\tilde{x}_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) = \prod_{i=1}^N p_\theta(\tilde{x}_i|x_i)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $\tilde{x}_{1:N} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. $R_{N,\theta}(\cdot|x_{1:N}, \tilde{x}_{1:N})$ is the probability measure on \mathcal{X}^N defined by

$$R_{N,\theta}(B|x_{1:N}, \tilde{x}_{1:N}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{X}} I_B(x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N w_\theta(x_j, \tilde{x}_j) \delta_{\tilde{x}_j}(dx'_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_\theta(x_j, \tilde{x}_j)} \right)$$

for Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $\tilde{x}_{1:N} = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$ ($\delta_{\tilde{x}}(\cdot)$ represents the Dirac measure centered at \tilde{x}).

Population Monte Carlo method is a method for simulating samples from $p(x)$ in a situation when only $q(x)$ is available (i.e., when $p(x)$ is known up to a normalizing constant). Population Monte Carlo method generates sequences of random variables $\{(X_n^\theta(1), \dots, X_n^\theta(N))\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\tilde{X}_n^\theta(1), \dots, \tilde{X}_n^\theta(N)\}_{n \geq 0}$ (defined on a canonical probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_\theta)$) using the following sampling importance-resampling scheme:

$$\tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta | X_n^\theta, \tilde{X}_n^\theta, \dots, X_0^\theta, \tilde{X}_0^\theta \sim \tilde{r}_{N,\theta}(\cdot | X_n^\theta) \quad (22)$$

$$X_{n+1}^\theta | \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta, X_n^\theta, \tilde{X}_n^\theta, \dots, X_0^\theta, \tilde{X}_0^\theta \sim R_{N,\theta}(\cdot | X_n^\theta, \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta), \quad n \geq 0, \quad (23)$$

where $X_n^\theta = (X_n^\theta(1), \dots, X_n^\theta(N))$, $\tilde{X}_n^\theta = (\tilde{X}_n^\theta(1), \dots, \tilde{X}_n^\theta(N))$, while $X_0^\theta, \tilde{X}_0^\theta \in \mathcal{X}^N$ are any deterministic vectors.³ For further details on the population Monte Carlo method, see e.g., [17], [42] and references cited therein.

² Paper [31] can be considered as the strongest result on the asymptotic behavior of reinforcement learning with ‘discounted’ gradient estimation. However, [31] only claims that a subsequence of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ converges to a vicinity to \mathcal{S} whose radius goes to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow 1$.

³At the sampling step (22), for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, $\tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(i)$ is sampled from $p_\theta(\cdot | X_n^\theta(i))$. At the resampling step (23), for each $1 \leq i \leq N$, random integer $I_n^\theta(i)$ is sampled proportionally from $(w_\theta(X_n^\theta(1), \tilde{X}_n^\theta(1)), \dots, w_\theta(X_n^\theta(N), \tilde{X}_n^\theta(N)))$ and then, random number $X_{n+1}^\theta(i)$ is selected according to $X_{n+1}^\theta(i) = \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(I_{n+1}^\theta(i))$.

In order to improve the performance of the population Monte Carlo method, parameter θ is selected so as the Kullback-Leibler distance between $p(x')p(x)$ and $p(x'|x)p(x)$ is minimum. Hence, θ minimizes

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \log \left(\frac{p(x')}{p_{\theta}(x'|x)} \right) p(x')p(x) dx' dx$$

on Θ . It is straightforward to show that θ also minimizes

$$f(\theta) = - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \log(p_{\theta}(x'|x)) p(x')p(x) dx' dx \quad (24)$$

on Θ . As $f(\cdot)$ and its gradient are not available analytically, $f(\cdot)$ is minimized using stochastic gradient search and Monte Carlo gradient estimation (or their variants such as online EM algorithm). $\nabla f(\cdot)$ can be estimated by the quantity

$$-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_{\theta}(X_n^{\theta}(i), X_{n+1}^{\theta}(i)), \quad (25)$$

where $s_{\theta}(x, x')$ is the function defined by

$$s_{\theta}(x, x') = \frac{\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(x'|x)}{p_{\theta}(x'|x)} \quad (26)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Estimator (25) is biased, and its bias is of the order $O(1/N)$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see Lemma 11.2). Combining gradient search with estimator (25), we get an adaptive population Monte Carlo method. This method is defined by the following difference equation:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n + \frac{\alpha_n}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_{\theta_n}(X_n(i), X_{n+1}(i)), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (27)$$

In the recursion (27), $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of positive reals, while $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ is any (deterministic) vector. $\{(X_n(1), \dots, X_n(N))\}_{n \geq 1}$ is an \mathcal{X}^N -valued stochastic process generated through the following Monte Carlo simulations:

$$\tilde{X}_{n+1}|X_n, \tilde{X}_n, \dots, X_0, \tilde{X}_0 \sim \tilde{r}_{N, \theta_n}(\cdot|X_n) \quad (28)$$

$$X_{n+1}|\tilde{X}_{n+1}, X_n, \tilde{X}_n, \dots, X_0, \tilde{X}_0 \sim R_{N, \theta_n}(\cdot|X_n, \tilde{X}_{n+1}), \quad n \geq 0, \quad (29)$$

where $X_n = (X_n(1), \dots, X_n(N))$, $\tilde{X}_n = (\tilde{X}_n(1), \dots, \tilde{X}_n(N))$, while $X_0, \tilde{X}_0 \in \mathcal{X}^N$ are any deterministic vectors. For more details on adaptive population Monte Carlo methods, see e.g., [18], [24].

Remark. Recursion (28) usually includes a projection (or truncation) scheme which keeps $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ within Θ (see [34]). For the sake of exposition, this aspect of (28) is not studied here. Instead, similarly as in [9] and [34], the asymptotic results are stated in a local form.

Algorithm (27) is analyzed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 5.1. \mathcal{X} is compact.

Assumption 5.2. $p(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, $p(x)$ is continuous for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 5.3. $p_{\theta}(x'|x) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, $\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}(x'|x)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in (θ, x, x') on $\Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 5.4.a. For each $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $p_{\theta}(x'|x)$ is p -times differentiable in θ on Θ , where $p > d_{\theta}$. Moreover, the p -th order derivatives (in θ) of $p_{\theta}(x'|x)$ are continuous in (θ, x, x') on $\Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 5.4.b. For each $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $p_{\theta}(x'|x)$ is real-analytic in θ on Θ . Moreover, $p_{\theta}(x'|x)$ has a (complex-valued) continuation $\hat{p}_{\eta}(x'|x)$ with the following properties:

(i) $\hat{p}_{\eta}(x'|x)$ maps $(\eta, x, x') \in \mathbb{C}^{d_{\theta}} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ to \mathbb{C} .

- (ii) $\hat{p}_\theta(x'|x) = p_\theta(x'|x)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.
- (iii) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, there exists a real number $\delta_\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\hat{p}_\eta(x'|x)$ is analytic in η and continuous in (η, x, x') for any $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^{d_\theta}$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $\|\eta - \theta\| \leq \delta_\theta$.

Assumptions 5.1 and 5.2 correspond to the target density $p(\cdot)$, while Assumptions 5.3, 5.4.a and 5.4.b are related to the instrumental density $p_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$. These assumptions are rather restrictive from the theoretical perspective, since they require $p(\cdot)$ and $p_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ to be compactly supported. We rely on such restrictive conditions for the sake of exposition. However, the results presented here can easily be extended to the case where \mathcal{X} is unbounded and where the fourth moments of $p(\cdot)$ and $p_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ are finite.

Let \mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ have the same meaning as in (2) ($f(\cdot)$ is now defined in (24)), while \mathcal{R} is the set of chain-recurrent points of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ (for details on chain-recurrence, see Section 2). Moreover, for a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, let Λ_Q have the same meaning as in (8). Then, our results on the asymptotic behavior of algorithm (27) read as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 5.1 and 5.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \Theta$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *There exists a (deterministic) non-decreasing function $\psi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_Q(t) = \psi_Q(0) = 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) \leq \psi_Q \left(\frac{1}{N} \right)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

- (ii) *If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1, 5.1 and 5.2) Assumption 5.4.a is satisfied, there exists a real number $K_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \frac{K_Q}{N^{q/2}}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq \frac{K_Q}{N^q}$$

almost surely on Λ_Q , where $q = (p - d_\theta)/(p - 1)$.

- (iii) *If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1, 5.1 and 5.2) Assumption 5.4.b is satisfied, there exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $L_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \frac{L_Q}{N^{1/2}}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})) \leq \frac{L_Q}{N}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) \leq \frac{L_Q}{N^{r_Q}}$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

Theorem 5.1 is proved in Section 11.

Remark. *Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (24)) and its properties (see Remark 2.2 for details). Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ also depends on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$ through lower bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$ and upper bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$, $\|\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x)\|$. Further details can be found in the proofs of Lemma 11.2 (Part (ii)) and Theorem 5.1 (Section 11).*

Remark. *As $\psi_Q(\cdot)$, constants K_Q and L_Q depend on $\phi(x, y)$, $p(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (24)) and its properties (see Remark 2.3 for details). K_Q and L_Q also depend on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$ through lower bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$ and upper bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q(x)$, $\|\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x)\|$. For further details, see the proofs of Lemma 11.2 (Part (ii)) and Theorem 5.1 (Section 11).*

Population Monte Carlo methods have been proposed and studied in [17], while their adaptive versions have been developed and analyzed in [18], [24]. Although based on the same principle as (28) (minimization of function $f(\cdot)$), the adaptive methods considered in [18], [24] compute optimal values of θ using iterative techniques (slightly) different from stochastic gradient search (i.e., using EM algorithm). Unfortunately, unless $f(\cdot)$ is convex, [18], [24] do not offer much information on the asymptotic behavior of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$.⁴ The purpose of Theorem 5.1 (besides illustrating Theorems 2.1, 3.1) is to fill this gap in the literature on population Monte Carlo methods.

⁴The results of [18], [24] are focused only on the case where $p_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a mixture of transition kernels parameterized by the mixture weights.

6. Example 3: Identification of Hidden Markov Models

In this section, Theorems 2.1 and 3.1 are applied to the asymptotic analysis of recursive maximum split-likelihood methods for the identification of hidden Markov models.

In order to define hidden Markov models and to formulate the problem of their identification, we use the following notation. $N_x > 1$, $N_y > 1$ are integers, while \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} are the sets

$$\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, N_x\}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, N_y\}.$$

$p(x'|x)$ and $q(y|x)$ are non-negative (real-valued) functions of $(x, x', y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} p(x'|x) = 1, \quad \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} q(y|x) = 1$$

for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$. $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ -valued Markov chain which is defined on a (canonical) probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and which admits

$$P(X_{n+1} = x', Y_{n+1} = y' | X_n = x, Y_n = y) = q(y'|x')p(x'|x)$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. On the other side, $d_\theta \geq 1$ is an integer, while $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is an open set. $\pi_\theta(x)$, $p_\theta(x'|x)$ and $q_\theta(y|x)$ are non-negative functions of $(\theta, x, x', y) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ with the following properties: They are differentiable in θ for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and satisfy

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \pi_\theta(x') = 1, \quad \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} p_\theta(x'|x) = 1, \quad \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} q_\theta(y|x) = 1$$

for the same θ , x . For $\theta \in \Theta$, $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ -valued Markov chain which is defined on a (canonical) probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_\theta)$ and which admits

$$\begin{aligned} P_\theta(X_0^\theta = x, Y_0^\theta = y) &= q_\theta(y|x)\pi_\theta(x), \\ P_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta = x', Y_{n+1}^\theta = y' | X_n^\theta = x, Y_n^\theta = y) &= q_\theta(y'|x')p_\theta(x'|x) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 0$. $\phi_{N,\theta}(y_{1:N})$ is the function defined as

$$\phi_{N,\theta}(y_{1:N}) = -\frac{1}{N} \log \left(\sum_{x_0, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^N (q_\theta(y_i|x_i)p_\theta(x_i|x_{i-1})) \right) \pi_\theta(x_0) \right),$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $y_{1:N} = (y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathcal{Y}^N$, $N \geq 1$. $f_N(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ are the functions defined by

$$f_N(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N})), \quad f(\theta) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E(\phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{1:N})) \quad (30)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $N \geq 1$ (here, $Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N}$ stands for $(Y_{nN+1}, \dots, Y_{(n+1)N})$). Then, it is straightforward to show that $f(\cdot)$ is the negative (asymptotic) log-likelihood associated with $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 0}$.

In the statistics and engineering literature, $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ (as well as $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$) is known as a hidden Markov model, while X_n and Y_n are the model's (unobservable) state and (observable) output at discrete-time n . Using the notation introduced in this section, the identification of $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ can be stated as follows: Given a realization of the output sequence $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, estimate $\{p(x'|x)\}_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\{q(y|x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}}$. If the identification is based on the maximum likelihood principle and the parameterized model $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$, the estimation reduces to the minimization of $f(\cdot)$ over Θ . In this context, $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ can be considered as a candidate model for the unknown system $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$. For more details on hidden Markov models and their identification see [16] and references cited therein.

As the negative log-likelihood $f(\cdot)$ and its gradient are rarely available analytically, $f(\cdot)$ is usually minimized by stochastic gradient search. Unfortunately, the consistent estimation of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is computationally expensive (even for moderately large N_x , N_y), since it relies on the optimal filter and the optimal filter derivatives (see e.g., [16]). To reduce the computational complexity, a number of approaches based on approximate

maximum likelihood (also known as pseudo-likelihood) has been proposed. Among them, the maximum split-likelihood method [45], [46] has attracted a considerable attention in the literature. This approach is based on the following fact. If $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic and if the optimal filter for the candidate model $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is stable, then

$$\nabla f(\theta) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \nabla f_N(\theta) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\nabla_\theta \phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N}))$$

(see Lemma 12.1). Hence, $\nabla_\theta \phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N})$ is a reasonably good estimator of $\nabla f(\theta)$ when n, N are large. This estimator is biased and the bias is of the order $O(1/N)$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see Lemma 12.1). Combining gradient search with the estimator $\nabla_\theta \phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N})$, we get the recursive maximum split-likelihood algorithm:

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n - \alpha_n \psi_{N,\theta_n}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N}), \quad n \geq 0. \quad (31)$$

Here, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of positive real numbers, $N \geq 1$ is a fixed integer, and $\psi_{N,\theta}(\cdot) = \nabla_\theta \phi_{N,\theta}(\cdot)$.

Remark. Since \mathcal{X} is a finite set, $\psi_{N,\theta_n}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N})$ can be computed exactly. When \mathcal{X} has infinitely many elements, $\psi_{N,\theta_n}(Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N})$ can accurately be approximated using Monte Carlo methods (for the developments of this kind see [1]). To avoid unnecessary technical details, we consider only the case when \mathcal{X} is finite.

Remark. As (28), recursion (31) usually includes a projection (or truncation) scheme which keeps $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ within Θ (see [34]). For the sake of exposition, this aspect of (31) is not studied here. Instead, similarly as in [9] and [34], the asymptotic results are stated in a local form.

Algorithm (31) is analyzed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 6.1. $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic.

Assumption 6.2. $p_\theta(x'|x) > 0$ and $q_\theta(y|x) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Assumption 6.3. For each $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x)$, $\nabla_\theta q_\theta(y|x)$ and $\nabla_\theta \pi_\theta(x)$ are locally Lipschitz continuous in θ on Θ .

Assumption 6.4.a. For all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $p_\theta(x'|x)$ and $q_\theta(y|x)$ are p -times differentiable in θ on Θ , where $p > d_\theta$.

Assumption 6.4.b. For all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $p_\theta(x'|x)$ and $q_\theta(y|x)$ are real-analytic in θ on Θ .

Assumption 6.1 is related to the stability of the unknown system $\{(X_n, Y_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$, while Assumption 6.2 corresponds to the stability of the optimal filter associated with the candidate model $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$. In this or similar form, Assumptions 6.1 and 6.2 are involved in any asymptotic analysis of identification methods for hidden Markov models (see e.g. [16], [50] and references cited therein). Assumptions 6.3, 6.4.a and 6.4.b correspond to the parameterization of the candidate model $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ and often hold in practice. For some commonly used parameterizations (such as natural, trigonometric and exponential), $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ and $\pi_\theta(x)$ are not only Lipschitz continuously differentiable in θ , but also real-analytic (see [50] for further details).

Let \mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ have the same meaning as in (2) ($f(\cdot)$ is now defined in (30)), while \mathcal{R} is the set of chain-recurrent points of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ (for details on chain-recurrence, see Section 2). Moreover, for a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, let Λ_Q have the same meaning as in (8). Our results on the asymptotic behavior of algorithm (31) read as follows.

Theorem 6.1. Suppose that Assumptions 3.1 and 6.1 – 6.3 hold. Let $Q \subset \Theta$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:

- (i) There exists a (deterministic) non-decreasing function $\psi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_Q(t) = \psi_Q(0) = 0$ and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) \leq \psi_Q\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

(ii) If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1 and 6.1 – 6.3) Assumption 6.4.a is satisfied, there exists a real number $K_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \frac{K_Q}{N^{q/2}}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq \frac{K_Q}{N^q}$$

almost surely on Λ_Q , where $q = (p - d_\theta)/(p - 1)$.

(iii) If (in addition to Assumptions 3.1 and 6.1 – 6.3) Assumption 6.4.b is satisfied, there exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $L_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of N and depending only on $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \frac{L_Q}{N^{1/2}}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})) \leq \frac{L_Q}{N}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) \leq \frac{L_Q}{N^{r_Q}}$$

almost surely on Λ_Q .

Theorem 6.1 is proved in Section 12.

Remark. Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (30)) and its properties (see Remark 2.2 for details). Function $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ also depends on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ through the ergodicity properties of the optimal filter (see (88)). In addition to this, $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ depends on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through upper and lower bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ and Lipschitz constants of $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $\nabla_\theta q_\theta(y|x)$ (see (83) – (85)). Further details can be found in the proofs of Lemma 12.1 and Theorem 6.1 (Section 12).

Remark. As $\psi_Q(\cdot)$, constants K_Q and L_Q depend on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ through function $f(\cdot)$ (defined in (30)) and its properties (see Remark 2.3 for details). K_Q and L_Q also depend on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\pi_\theta(x)$, $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ through the ergodicity properties of the optimal filter. In addition to this, K_Q and L_Q depend on $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ through upper and lower bounds of $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$ and Lipschitz constants of $p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $q_\theta(y|x)$, $\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x, y)$, $\nabla_\theta q_\theta(y|x)$. For further details, see the proofs of Lemma 12.1 and Theorem 6.1 (Section 12).

The recursive maximum split-likelihood method (31) has been proposed and thoroughly analyzed in [45], [46]. Although the results of [46] provide a good insight into its asymptotic behavior, they do not offer any information about the asymptotic bias (i.e., bounds on quantities (14)). The main difficulty is the same as in the case of policy-gradient search: The recursive maximum split-likelihood (31) is so complex (even for moderately large N_x , N_y) that the existing results on the biased stochastic gradient search and the biased stochastic approximation [14, Section 5.3], [19], [20], [21, Section 2.7] cannot be applied. As opposed to the results of [46], under mild and easily verifiable conditions, Theorem 6.1 provides (relatively) tight upper bounds on the asymptotic bias of (31) in terms of N . It is worth mentioning that Theorem 6.1 can be extended to more general models and more sophisticated identification algorithms (such as those based on MCMC and SMC sampling; see [52]).

7. Proof of Part (i) of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we rely on the following notation. For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, let $V_\varepsilon(A)$ be the ε -vicinity of A , i.e., $V_\varepsilon(A) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : d(\theta, A) \leq \varepsilon\}$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$, let $F_\gamma(\theta)$ be the set defined by

$$F_\gamma(\theta) = \{-\nabla f(\theta) + \vartheta : \vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}, \|\vartheta\| \leq \gamma\}$$

(notice that $F_\gamma(\theta)$ is a set-valued function of θ). For $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$, let Φ_γ be the family of solutions to the differential inclusion $d\theta/dt \in F_\gamma(\theta)$, i.e., Φ_γ is the collection of absolutely continuous functions $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $d\varphi(t)/dt \in F_\gamma(\varphi(t))$ almost everywhere (in t) on $[0, \infty)$. For a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{H}_{Q, \gamma}$ be the largest invariant set of the differential inclusion $d\theta/dt \in F_\gamma(\theta)$ contained in Q , i.e., $\mathcal{H}_{Q, \gamma}$ is the largest set \mathcal{H} with the following property: For any $\theta \in \mathcal{H}$, there exists a solution $\varphi \in \Phi_\gamma$ such that $\varphi(0) = \theta$ and $\varphi(t) \in \mathcal{H}$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$. For a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{R}_{Q, \gamma}$ be

the set of chain-recurrent points of the differential inclusion $d\theta/dt \in F_\gamma(\theta)$ contained in Q , i.e., $\theta \in \mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma}$ if and only if for any $\delta, t \in (0, \infty)$, there exist an integer $N \geq 1$, real numbers $t_1, \dots, t_N \in [t, \infty)$ and solutions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N \in \Phi_\gamma$ (each of which can depend on θ, δ, t) such that $\varphi_k(0) \in \mathcal{H}_{Q,\gamma}$ for $1 \leq k \leq N$ and

$$\|\varphi_1(0) - \theta\| \leq \delta, \quad \|\varphi_N(t_N) - \theta\| \leq \delta, \quad \|\varphi_k(t_k) - \varphi_{k+1}(0)\| \leq \delta$$

for $1 \leq k < N$. For more details on differential inclusions and their solutions, invariant sets and chain-recurrent points, see [3] and references cited therein.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.3.a holds. Then, given a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a non-decreasing function $\phi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \phi_Q(\gamma) = \phi_Q(0) = 0$ and $\mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma} \subseteq V_{\phi_Q(\gamma)}(\mathcal{R})$ for all $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$.*

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Moreover, let $\phi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the function defined by $\phi_Q(0) = 0$ and

$$\phi_Q(\gamma) = \sup(\{d(\theta, \mathcal{R}) : \theta \in \mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma}\} \cup \{0\})$$

for $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$. Then, it is easy to show that $\phi_Q(\cdot)$ is well-defined and satisfies $\mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma} \subseteq V_{\phi_Q(\gamma)}(\mathcal{R})$ for all $\gamma \in [0, \infty)$. It is also easy to check that $F_\gamma(\theta) \subseteq F_\delta(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\gamma, \delta \in [0, \infty)$ satisfying $\gamma \leq \delta$. Consequently, $\Phi_\gamma \subseteq \Phi_\delta$, $\mathcal{H}_{Q,\gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{Q,\delta}$, $\mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma} \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{Q,\delta}$ for all $\gamma, \delta \in [0, \infty)$ satisfying $\gamma \leq \delta$. Thus, $\phi_Q(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing.⁵ Moreover, [8, Theorem 3.1] implies that given $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, there exists a real number $\gamma_Q(\varepsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma} \subseteq V_\varepsilon(\mathcal{R})$ for all $\gamma \in [0, \gamma_Q(\varepsilon))$. Therefore, $\phi_Q(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $\gamma \in [0, \gamma_Q(\varepsilon))$.⁶ Consequently, $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \phi_Q(\gamma) = \phi_Q(0) = 0$. \square

Proof of Part (i) of Theorem 2.1. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set and let $\psi_Q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the function defined by $\psi_Q(t) = \phi_Q(2t)$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$ ($\phi_Q(\cdot)$ is specified in the statement of Lemma 7.1). Then, due to Lemma 7.1, $\psi_Q(\cdot)$ is non-decreasing and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi_Q(t) = \psi_Q(0) = 0$. Moreover, owing to Assumption 2.2, there exists an event $N_Q \in \mathcal{F}$ such that the following holds: $P(N_Q) = 0$ and (4) is satisfied on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_Q$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let ω be an arbitrary sample in $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_Q$. To prove Part (i) of Theorem 2.1, it is sufficient to show (9) for ω . Notice that all formulas that follow in the proof correspond to ω .

If $\eta = 0$, then [6, Proposition 4.1, Theorem 5.7] imply that all limit points of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are included in \mathcal{R} . Hence, (9) holds when $\eta = 0$.

Now, suppose $\eta > 0$. Then, there exists $n_0 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that $\theta_n \in Q$, $\|\eta_n\| \leq 2\eta$ for $n \geq n_0$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n}{\alpha_n} + \zeta_n = -(\nabla f(\theta_n) + \eta_n) \in F_{2\eta}(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq n_0$. Consequently, [7, Proposition 1.3, Theorem 3.6] imply that all limit points of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are contained in $\mathcal{R}_{Q,2\eta}$. Combining this with Lemma 7.1, we conclude that the limit points of $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are included in $V_{\phi_Q(2\eta)}(\mathcal{R}) = V_{\psi_Q(\eta)}(\mathcal{R})$. Thus, (9) holds when $\eta > 0$. \square

8. Proof of Parts (ii), (iii) of Theorem 2.1

In this section, the following notation is used. ϕ is the random variable defined by

$$\phi = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|.$$

⁵Notice that $\{d(\theta, \mathcal{R}) : \theta \in \mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma}\} \subseteq \{d(\theta, \mathcal{R}) : \theta \in \mathcal{R}_{Q,\delta}\}$ whenever $\gamma \leq \delta$.

⁶Notice that $d(\theta, \mathcal{R}) \leq \varepsilon$ whenever $\theta \in \mathcal{R}_{Q,\gamma}$, $\gamma \in [0, \gamma_Q(\varepsilon))$.

For $t \in (0, \infty)$ and $n \geq 0$, $\phi_{1,n}(t), \phi_{2,n}(t), \phi_n(t)$ are the random quantities defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{1,n}(t) &= -(\nabla f(\theta_n))^T \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i (\nabla f(\theta_i) - \nabla f(\theta_n)), \\ \phi_{2,n}(t) &= \int_0^1 (\nabla f(\theta_n + s(\theta_{a(n,t)} - \theta_n)) - \nabla f(\theta_n))^T (\theta_{a(n,t)} - \theta_n) ds, \\ \phi_n(t) &= \phi_{1,n}(t) + \phi_{2,n}(t).\end{aligned}$$

Then, it is straightforward to demonstrate

$$\begin{aligned}f(\theta_{a(n,t)}) - f(\theta_n) &= -\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i - (\nabla f(\theta_n))^T \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i + \phi_n(t) \\ &\leq -\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,t)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) + |\phi_n(t)|\end{aligned}\quad (32)$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$, $n \geq 0$.

In this section, the following notation is also relied on. The Lebesgue measure is denoted by $m(\cdot)$. For a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$, $A_{Q,\varepsilon}$ is the set defined by

$$A_{Q,\varepsilon} = \{f(\theta) : \theta \in Q, \|\nabla f(\theta)\| \leq \varepsilon\}.\quad (33)$$

In order to treat Assumptions 2.3.b, 2.3.c in a unified way and to provide a unified proof of Parts (ii), (iii) of Theorem 2.1, we introduce the following assumption.

Assumption 8.1. *There exists a real number $s \in (0, 1]$ and for any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $M_Q \in [1, \infty)$ such that $m(A_{Q,\varepsilon}) \leq M_Q \varepsilon^s$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proposition 8.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.3.b holds. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, there exists a real number $M_Q \in [1, \infty)$ (depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that $m(A_{Q,\varepsilon}) \leq M_Q \varepsilon^q$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ (q is specified in the statement of Theorem 2.1).*

Proof. The proposition is a particular case of Yomdin theorem [53, Theorem 1.2]. \square

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose that Assumption 2.3.c holds. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *There exists a real number $M_Q \in [1, \infty)$ (depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that $m(A_{Q,\varepsilon}) \leq M_Q \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$.*
- (ii) *There exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $M_{1,Q}, M_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$d(\theta, \mathcal{S}) \leq M_{1,Q} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|^{r_Q}, \quad d(f(\theta), f(\mathcal{S})) \leq M_{2,Q} \|\nabla f(\theta)\| \quad (34)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$ (\mathcal{S} and $f(\mathcal{S})$ are specified in (2)).

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Owing to Lojasiewicz (ordinary) inequality (see [12, Theorem 6.4, Remark 6.5]), there exist real numbers $r_Q \in (0, 1)$, $M_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ such the first inequality in (34) holds for all $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$. On the other side, due to Lojasiewicz gradient inequality (see [32, Theorem LI, Page 775]), we have the following: For any $a \in f(Q) = \{f(\theta) : \theta \in Q\}$, there exist real numbers $\delta_{Q,a} \in (0, 1)$, $\nu_{Q,a} \in (1, 2]$, $N_{Q,a} \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$|f(\theta) - a| \leq N_{Q,a} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|^{\nu_{Q,a}} \quad (35)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$ satisfying $|f(\theta) - a| \leq \delta_{Q,a}$.

Now, we show by contradiction that $f(\mathcal{S} \cap Q) = \{f(\theta) : \theta \in \mathcal{S} \cap Q\}$ has finitely many elements. Suppose the opposite. Then, there exists a sequence $\{\vartheta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in $\mathcal{S} \cap Q$ such that $\{f(\vartheta_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ contains infinitely

many different elements. Since $\mathcal{S} \cap Q$ is compact, $\{\vartheta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{\tilde{\vartheta}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\{f(\tilde{\vartheta}_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ also contains infinitely many different elements. Let $\vartheta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\vartheta}_n$, $a = f(\vartheta)$. As $\delta_{Q,a} > 0$, there exists an integer $n_0 \geq 0$ such that $|f(\tilde{\vartheta}_n) - a| \leq \delta_{Q,a}$ for $n \geq n_0$. Since $\nabla f(\tilde{\vartheta}_n) = 0$ for $n \geq 0$, (35) implies $f(\tilde{\vartheta}_n) = a$ for $n \geq n_0$. However, this is impossible, since $\{f(\tilde{\vartheta}_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ has infinitely many different elements.

Let a_1, \dots, a_N be the elements of $f(\mathcal{S} \cap Q)$, while $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} N_{Q,a_i}$. For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let

$$B_{Q,i} = \{\theta \in Q : \|\nabla f(\theta)\| < 1, f(\theta) \in (a_i - \delta_{Q,a_i}, a_i + \delta_{Q,a_i})\},$$

while $B_Q = \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_{Q,i}$, $\varepsilon_Q = \inf\{\|\nabla f(\theta)\| : \theta \in Q \setminus B_Q\}$. As B_Q is open and $\mathcal{S} \cap Q \subset B_Q$, we have $\varepsilon_Q > 0$.

Let $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $|f(\cdot)|$ on Q , while $M_{2,Q} = 2 \max\{\tilde{C}_{1,Q}, \tilde{C}_{2,Q}/\varepsilon_Q\}$. Then, if $\theta \in B_Q$, we have

$$d(f(\theta), f(\mathcal{S})) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} |f(\theta) - a_i| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} N_{Q,a_i} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|^{\nu_{Q,a_i}} \leq M_{2,Q} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|$$

(notice that $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| < 1$, $\nu_{Q,a_i} > 1$). On the other side, if $\theta \in Q \setminus B_Q$, we get

$$d(f(\theta), f(\mathcal{S})) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} |f(\theta) - a_i| \leq 2\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \leq 2\tilde{C}_{2,Q}\varepsilon_Q^{-1} \|\nabla f(\theta)\| \leq M_{2,Q} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|$$

(notice that $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| \geq \varepsilon_Q$). Hence, the second inequality in (34) holds for all $\theta \in Q$.

Let $M_Q = 2M_{2,Q}N$. Owing to the second inequality in (34), we have

$$A_{Q,\varepsilon} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^N [f(a_i) - M_{2,Q}\varepsilon, f(a_i) + M_{2,Q}\varepsilon]$$

for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Consequently, $m(A_{Q,\varepsilon}) \leq 2M_{2,Q}N\varepsilon = M_Q\varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. \square

Lemma 8.1. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Then, there exists an event $N_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $P(N_0) = 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k < a(n,t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \eta t, \quad (36)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f(\theta_{n+1}) - f(\theta_n)| = 0 \quad (37)$$

on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\} \setminus N_0$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, given a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $C_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n,t)} |f(\theta_k) - f(\theta_n)| \leq C_{1,Q} t(\phi + \eta), \quad (38)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_n(t)| \leq C_{1,Q} t^2(\phi + \eta)^2 \quad (39)$$

on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. In the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7.1, it can be shown that there exists $N_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that the following holds: (i) $P(N_0) = 0$, and (ii) (4), (36) are satisfied on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\} \setminus N_0^c$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set, while $\tilde{C}_Q \in [1, \infty)$ stands for a Lipschitz constant of $f(\cdot)$, $\nabla f(\cdot)$ on Q . Moreover, let $C_{1,Q} = 2\tilde{C}_Q$, while ω is an arbitrary sample from $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$. In order to prove the lemma, it is sufficient to show that (37) – (39) hold for ω and any $t \in (0, \infty)$. Notice that all formulas which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ be any real number. Then, there exists $n_0 \geq 0$ (depending on ω , ε) such that $\theta_n \in Q$, $\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \phi + \varepsilon$ for $n \geq n_0$ (notice that these relations hold for all but finitely many n). Therefore,

$$\|\theta_k - \theta_n\| \leq \sum_{i=n}^{k-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{k-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq t(\phi + \varepsilon) + \max_{n \leq j < a(n,t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \xi_i \right\|$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq k \leq a(n, t)$, $t \in (0, \infty)$. Combining this with (36), we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} \|\theta_k - \theta_n\| \leq t(\phi + \eta + \varepsilon)$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then, the limit process $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} \|\theta_k - \theta_n\| \leq t(\phi + \eta)$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$ (notice that $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ is any real number). As

$$|f(\theta_k) - f(\theta_n)| \leq \tilde{C}_Q \|\theta_k - \theta_n\|$$

for $k \geq n \geq n_0$ (notice that $\theta_n \in Q$ for $n \geq n_0$), we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} |f(\theta_k) - f(\theta_n)| \leq \tilde{C}_Q t(\phi + \eta) \leq C_{1, Q} t(\phi + \eta)$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Since

$$|f(\theta_{n+1}) - f(\theta_n)| \leq \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} |f(\theta_k) - f(\theta_n)|$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$ and sufficiently large n (notice that $a(n, t) \geq n + 1$ for sufficiently large n), we conclude

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f(\theta_{n+1}) - f(\theta_n)| \leq \tilde{C}_Q t(\phi + \eta)$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then, the limit process $t \rightarrow 0$ implies (37). On the other side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{1, n}(t)| &\leq \tilde{C}_Q \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n, t)-1} \alpha_i \|\theta_i - \theta_n\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q t \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} \|\theta_k - \theta_n\|, \\ |\phi_{2, n}(t)| &\leq \tilde{C}_Q \|\theta_{a(n, t)} - \theta_n\|^2 \leq \tilde{C}_Q \max_{n \leq k \leq a(n, t)} \|\theta_k - \theta_n\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$, $t \in (0, \infty)$. Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{1, n}(t)| \leq \tilde{C}_Q t^2 \phi(\phi + \eta), \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{2, n}(t)| \leq \tilde{C}_Q t^2 (\phi + \eta)^2$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Hence,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_n(t)| \leq 2\tilde{C}_Q t^2 (\phi + \eta)^2 = C_{1, Q} t^2 (\phi + \eta)^2$$

for $t \in (0, \infty)$. □

Lemma 8.2. *Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 8.1 hold. Then, given a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $C_{2, Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq C_{2, Q} \eta^s \quad (40)$$

on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$ (s is specified in Assumption 8.1).

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set, while \tilde{C}_Q stands for an upper bound of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ on Q . Moreover, let $C_{2, Q} = 4M_Q$. In order to avoid considering separately the cases $\eta = 0$ and $\eta > 0$, we show

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq C_{2, Q} (\varepsilon + \eta)^s \quad (41)$$

on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Then, (40) follows directly from (41) by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Inequality (41) is proved by contradiction: Suppose that there exist a sample $\omega \in \Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$ and a real number $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ such that (41) does not hold for them. Notice that all formulas which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

Let $\gamma = 2(\varepsilon + \eta)$, $\delta = M_Q \gamma^s$, while

$$\mu = \delta / (C_{1,Q}(\tilde{C}_Q + \eta)), \quad \nu = \gamma^2 / (4C_{1,Q}(\tilde{C}_Q + \eta)^2), \quad \tau = \min\{\mu, \nu/2\}.$$

Since $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded and (41) is not satisfied, there exist real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ (depending on ω, ε) such that $b - a > 2\delta$ and such that inequalities $f(\theta_n) < a$, $f(\theta_k) > b$ hold for infinitely many $n, k \geq 0$ (notice that $C_{2,Q}(\varepsilon + \eta)^s \geq 2\delta$). As $m(A_{Q,\gamma}) \leq M_Q \gamma^s = \delta$, there exists a real number c such that $c \notin A_{Q,\gamma}$ and $a < c < b - \delta$ (otherwise, $(a, b - \delta) \subset A_{Q,\varepsilon}$, which is impossible as $(b - \delta) - a > \delta$).

Let $n_0 = 0$, while

$$l_k = \min\{n \geq n_{k-1} : f(\theta_n) \leq c\}, \quad n_k = \min\{n \geq l_k : f(\theta_n) \geq b\}, \quad m_k = \max\{n \leq n_k : f(\theta_n) \leq c\}$$

for $k \geq 1$. It can easily be deduced that sequences $\{l_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, $\{m_k\}_{k \geq 1}$, $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ are well-defined and satisfy $l_k < m_k < n_k < l_{k+1}$ and

$$f(\theta_{m_k}) \leq c < f(\theta_{m_k+1}), \quad f(\theta_{n_k}) - f(\theta_{m_k}) \geq b - c, \quad \min_{m_k < n \leq n_k} f(\theta_n) > c \quad (42)$$

for $k \geq 1$. On the other side, Lemma 8.1 implies

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |f(\theta_{m_k+1}) - f(\theta_{m_k})| = 0, \quad (43)$$

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m_k \leq j \leq a(m_k, \tau)} |f(\theta_j) - f(\theta_{m_k})| \leq C_{1,Q} \tau (\tilde{C}_Q + \eta) \leq \delta < b - c \quad (44)$$

(to get (44), notice that $\theta_n \in Q$ for all but finitely many n and that $\phi \leq \tilde{C}_Q$). Owing to (44) and the second inequality in (42), there exists $k_0 \geq 1$ such that $a(m_k, \tau) \leq n_k$ for $k \geq k_0$.⁷ Then, the last inequality in (42) implies $f(\theta_{a(m_k, \tau)}) \geq c$ for $k \geq k_0$, while $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_{m_k}) = c$ follows from (43) and the first inequality in (42). Since $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| > \gamma$ for any $\theta \in Q$ satisfying $f(\theta) = c$ (due to the way c is selected), we have $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \geq \gamma$. Consequently, Lemma 8.1 and (6) yield

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) \geq \tau(\gamma - \eta) \geq \tau\gamma/2 > 0$$

(notice that $\eta < \gamma/2$). Therefore,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) \geq \tau\gamma^2/2.$$

Combining this with Lemma 8.1 and (32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (f(\theta_{a(m_k, \tau)}) - f(\theta_{m_k})) &\leq - \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_{m_k})\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{a(m_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) \\ &\quad + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{m_k}(\tau)| \\ &\leq -\tau\gamma^2/2 + C_{1,Q} \tau^2 (\phi + \eta)^2 < 0 \end{aligned}$$

(notice that $\phi \leq \tilde{C}_Q$, $C_{1,Q} \tau (\tilde{C}_Q + \eta)^2 \leq \gamma^2/4$). However, this is not possible, as $f(\theta_{a(m_k, \tau)}) \geq c \geq f(\theta_{m_k})$ for each $k \geq k_0$. Hence, (41) is true. \square

⁷If $a(m_k, \tau) > n_k$ for infinitely many k , then (44) yields

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (f(\theta_{n_k}) - f(\theta_{m_k})) \leq \delta < b - c.$$

However, this contradicts the second inequality in (42).

Lemma 8.3. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Then, given a compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $C_{3,Q} \in (0, 1)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \geq C_{3,Q} \phi^2 \quad (45)$$

on $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi > 2\eta\}$.

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set, while $C_{3,Q} = 1/(64C_{1,Q})$ and $\tau = 1/(16C_{1,Q})$. Moreover, let ω be an arbitrary sample from $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi > 2\eta\}$. In order to prove the lemma's assertion, it is sufficient to show that (45) holds for ω . Notice that all formulas which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

Let $n_0 = 0$ and

$$n_k = \min\{n > n_{k-1} : \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \geq \phi - 1/k\}$$

for $k \geq 1$. Obviously, sequence $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is well-defined and satisfies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{n_k})\| = \phi$. Then, Lemma 8.1 and (6) yield

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{n_k})\| \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_{n_k})\| \sum_{i=n_k}^{a(n_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=n_k}^{a(n_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) \geq \tau \phi (\phi - \eta) \geq \tau \phi^2 / 2 > 0.$$

Combining this with Lemma 8.1 and (32), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (f(\theta_{a(n_k, \tau)}) - f(\theta_{n_k})) &\leq - \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_{n_k})\| \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_{n_k})\| \sum_{i=n_k}^{a(n_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=n_k}^{a(n_k, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \right) \\ &\quad + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\phi_{n_k}(\tau)| \\ &\leq -\tau \phi^2 / 2 + C_{1,Q} \tau^2 (\phi + \eta)^2 \leq -C_{3,Q} \phi^2 \end{aligned}$$

(notice that $\eta < \phi$). Consequently,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \geq - \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (f(\theta_{a(n_k, \tau)}) - f(\theta_{n_k})) \geq C_{3,Q} \phi^2.$$

Hence, (45) is true. \square

Proposition 8.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 8.1 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, there exists a real number $K_Q \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq K_Q \eta^s \quad (46)$$

on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$.

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set, while $\tilde{C}_Q \in [1, \infty)$ stands for an upper bound of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ on Q . Moreover, let $K_Q = \max\{2, \tilde{C}_Q, C_{2,Q}\}$. Obviously, it is sufficient to show $\phi \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}$ on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$ (notice that the second inequality in (46) is a direct consequence of Lemma 8.2).

Owing to Lemmas 8.2, 8.3, we have $C_{3,Q} \phi^2 \leq C_{2,Q} \eta^s$ on $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi > 2\eta\}$. Therefore, $\phi \leq (C_{2,Q}/C_{3,Q})^{1/2} \eta^{s/2} \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}$ on $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi > 2\eta\}$. On the other side, $\phi \leq 2\eta \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}$ on $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi \leq 2\eta, \eta \leq 1\}$ (notice that $s/2 < 1$), while $\phi \leq \tilde{C}_Q \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}$ on $(\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0) \cap \{\phi \leq 2\eta, \eta > 1\}$. Thus, $\phi \leq K_Q \eta^{s/2}$ indeed holds on $\Lambda_Q \setminus N_0$. \square

Proof of Parts (ii), (iii) of Theorem 2.1. Part (ii) of the theorem directly follows from Propositions 8.1, 8.3, while Part (iii) is a direct consequence of Propositions 8.2, 8.3 \square

9. Proof of Theorem 3.1

The following notation is used in this section. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $E_{\theta,z}(\cdot)$ denotes the conditional expectation given $\theta_0 = \theta$, $Z_0 = z$. For $n \geq 1$, ζ_n , ξ_n are the random variables defined by

$$\zeta_n = F(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) - \nabla f(\theta_n), \quad \xi_n = \zeta_n + \eta_n, \quad (47)$$

while $\zeta_{1,n}$, $\zeta_{2,n}$, $\zeta_{3,n}$ are random variables defined as

$$\zeta_{1,n} = \tilde{F}(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) - (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta_n, Z_n), \quad \zeta_{2,n} = (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta_n, Z_n) - (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta_{n-1}, Z_n), \quad \zeta_{3,n} = -(\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}).$$

Then, it is straightforward to verify that algorithm (15) admits the form (1). Moreover, using Assumption 3.2, it is easy to show

$$\sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \zeta_i = \sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} + \sum_{i=n}^k \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} + \sum_{i=n}^k (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} + \alpha_{k+1} \zeta_{3,k} - \alpha_n \zeta_{3,n-1} \quad (48)$$

for $1 \leq n \leq k$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set and $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$ be the event defined by $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \{\theta_n \in Q\}$. Then, owing to Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3, we have

$$E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \right) < \infty, \quad E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}| \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \right) < \infty \quad (49)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\theta_0, Z_0, \dots, \theta_n, Z_n\}$ for $n \geq 0$. Since $\{\tau_Q > n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ for $n \geq 0$, Assumption 3.2 implies

$$E_{\theta,z} (\zeta_{1,n} I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} | \mathcal{F}_n) = \left(E_{\theta,z} (\tilde{F}(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n) - (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta_n, Z_n) \right) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} = 0$$

almost surely for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $n \geq 0$. Assumption 3.3 also yields

$$\|\zeta_{1,n}\| I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \leq \varphi_Q(Z_n) I_{\{\tau_Q > n-1\}} + \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}$$

for $n \geq 0$. Combining this with (49), we get

$$E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 \|\zeta_{1,n}\|^2 I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \right) \leq 2E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. Then, using Doob theorem, we conclude that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n} I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}$ converges almost surely. As $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q \subseteq \{\tau_Q > n\}$ for $n \geq 0$, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n}$ converges almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$.⁸

Due to Assumption 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_{2,n}\| I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} &\leq \varphi_Q(Z_n) \|\theta_n - \theta_{n-1}\| I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \\ &\leq \alpha_{n-1} \varphi_Q(Z_n) (\|F(\theta_{n-1}, Z_n)\| + \|\eta_{n-1}\|) I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \\ &\leq \alpha_{n-1} \varphi_Q(Z_n) (\varphi_Q(Z_n) + \|\eta_{n-1}\|) I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \\ &\leq 2\alpha_{n-1} (\varphi_Q^2(Z_n) + \|\eta_{n-1}\|^2) I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq 1$ (notice that $\varphi_Q(z) \geq 1$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^j \alpha_n \|\zeta_{2,n}\| I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} &\leq 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} (\varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) + \|\eta_{n+1}\|^2) I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} + \sup_{n \geq 0} \|\eta_n\|^2 I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \end{aligned}$$

⁸Notice that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n} I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n}$ on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$.

(notice that $2\alpha_n\alpha_{n+1} \leq \alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2$). Then, Assumption 3.4 and (49) imply that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{2,n}$ converges almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$.

Owing to Assumption 3.3, we have

$$\|\zeta_{3,n}\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \leq \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1})I_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} \leq \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1})I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}$$

for $n \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1}^2 \|\zeta_{3,n}\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q}^2 &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1}^2 \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1})I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}, \\ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}| \|\zeta_{3,n}\|_{\tilde{\Lambda}_Q} &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}| \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1})I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (49), we conclude $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{n+1} \zeta_{3,n} = 0$ almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$. We also deduce that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}) \zeta_{3,n}$ converges almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$. Since $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n}$, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{2,n}$ converge almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$, (48) implies that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_n$ also converges almost surely on $\tilde{\Lambda}_Q$. As Q is any compact set in \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_n$ converges almost surely on $\{\sup_{n \geq 0} \|\theta_n\| < \infty\}$. Consequently, Assumption 3.4 yields that $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ defined in (47) satisfies Assumption 2.2. Then, the theorem's assertion directly follows from Theorem 2.1. \square

10. Proof of Theorem 4.1

In this section, we use the following notation. $\phi(v)$, $s_\theta(v)$ are the functions defined by

$$\phi(v) = \phi(x, y), \quad s_\theta(v) = s_\theta(x, y)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{W_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ are stochastic processes defined by

$$V_n^\theta = (X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta), \quad W_{n+1}^\theta = \lambda W_n^\theta + s_\theta(V_n^\theta), \quad Z_n^\theta = (V_n^\theta, W_n^\theta)$$

for $n \geq 0$, where $W_0^\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is a (deterministic) vector (notice that $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ are Markov chains). Moreover, for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $r_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ and $\nu_\theta(\cdot)$ are the transition kernel and invariant probability of $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$,⁹ while $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the transition kernel of $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$.¹⁰ For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $n \geq 0$, $r_\theta^n(\cdot|\cdot)$ is the n -th transition probability of $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$, while

$$\tilde{r}_\theta^n(v'|v) = r_\theta^n(v'|v) - \nu_\theta(v')$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 0$. Additionally, the functions $\eta(\cdot)$, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ are defined by

$$\eta(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v, v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \lambda^n \phi(v') \tilde{r}_\theta^n(v'|v) s_\theta(v) \nu_\theta(v) - \nabla f(\theta), \quad F(\theta, z) = \phi(v)w - \eta(\theta)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$.¹¹ $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are the stochastic processes defined as

$$Z_n = (X_n, Y_n, W_n), \quad \eta_n = \eta(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq 0$. Then, it is straightforward to show that the algorithm (20) is of the same form as the recursion studied in Section 3 (i.e., $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined in Section 4 and here admit (15), (16)).

⁹Under Assumption 4.1, $\nu_\theta(\cdot)$ exists and is unique (the details are provided in Lemma 10.1). The transition $r_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$ can be defined by $r_\theta(v'|v) = q_\theta(y'|x')p(x'|x, y)$ for $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $v' = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

¹⁰ $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ can be defined by $\Pi_\theta(z, \{v'\} \times B) = I_B(\lambda w + s_\theta(v'))r_\theta(v'|v)$ for $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and a Borel-measurable set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$.

¹¹Under Assumptions 4.1, 4.2, $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable (the details are provided in Lemma 10.2).

We will use the following additional notation. N_v is the integer defined by $N_v = N_x N_y$, while $e \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v}$ is the vector whose all components are one. For $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $e(v) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v}$ is the vector representation of $I_v(\cdot)$, while $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v}$ is the vector representation of $\phi(\cdot)$.¹² For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $R_\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v \times N_v}$ and $\nu_\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v}$ are the transition matrix and the invariant probability vector of $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$,¹³ while $\tilde{R}_\theta = R_\theta - e\nu_\theta^T$. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $s_{\theta,j}(\cdot)$ is the j -th component of $s_\theta(\cdot)$, while $S_{\theta,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v \times N_v}$ is the diagonal matrix representation of $s_{\theta,j}(\cdot)$.¹⁴

Lemma 10.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Moreover, there exist real numbers $\varepsilon_Q \in (0, 1)$, $C_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of λ) such that $\|\tilde{R}_\theta^n\| \leq C_{1,Q} \varepsilon_Q^n$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$.
- (ii) There exists a real number $C_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of λ) such that

$$\max\{\|\nu_{\theta'} - \nu_{\theta''}\|, \|R_{\theta'}^n - R_{\theta''}^n\|\} \leq C_{2,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\|, \quad (50)$$

$$\|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^n - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^n\| \leq C_{2,Q} \varepsilon_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| \quad (51)$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $n \geq 0$.

- (iii) ν_θ is differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} . Moreover, $\nabla_\theta \nu_\theta$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .
- (iv) If Assumption 4.3.a is satisfied, ν_θ is p times differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .
- (v) If Assumption 4.3.b is satisfied, ν_θ is real-analytic on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Proof. (i) For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $n \geq 0$, let $p_\theta^n(\cdot|\cdot)$ and $\mu_\theta(\cdot)$ be the n -th transition probability and the invariant probability of $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$. Moreover, for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, let $\tilde{\nu}_\theta(v) = q_\theta(y|x)\mu_\theta(x)$. Then, it is straightforward to verify

$$r_\theta^{n+1}(v'|v) - \tilde{\nu}_\theta(v') = \sum_{x'' \in \mathcal{X}} q_\theta(y'|x')(p_\theta^n(x'|x'') - \mu_\theta(x'))p(x''|x, y)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $v' = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$|r_\theta^{n+1}(v'|v) - \tilde{\nu}_\theta(v')| \leq \sum_{x'' \in \mathcal{X}} q_\theta(y'|x')|p_\theta^n(x'|x'') - \mu_\theta(x')|p(x''|x, y) \leq N_x \max_{x'' \in \mathcal{X}} |p_\theta^n(x'|x'') - \mu_\theta(x')|$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $v' = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 0$. Combining this with Assumption 4.1, we conclude that $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. We also conclude that $\tilde{\nu}_\theta(\cdot)$ is the invariant probability of $\{V_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, i.e., $\nu_\theta(v) = \tilde{\nu}_\theta(v) = q_\theta(y|x)\mu_\theta(x)$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.

For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, let $\rho_\theta = \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \nu_\theta(v)/3$. Then, we have $0 < \rho_\theta \leq 1/(3N_v)$, $\rho_\theta \leq \nu_\theta(v)/3$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Moreover, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists an integer $n_\theta \geq 0$ such that $|r_\theta^n(v'|v) - \nu_\theta(v')| \leq \rho_\theta$ for each $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq n_\theta$. Hence, $r_\theta^n(v'|v) \geq \nu_\theta(v') - \rho_\theta \geq 2\rho_\theta$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq n_\theta$. Additionally, Assumption 4.2 implies that for each $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq 0$, $r_\theta^n(v'|v)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .¹⁵ Consequently, for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $\delta_\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that $|r_\theta^{n_\theta}(v'|v) - r_\theta^{n_\theta}(v'|v)| \leq \rho_\theta$ for all $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfying $\|\vartheta - \theta\| \leq \delta_\theta$. Thus, $r_\vartheta^{n_\theta}(v'|v) \geq r_\theta^{n_\theta}(v'|v) - \rho_\theta \geq \rho_\theta$ for each $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfying $\|\vartheta - \theta\| \leq \delta_\theta$. Since

$$r_\vartheta^n(v'|v) = \sum_{v'' \in \mathcal{V}} r_\vartheta^{n_\theta}(v'|v'')r_\vartheta^{n-n_\theta}(v''|v) \geq \rho_\theta \sum_{v'' \in \mathcal{V}} r_\vartheta^{n-n_\theta}(v''|v) = \rho_\theta$$

for any $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq n_\theta$ satisfying $\|\vartheta - \theta\| \leq \delta_\theta$, we conclude $r_\vartheta^n(v'|v) \geq \rho_\theta$ for the same ϑ, v, v', n .

Let $B_\theta = \{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : \|\vartheta - \theta\| < \delta_\theta\}$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. As $\{B_\theta\}_{\theta \in Q}$ is an open covering of Q , there exists a finite set $\tilde{Q} \subseteq Q$ such that $\bigcup_{\theta \in \tilde{Q}} B_\theta \supset Q$. Let $\tilde{n}_Q = \max_{\theta \in \tilde{Q}} n_\theta$, $\tilde{\rho}_Q = \min_{\theta \in \tilde{Q}} \rho_\theta$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}_Q = (1 - \tilde{\rho}_Q)^{1/\tilde{n}_Q}$. Since each

¹² For $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, element i of $e(v)$ is one if $i = (x-1)N_y + y$ and zero otherwise. For the same v , $\phi(v)$ is element $(x-1)N_y + y$ of ϕ .

¹³ For $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $v' = (x', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $r_\theta(v'|v)$ is entry $((x-1)N_y + y, (x'-1)N_y + y')$ of R_θ , while $\nu_\theta(v)$ is element $(x-1)N_y + y$ of ν_θ .

¹⁴ For $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $s_{\theta,j}(v)$ is entry $((x-1)N_y + y, (x-1)N_y + y)$ of $S_{\theta,j}$. The off-diagonal elements of $S_{\theta,j}$ are zero.

¹⁵ Notice that, due to Assumption 4.2, $q_\theta(y|x)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and that $r_\theta^n(\cdot|\cdot)$ is a polynomial function of $p(\cdot|\cdot, \cdot)$, $q_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$.

element of Q is also an element of one of $\{B_\theta\}_{\theta \in \tilde{Q}}$, we have $r_\theta^n(v'|v) \geq \tilde{\rho}_Q$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq \tilde{n}_Q$.¹⁶ Then, standard results of Markov chain theory (see e.g., [38, Theorem 16.0.2]) imply

$$|r_\theta^n(v'|v) - \nu_\theta(v')| \leq (1 - \tilde{\rho}_Q N_v)^{n/\tilde{n}_Q} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_Q^n$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}$, $n \geq 0$.

Let $\varepsilon_Q = \tilde{\varepsilon}_Q^{1/2}$, $C_{1,Q} = N_v$. Then, we have

$$\|\tilde{R}_\theta^n\| \leq N_v \max_{v, v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} |\tilde{r}_\theta^n(v'|v)| \leq N_v \tilde{\varepsilon}_Q^n = C_{1,Q} \varepsilon_Q^{2n} \quad (52)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$.

(ii) Let g be the N_v -th standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^{N_v} (i.e., the first $N_v - 1$ elements of g are zero, while the last element of g is one) and, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v \times N_v}$, let $G(A)$ be the $N_v \times N_v$ matrix obtained when the last row of $I - A^T$ is replaced by e^T (here, I is the $N_v \times N_v$ unit matrix). Additionally, let $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v} = \{A \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v \times N_v} : \det(G(A)) \neq 0\}$ and, for $A \in \mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$, let $h(A) = (G(A))^{-1}g$. Then, it is easy to conclude that $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ is an open set (notice that $\det(G(A))$ is a polynomial function of the entries of A). It is also easy to deduce that $h(\cdot)$ is well-defined and real-analytic on $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ (notice that due to the Cramer's rule, all elements of $h(A)$ are rational functions of the entries of A).

Let $\mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ be the set of $N_v \times N_v$ geometrically ergodic stochastic matrices. Then, each $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ has a unique invariant probability vector. Moreover, the invariant probability vector of $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ is the unique solution to the linear system of equations $G(P)x = g$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^{N_v}$ is the unknown. Hence, $\det(G(P)) \neq 0$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ so $\mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v} \subset \mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$.

Owing to (i), $R_\theta \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Thus, $\nu_\theta = h(R_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Moreover, due to Assumption 4.2, R_θ is locally Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .¹⁷ Since $h(\cdot)$ is real-analytic on $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ and $\mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v} \subset \mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$, ν_θ is locally Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

Let $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be a Lipschitz constant of R_θ , ν_θ on Q , while $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ is an upper bound of the sequence $\{n\varepsilon_Q^n\}_{n \geq 1}$. Let $C_{2,Q} = 3\varepsilon_Q^{-1}C_{1,Q}^2\tilde{C}_{1,Q}\tilde{C}_{2,Q}$. It is straightforward to verify

$$\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^{n+1} - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^n \tilde{R}_{\theta'}^i (R_{\theta'} - R_{\theta''} - e(\nu_{\theta'} - \nu_{\theta''})^T) \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^{n-i}$$

for $\theta', \theta'' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $n \geq 0$. Combining this with (52), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^{n+1} - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^{n+1}\| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^i\| \|\tilde{R}_{\theta''}^{n-i}\| (\|R_{\theta'} - R_{\theta''}\| + \|\nu_{\theta'} - \nu_{\theta''}\|) \\ &\leq 2C_{1,Q}^2 \tilde{C}_{1,Q} (n+1) \varepsilon_Q^{2n} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \\ &\leq C_{2,Q} \varepsilon_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for each $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\|R_{\theta'}^n - R_{\theta''}^n\| \leq \|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^n - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^n\| + \|\nu_{\theta'} - \nu_{\theta''}\| \leq \tilde{C}_{1,Q} (2C_{1,Q}^2 \tilde{C}_{2,Q} n \varepsilon_Q^{n-1} + 1) \|\theta' - \theta''\| \leq C_{2,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $n \geq 0$ (notice that $\tilde{R}_\theta^k = R_\theta^k - e\nu_\theta^T$).

(iii) Due to (i), $R_\theta \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Hence, $\nu_\theta = h(R_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Moreover, owing to Assumption 4.2, R_θ is differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} and its first-order derivatives are locally Lipschitz continuous on the same space.¹⁸ As $h(\cdot)$ is real-analytic on $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$ and $\mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v} \subset \mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$, ν_θ is differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} . The same arguments also imply that $\nabla_\theta \nu_\theta$ is locally Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} .

(iv), (v) If Assumption 4.3.a is satisfied, then R_θ is p times differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , and consequently, ν_θ is p times differentiable on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , too.¹⁹ Similarly, if Assumption 4.3.b is satisfied, then R_θ is real-analytic on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} , and therefore, ν_θ is also real-analytic on \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} . \square

¹⁶If $\theta \in B_\theta$ and $\vartheta \in \tilde{Q}$, then $n_\vartheta \leq \tilde{n}_Q$ and $r_\theta^n(v'|v) \geq \rho_\vartheta \geq \tilde{\rho}_Q$ for $n \geq n_\vartheta$.

¹⁷ Notice that $r_\theta(v'|v) = q_\theta(y'|x)p(x'|x, y)$ for $v = (x, y)$, $v' = (x', y')$ and that $q_\theta(y|x)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ .

¹⁸Notice that $\nabla_\theta r_\theta(v'|v) = s_\theta(x', y')q_\theta(y'|x')p(x'|x, y)$ for $v = (x, y)$, $v' = (x', y')$.

¹⁹Notice that $R_\theta \in \mathcal{P}_0^{N_v \times N_v} \subset \mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$, $\nu_\theta = h(R_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Notice also that $h(\cdot)$ is real-analytic on $\mathcal{Q}_0^{N_v \times N_v}$.

Lemma 10.2. Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:

- (i) $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.
- (ii) There exists a real number $C_{3,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of λ) such that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq C_{3,Q}(1 - \lambda)$ for all $\theta \in Q$.
- (iii) If Assumption 4.3.a is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is p times differentiable.
- (iv) If Assumption 4.3.b is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is real-analytic.

Proof. (i), (iii), (iv) Owing to Lemma 10.1, we have

$$f(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_\theta(\phi(V_n^\theta)) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v) \nu_\theta(v) = \phi^T \nu_\theta \quad (53)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Then, these parts of the lemma directly follow from Lemma 10.1.

(ii) For each $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, let $\tilde{C}_Q \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $\|S_{\theta,j}\|$ on Q . For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 0$, let also define

$$f_n(\theta, v) = \sum_{v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v') r_\theta^n(v'|v), \quad h(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{v, v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v') \tilde{r}_\theta^n(v'|v) s_\theta(v) \nu_\theta(v). \quad (54)$$

Owing to Lemma 10.1, $f_n(\theta, v)$ converges to $f(\theta)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in (θ, v) on $Q \times (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$. Due to the same lemma, $h(\cdot)$ is well-defined on Q (notice that when $\theta \in Q$, each term in the sum in (54) tends to zero at the rate ε_Q^n). Moreover, it is straightforward to show

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_\theta f_n(\theta, v_0) &= \nabla_\theta \left(\sum_{v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v_n) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n r_\theta(v_i|v_{i-1}) \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v_n) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\nabla_\theta r_\theta(v_i|v_{i-1})}{r_\theta(v_i|v_{i-1})} \right) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n r_\theta(v_i|v_{i-1}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{v', v'' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v'') r_\theta^{n-i}(v''|v') s_\theta(v') r_\theta^i(v'|v_0) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v_0 \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $n \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\partial_\theta^j f_n(\theta, v) = \sum_{i=1}^n e^T(v) R_\theta^i S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^{n-i} \phi = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i \phi \quad (56)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$, where $\partial_\theta^j f_n(\theta, v)$ is the j -th component of $\nabla_\theta f_n(\theta, v)$. We also have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i e = 0 \quad (57)$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$.²⁰ Hence,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} e \nu_\theta^T \phi = \nu_\theta^T \phi \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i e = 0$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$ (notice that $R_\theta^i e = e$). Therefore,

$$\partial_\theta^j f_n(\theta, v) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi$$

²⁰ If $\phi = e$, then $f_n(\theta, v)$ is identically one, while $\nabla_\theta f_n(\theta, v)$ is identically zero. Hence, (56) reduces to (57) when $\phi = e$.

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Additionally, we have

$$h_j(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^n \phi = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) e \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi + \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$ (notice that $e^T(v)e = 1$), where $h_j(\theta)$ is the j -th component of $h(\theta)$. Thus,

$$\partial_\theta^j f_n(\theta, v) - h_j(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e^T(v) \tilde{R}_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi - \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Then, Lemma 10.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta^j f_n(\theta, v) - h_j(\theta)| &\leq \|\phi\| \|e(v)\| \|S_{\theta,j}\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|\tilde{R}_\theta^i\| \|\tilde{R}_\theta^{n-i}\| + \|\phi\| \|\nu_\theta\| \|S_{\theta,j}\| \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \|\tilde{R}_\theta^i\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_Q C_{1,Q}^2 \|\phi\| n \varepsilon_Q^n + \frac{\tilde{C}_Q C_{1,Q} \|\phi\| \varepsilon_Q^n}{1 - \varepsilon_Q} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Hence, $\nabla_\theta f_n(\theta, v)$ converges to $h(\theta)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in (θ, v) on $Q \times (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$. Therefore, $\nabla f(\theta) = h(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ (notice that Q is any compact set). Consequently,

$$\eta_j(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^n \phi - h_j(\theta) = - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda^n) \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^n \phi$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, where $\eta_j(\theta)$ is the j -th component of $\eta(\theta)$. Combining this with Lemma 10.1, we get

$$|\eta_j(\theta)| \leq \|\phi\| \|\nu_\theta\| \|S_{\theta,j}\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda^n) \|\tilde{R}_\theta^n\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q C_{1,Q} \|\phi\| \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda^n) \varepsilon_Q^n \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_Q C_{1,Q} \|\phi\| (1 - \lambda)}{(1 - \varepsilon_Q)^2}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$. Then, we conclude that there exists a real number $C_{3,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ with the properties specified in (ii). \square

Lemma 10.3. *Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 hold. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

(i) *There exist real numbers $\delta_Q \in (0, 1)$, $C_{4,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (possibly depending on λ) such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Pi^n F)(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta)\| &\leq C_{4,Q} n \delta_Q^n (1 + \|w\|), \\ \|((\Pi^n F)(\theta', z) - \nabla f(\theta')) - ((\Pi^n F)(\theta'', z) - \nabla f(\theta''))\| &\leq C_{4,Q} n \delta_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| (1 + \|w\|), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z = (x, y, w) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $n \geq 0$.

(ii) *There exists a real number $C_{5,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (possibly depending on λ) such that*

$$\|W_{n+1}\| I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} \leq C_{5,Q} (1 + \|W_0\|)$$

for all $n \geq 0$ (τ_Q is specified in Assumption 3.3).

Proof. (i) For each $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, let $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $\|S_{\theta,j}\|$ on Q and a Lipschitz constant of $S_{\theta,j}$ on the same set. Moreover, let $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} = 3\tilde{C}_{1,Q} C_{1,Q} C_{2,Q} N_v$, $\tilde{C}_{3,Q} = 2\tilde{C}_{2,Q} (1 - \varepsilon_Q)^{-1}$, while $\delta_Q = \max\{\lambda, \varepsilon_Q\}$.

Owing to Lemma 10.1, we have

$$\|\tilde{R}_\theta^k S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^l\| \leq \|\tilde{R}_\theta^k\| \|S_{\theta,j}\| \|R_\theta^l\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \varepsilon_Q^k, \quad (58)$$

$$\|\nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^l\| \leq \|\nu_\theta^T\| \|S_{\theta,j}\| \|R_\theta^l\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}, \quad (59)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $k, l \geq 1$. Due to the same lemma, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{R}_{\theta',j}^k S_{\theta',j} R_{\theta'}^l - \tilde{R}_{\theta'',j}^k S_{\theta'',j} R_{\theta''}^l\| &\leq \|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^k - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^k\| \|S_{\theta',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l\| + \|\tilde{R}_{\theta''}^k\| \|S_{\theta',j} - S_{\theta'',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l\| \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{R}_{\theta''}^k\| \|S_{\theta'',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l - R_{\theta''}^l\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \varepsilon_Q^k \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $k, l \geq 1$. In addition to this, Lemma 10.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu_{\theta',j}^T S_{\theta',j} R_{\theta'}^l - \nu_{\theta'',j}^T S_{\theta'',j} R_{\theta''}^l\| &\leq \|\nu_{\theta'}^T - \nu_{\theta''}^T\| \|S_{\theta',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l\| + \|\nu_{\theta''}^T\| \|S_{\theta',j} - S_{\theta'',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l\| \\ &\quad + \|\nu_{\theta''}^T\| \|S_{\theta'',j}\| \|R_{\theta'}^l - R_{\theta''}^l\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

for each $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $l \geq 1$. Moreover, it is straightforward to show

$$\begin{aligned} (\Pi^n F)(\theta, z) &= -\eta(\theta) + E_\theta(\phi(V_n^\theta) W_n^\theta | V_0^\theta = v, W_0^\theta = w) \\ &= -\eta(\theta) + E_\theta\left(\phi(V_n^\theta) \left(\lambda^n w + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i s_\theta(V_{n-i}^\theta)\right) \middle| V_0^\theta = v\right) \\ &= -\eta(\theta) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{v', v'' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \lambda^i \phi(v'') r_\theta^i(v'' | v') s_\theta(v') r_\theta^{n-i}(v' | v) + \lambda^n w \sum_{v' \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \phi(v') r_\theta^n(v' | v) \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $n \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$(\Pi^n F_j)(\theta, z) = -\eta_j(\theta) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i e^T(v) R_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i \phi + \lambda^n e_j^T w e^T(v) R_\theta^n \phi$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Here, $F_j(\theta, z)$, $\eta_j(\theta)$ are the j -th components of $F(\theta, z)$, $\eta(\theta)$, while e_j is the j -th standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} . Moreover, we have

$$\partial^j f(\theta) = -\eta_j(\theta) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda^n \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^n \phi$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, where $\partial^j f(\theta)$ is the j -th component of $\nabla f(\theta)$. Since $e^T(v)e = 1$, $\tilde{R}_\theta^n = R_\theta^n - e \nu_\theta^T$ and

$$\nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} e = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}} \nu_\theta(v) s_{\theta,j}(v) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \partial_\theta^j q_\theta(y|x) \right) \mu_\theta(x) = 0$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 0$,²¹ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^j f(\theta) &= -\eta_j(\theta) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i \phi + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} e \nu_\theta^T \phi + \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi \\ &= -\eta_j(\theta) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i e^T(v) e \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i \phi + \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi \end{aligned}$$

for the same θ, v, j, n . Consequently,

$$(\Pi^n F_j)(\theta, z) - \partial^j f(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i e^T(v) \tilde{R}_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i \phi - \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i \phi + \lambda^n e_j^T w e^T(v) R_\theta^n \phi$$

²¹ Notice that $\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \partial_\theta^j q_\theta(y|x) = \partial_\theta^j \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} q_\theta(y|x) \right) = 0$. Notice also that $\nu_\theta(v) = q_\theta(y|x) \mu_\theta(x)$ for $v = (x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where $\mu_\theta(x)$ is the invariant probability of $\{X_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ (see the proof of Part (i) of Lemma 10.1).

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Then, (58), (59) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Pi^n F_j)(\theta, z) - \partial^j f(\theta)| &\leq \|\phi\| \|e(v)\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i \|\tilde{R}_\theta^{n-i} S_{\theta,j} R_\theta^i\| + \|\phi\| \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \|\nu_\theta^T S_{\theta,j} \tilde{R}_\theta^i\| + \lambda^n \|\phi\| \|e(v)\| \|R_\theta^n\| \|w\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^i \varepsilon_Q^{n-i} + \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \varepsilon_Q^i + \lambda^n \|w\| \right) \\ &\leq C_{3,Q} n \delta_Q^n (1 + \|w\|) \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Similarly, (60), (61) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &|((\Pi^n F_j)(\theta', z) - \partial^j f(\theta')) - ((\Pi^n F_j)(\theta'', z) - \partial^j f(\theta''))| \\ &\leq \|\phi\| \|e(v)\| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i \|\tilde{R}_{\theta'}^{n-i} S_{\theta',j} R_{\theta'}^i - \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^{n-i} S_{\theta'',j} R_{\theta''}^i\| + \|\phi\| \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \|\nu_{\theta'}^T S_{\theta',j} \tilde{R}_{\theta'}^i - \nu_{\theta''}^T S_{\theta'',j} \tilde{R}_{\theta''}^i\| \\ &\quad + \lambda^n \|\phi\| \|e(v)\| \|w\| \|R_{\theta'}^n - R_{\theta''}^n\| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda^i \varepsilon_Q^{n-i} + \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \lambda^i \varepsilon_Q^i + \lambda^n \|w\| \right) \\ &\leq C_{3,Q} n \delta_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| (1 + \|w\|) \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_\theta$, $n \geq 1$. Using (62), (63), we conclude that there exist real numbers δ_Q , $C_{4,Q}$ with properties specified in (i).

(ii) Let $C_{5,Q} = \tilde{C}_{1,Q}(1 - \lambda)^{-1}$ ($\tilde{C}_{1,Q}$ is specified in the proof of (i)). Then, due to Assumption 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|W_{n+1}\|_{I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}} &= \left\| \lambda^{n+1} W_0 + \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda^{n-i} s_{\theta_i}(X_{i+1}, Y_{i+1}) \right\|_{I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}}} \\ &\leq \lambda^{n+1} \|W_0\| + \tilde{C}_{1,Q} \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda^{n-i} \\ &\leq C_{5,Q} (1 + \|W_0\|) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. For $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z = (v, w) \in (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, let

$$\tilde{F}(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} ((\Pi^n F)(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta)), \quad \varphi(z) = 1 + \|w\|.$$

Then, using Lemma 10.3, we conclude that for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $\tilde{F}(\theta, z)$ is well-defined and satisfies $(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ((\Pi^n F)(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta))$. Thus, Assumption 3.2 holds. Relying on Lemma 10.3, we also deduce that for any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_Q \in [1, \infty)$ (possibly depending on λ) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\|F(\theta, z)\|, \|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} &\leq \tilde{C}_Q \varphi(z), \\ \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| &\leq \tilde{C}_Q \varphi(z) \|\theta' - \theta''\|, \\ E(\varphi^2(Z_{n+1}) I_{\{\tau_Q > n\}} | \theta_0 = \theta, Z_0 = z) &\leq \tilde{C}_Q \varphi^2(z) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Hence, Assumptions 3.3 is satisfied, too. Moreover, Lemma 10.2 yields

$$\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| \leq C_{3,Q} (1 - \lambda)$$

on Λ_Q (notice that $C_{3,Q}$ does not depend on λ). Then, the theorem's assertion directly follows from Theorem 3.1 and Parts (i), (iii), (iv) of Lemma 10.2. □

11. Proof of Theorem 5.1

In this section, we rely on the following notation. $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the \mathcal{X}^{2N} -valued Markov chain defined by $Z_{n+1}^\theta = (X_n^\theta, X_{n+1}^\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, while $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\pi_\theta(\cdot)$ are the transition kernel and the invariant probability of $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$. $G(\cdot, \cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ are the functions defined by

$$G(\theta, z) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_\theta(x_i, x'_i), \quad g(\theta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} G(\theta, z') \pi_\theta(dz')$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $z = (x_1, \dots, x_N, x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. $\eta(\cdot)$, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$ are the functions defined as

$$\eta(\theta) = g(\theta) - \nabla f(\theta), \quad F(\theta, z) = G(\theta, z) - \eta(\theta)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. On the other side, $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are the stochastic processes defined by

$$Z_{n+1} = (X_n, X_{n+1}), \quad \eta_n = \eta(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq 0$. Then, it is straightforward to show that the algorithm (27) is of the same form as the recursion studied in Section 3 (i.e., $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\Pi_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined in Section 4 and here admit (15), (16)).

In this section, we also use the following notation. For $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $\Pi_\theta^n(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the n -th transition distribution of $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$, while

$$\tilde{\Pi}_\theta^n(z, B) = \Pi_\theta^n(z, B) - \pi_\theta(B), \quad (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} F(\theta, z') \tilde{\Pi}_\theta^n(z, dz')$$

for a Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$.

Lemma 11.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 – 5.3 hold. Let $Q \subset \Theta$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \Theta$.
- (ii) There exist real numbers $\delta_Q \in (0, 1)$, $C_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (possibly depending on N) such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Pi}_\theta^n(z, B)| &\leq C_{1,Q} \delta_Q^n, \\ |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^n(z, B) - \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^n(z, B)| &\leq C_{1,Q} n \delta_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\|, \\ |\pi_{\theta'}(B) - \pi_{\theta''}(B)| &\leq C_{1,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$.

Proof. For $\theta \in \Theta$, let $P_\theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the transition kernel of $\{X_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$, while $\lambda(\cdot)$ is the measure on \mathcal{X}^N defined by

$$\lambda(B) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{X}} I_B(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_N}) dx_1 \cdots dx_N$$

for a Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$. On the other side, let

$$v_\theta(x'_{1:N} | x_{1:N}) = \prod_{j=1}^N p_\theta(x'_j | x_j), \quad w_{\theta,i}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) = \frac{w_\theta(x_i, x'_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_\theta(x_j, x'_j)}$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Moreover, let

$$u_\theta(B | x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} I_B(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_N}) \frac{\prod_{j=1}^N w_\theta(x_{i_j}, x'_{i_j})}{\left(\sum_{j=1}^N w_\theta(x_j, x'_j)\right)^N}$$

for a Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. Then, it is straightforward to show

$$P_\theta(x_{1:N}, B) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} u_\theta(B | x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) v_\theta(x'_{1:N} | x_{1:N}) dx'_{1:N}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. It is also easy to demonstrate

$$u_\theta(B|x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} I_B(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_N}) \prod_{j=1}^N w_{\theta, i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N})$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and all $\theta \in \Theta$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$.

Due to Assumptions 5.1 – 5.3, there exists a real number $\varepsilon_{1,Q} \in (0, 1)$ such that $p_\theta(x'|x) \geq \varepsilon_{1,Q}$, $q(x) \geq \varepsilon_{1,Q}$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $\tilde{C} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $q(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{X} , while $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [\tilde{C}, \infty)$ is an upper bound in (θ, x, x') for $p_\theta(x'|x)$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, let $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be a Lipschitz constant in (θ, x, x') for $p_\theta(x'|x)$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, while $\varepsilon_{2,Q} = \varepsilon_{1,Q}^2 \tilde{C}_{1,Q}^{-2} N^{-1}$, $\tilde{C}_{3,Q} = 2\varepsilon_{1,Q}^{-3} \tilde{C}_{1,Q}^2 \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$. Then, we have $\varepsilon_{2,Q} \leq w_{\theta,i}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \leq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{\theta',i}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) - w_{\theta'',i}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N})| &\leq \frac{w_{\theta',i}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \sum_{j=1}^N |w_{\theta''}(x_j, x'_j) - w_{\theta'}(x_j, x'_j)|}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_{\theta''}(x_j, x'_j)} \\ &\quad + \frac{|w_{\theta'}(x_i, x'_i) - w_{\theta''}(x_i, x'_i)|}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_{\theta''}(x_j, x'_j)} \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.²² Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \prod_{j=1}^N w_{\theta', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) - \prod_{j=1}^N w_{\theta'', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \right| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} w_{\theta', i_k}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \right) \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^N w_{\theta', i_k}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \right) \\ &\quad \cdot |w_{\theta', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) - w_{\theta'', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N})| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q} N \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for each $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v_{\theta'}(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) - v_{\theta''}(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N})| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\prod_{k=1}^{j-1} p_{\theta'}(x'_k|x_k) \right) \left(\prod_{k=j+1}^N p_{\theta'}(x'_k|x_k) \right) |p_{\theta'}(x'_j|x_j) - p_{\theta''}(x'_j|x_j)| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q}^N \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. Hence,

$$\left| \left(\prod_{j=1}^N w_{\theta', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \right) v_{\theta'}(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) - \left(\prod_{j=1}^N w_{\theta'', i_j}(x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \right) v_{\theta''}(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) \right| \leq 2\tilde{C}_{3,Q}^N \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for each $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $x'_{1:N} = (x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$, $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N$ (notice that $v_\theta(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) \leq \tilde{C}_{1,Q}^N \leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q}^N N^{-1}$ when $\theta \in Q$).

Let $\varepsilon_{3,Q} = \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{4N} \min\{1, \lambda(\mathcal{X}^N)\}$, $\delta_Q = (1 - \varepsilon_{3,Q})^{1/2}$. Then, we have

$$P_\theta(x_{1:N}, B) \geq \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{2N} \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{X}} I_B(x'_{i_1}, \dots, x'_{i_N}) dx'_1 \cdots dx'_N = \frac{\varepsilon_{3,Q}^{1/2} \lambda(B)}{\lambda(\mathcal{X}^N)}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and all $\theta \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$.²³ Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\theta^2(z, B) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} I_B(x''_{1:N}, x'''_{1:N}) P_\theta(x''_{1:N}, dx''_{1:N}) P_\theta(x'_{1:N}, dx'_{1:N}) \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon_{3,Q}}{\lambda^2(\mathcal{X}^N)} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} I_B(x''_{1:N}, x'''_{1:N}) \lambda(dx''_{1:N}) \lambda(dx'_{1:N}) \end{aligned}$$

²² Notice that $\varepsilon_Q \tilde{C}_{1,Q}^{-1} \leq w_\theta(x, x') \leq \varepsilon_Q^{-1} \tilde{C}_{1,Q}$ and $|w_{\theta'}(x, x') - w_{\theta''}(x, x')| \leq \varepsilon_Q^{-2} \tilde{C}_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$ when $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$.

²³ Notice that $v_\theta(x'_{1:N}|x_{1:N}) \geq \varepsilon_{1,Q}^N \geq \varepsilon_{2,Q}^N$ and $u_\theta(B|x_{1:N}, x'_{1:N}) \geq \varepsilon_Q^N \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} I_B(x'_{i_1}, \dots, x'_{i_N})$ when $\theta \in Q$.

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta \in Q$, $z = (x_1, \dots, x_N, x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. Combining this with well-known results from the Markov chain theory (see e.g., [38, Theorem 16.02]), we conclude that $\{Z_n^\theta\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \Theta$ (notice that Q is any compact set). We also deduce

$$|\tilde{\Pi}_\theta^n(z, B)| \leq (1 - \varepsilon_{3,Q})^{n/2} = \delta_Q^n$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$.

Let $\tilde{C}_{4,Q} = 2\tilde{C}_{3,Q}^{2N} \max\{1, \lambda(\mathcal{X}^N)\}$, $C_{1,Q} = \delta_Q^{-1} \tilde{C}_{4,Q}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |P_{\theta'}(x_{1:N}, B) - P_{\theta''}(x_{1:N}, B)| &\leq 2\tilde{C}_{3,Q}^{2N} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_N \leq N} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{X}} I_B(x'_{i_1}, \dots, x'_{i_N}) dx'_1 \cdots dx'_N \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{4,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^N$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x_{1:N} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X}^N$. Therefore,

$$|\Pi_{\theta'}(z, B) - \Pi_{\theta''}(z, B)| = \left| \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} I_B(x'_{1:N}, x''_{1:N}) (P_{\theta'} - P_{\theta''})(x'_{1:N}, dx''_{1:N}) \right| \leq \tilde{C}_{4,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z = (x_1, \dots, x_N, x'_1, \dots, x'_N) \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. Consequently, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} |\Pi_{\theta'}^{n+1}(z, B) - \Pi_{\theta''}^{n+1}(z, B)| &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^j(z'', B) (\Pi_{\theta'} - \Pi_{\theta''})(z', dz'') \Pi_{\theta''}^{n-j}(z, dz') \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^j(z'', B)| |\Pi_{\theta'} - \Pi_{\theta''}|(z', dz'') \Pi_{\theta''}^{n-j}(z, dz') \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{4,Q} (1 - \delta_Q)^{-1} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \\ &\leq C_{1,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$. Similarly, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^{n+1}(z, B) - \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^{n+1}(z, B)| &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^j(z'', B) (\Pi_{\theta'} - \Pi_{\theta''})(z', dz'') \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^{n-j}(z, dz') \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^n \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^j(z'', B)| |\Pi_{\theta'} - \Pi_{\theta''}|(z', dz'') |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^{n-j}(z, dz')| \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{4,Q} \delta_Q^n (n+1) \|\theta' - \theta''\| \\ &= C_{1,Q} \delta_Q^{n+1} (n+1) \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$. Hence, we have

$$|\pi_{\theta'}(B) - \pi_{\theta''}(B)| \leq |\Pi_{\theta'}^n(z, B) - \Pi_{\theta''}^n(z, B)| + |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^n(z, B)| + |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^n(z, B)| \leq C_{1,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| + 2C_{1,Q} \delta_Q^n$$

for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 1$. Then, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that (64) holds for any Borel-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{X}^{2N}$ and all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$. \square

Lemma 11.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 5.1 – 5.3 hold. Let $Q \subset \Theta$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable and $\nabla f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ are locally Lipschitz continuous.
- (ii) There exists a real number $C_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of N) such that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq C_{2,Q}/N$ for all $\theta \in Q$.
- (iii) If Assumption 5.4.a is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is p times differentiable.
- (iv) If Assumption 5.4.b is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is real-analytic.

Proof. (i) Owing to Assumptions 5.2, 5.3, there exists a real number $\varepsilon_Q \in (0, 1)$ such that $p_\theta(x'|x) \geq \varepsilon_Q$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound in (θ, x, x') for $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $\|\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x)\|$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, while $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ is a Lipschitz constant in (θ, x, x') for $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x'|x)$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, let $\tilde{C}_{3,Q} = 2\varepsilon_Q^{-2}\tilde{C}_{1,Q}\tilde{C}_{2,Q}$. Then, we have $\|s_\theta(x, x')\| \leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|s_{\theta'}(x, x') - s_{\theta''}(x, x')\| &\leq \frac{\|\nabla_\theta p_{\theta'}(x'|x) - \nabla_\theta p_{\theta''}(x'|x)\| + \|s_{\theta''}(x, x')\| |p_{\theta'}(x'|x) - p_{\theta''}(x'|x)|}{p_{\theta'}(x'|x)} \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Hence,

$$\|G(\theta, z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q}, \quad \|G(\theta', z) - G(\theta'', z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \quad (66)$$

for each $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. As $s_\theta(x, x') = \nabla_\theta \log p_\theta(x'|x)$ for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, the dominated convergence theorem implies that $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable on Q and satisfies

$$\nabla f(\theta) = - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(x, x') p(x) p(x') dx dx' \quad (67)$$

for any $\theta \in Q$. As Q is any compact set, we conclude that $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable on Θ . Combining (65) – (67), we deduce

$$\|\nabla f(\theta') - \nabla f(\theta'')\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|s_{\theta'}(x, x') - s_{\theta''}(x, x')\| p(x) p(x') dx dx' \leq \tilde{C}_{3,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$. Similarly, using Lemma 11.1 and (66), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(\theta') - g(\theta'')\| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \|G(\theta', z) - G(\theta'', z)\| \pi_{\theta'}(dz) + \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \|G(\theta'', z)\| |\pi_{\theta'} - \pi_{\theta''}|(dz) \\ &\leq 2C_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{3,Q} \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for each $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$. Since Q is any compact set, we deduce that $\nabla f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous on Θ .

(ii) Due to Assumptions 5.2, 5.3, there exists a real number $\varepsilon_{1,Q} \in (0, 1)$ such that $p(x) \geq \varepsilon_{1,Q}$, $p_\theta(x'|x) \geq \varepsilon_{1,Q}$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Let $\tilde{C} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $p(\cdot)$ on \mathcal{X} , while $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [\tilde{C}, \infty)$ is an upper bound in (θ, x, x') of $p_\theta(x'|x)$, $\|\nabla_\theta p_\theta(x, x')\|$ on $\Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, let $\varepsilon_{2,Q} = \varepsilon_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{1,Q}^{-1}$, $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} = \varepsilon_{1,Q}^{-1} \tilde{C}_{1,Q}$, $\tilde{C}_{3,Q} = \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{-1} \tilde{C}_{2,Q}^4$. On the other side, let

$$t_\theta(x) = \int s_\theta(x, x'') p(x'') dx'', \quad \bar{w}_\theta(x, x') = \frac{p(x')}{p_\theta(x'|x)},$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, we have $\varepsilon_{2,Q} \leq \bar{w}_\theta(x, x') \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$, $\|s_\theta(x, x')\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$ for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. We also have $\|t_\theta(x)\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$ for each $\theta \in Q$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

For $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, let $S_{n,i,j}^\theta = s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j))$, $\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta = \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j))$, while $E_\theta(\cdot)$ denotes expectation in the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_\theta)$ ($X_n^\theta(i)$, $\tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(i)$ are specified in Section 5). Then, it is straightforward to verify

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta(s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) &= E_\theta(s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(I_{n+1}^\theta(i))) | X_n^\theta) \\ &= E_\theta\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^N s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) w_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j))}{\sum_{j=1}^N w_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j))} \middle| X_n^\theta\right) \\ &= E_\theta\left(\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta}{1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1)} \middle| X_n^\theta\right) \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.²⁴ Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta (s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad - E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, where $\phi(t) = t^2/(1+t)$ for $t \in (-1, \infty)$.²⁵ On the other side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \middle| X_n^\theta \right) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N E_\theta (s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) | X_n^\theta) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{X}} s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), x_j) \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), x_j) p_\theta(x_j | X_n^\theta(j)) dx_j \\ &= t_\theta(X_n^\theta(i)) \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. We also have

$$E_\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1 | X_n^\theta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), x_j) p_\theta(x_j | X_n^\theta(j)) dx_j - 1 = 0 \quad (69)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq j \leq N$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j,k \leq N \\ j \neq k}} E_\theta (S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,k}^\theta - 1) | X_n^\theta) \\ &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$.²⁶ Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta (s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) - t_\theta(X_n^\theta(i)) &= - E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Since $\|S_{n,i,j}^\theta\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$, $\varepsilon_{2,Q} \leq \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$ for each $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i, j \leq N$,

²⁴Notice that $w_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) = c \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta$, where $c = \int_{\mathcal{X}} q(x) dx$. $I_{n+1}^\theta(i)$ is specified in Section 5 (see the footnote after (23)).

²⁵Notice that $1/(1+t) = 1-t+\phi(t)$. Notice also that $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) > -1$.

²⁶Notice that $S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta$ and $\bar{W}_{n,k}^\theta$ are independent conditionally on X_n^θ whenever $j \neq k$.

we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \right\| &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}^\phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}^2 \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for the same θ, n, i .²⁷ Similarly, we get

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right\| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{2,Q}^3}{N}$$

for all $\theta \in Q, n \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq N$. On the other side, (69) yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right|^2 \middle| X_n^\theta \right) &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1)^2 \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j, k \leq N \\ j \neq k}} E_\theta \left((\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1)(\bar{W}_{n,k}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1)^2 \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{2,Q}^2}{N} \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

for each $\theta \in Q, n \geq 0$.²⁸ Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{3,Q}}{N}, \\ \left\| E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N S_{n,i,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{3,Q}}{N} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in Q, n \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq N$. Combining this with (71), we deduce

$$\|E_\theta (s_\theta(X_n^\theta(i), X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) - t_\theta(X_n^\theta(i))\| \leq \frac{2\tilde{C}_{3,Q}}{N} \tag{73}$$

for each $\theta \in Q, n \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq N$.

For $\theta \in \Theta, n \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq N$, let $T_{n,j}^\theta = t_\theta(\tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j))$. Then, similarly as (68), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta (t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \middle| X_n^\theta \right) - E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

²⁷Notice that $1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \geq \varepsilon_{2,Q}$. Notice also that $\phi(t) \leq \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{-1} t^2$ when $t + 1 \geq \varepsilon_{2,Q}$.

²⁸Notice that $\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta$ and $\bar{W}_{n,k}^\theta$ are independent conditionally on X_n^θ whenever $j \neq k$.

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Moreover, similarly as (70), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j, k \leq N \\ j \neq k}} E_\theta (T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,k}^\theta - 1) | X_n^\theta) \\ &= E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$. On the other side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \middle| X_n^\theta \right) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N E_\theta (t_\theta(\tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), \tilde{X}_{n+1}^\theta(j)) | X_n^\theta) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{X}} t_\theta(x_j) \bar{w}_\theta(X_n^\theta(j), x_j) p_\theta(x_j | X_n^\theta(j)) dx_j \\ &= -\nabla f(\theta) \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$. As a result of (74) – (76), we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta (t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) + \nabla f(\theta) &= -E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$. Since $\|T_{n,j}^\theta\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$, $\varepsilon_{2,Q} \leq \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}$ for each $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, we conclude

$$\left\| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \right\| \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q}^2 \varepsilon_{2,Q}^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right|^2,$$

for the same θ , n . We also deduce

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right\| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{2,Q}^3}{N}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$. Combining this with (72), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{3,Q}}{N}, \\ \left\| E_\theta \left(\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N T_{n,j}^\theta \bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta \right) \phi \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (\bar{W}_{n,j}^\theta - 1) \right) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \right\| &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{3,Q}}{N} \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\|E_\theta (t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) + \nabla f(\theta)\| \leq 2\tilde{C}_{3,Q}/N \quad (78)$$

for each $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$.

Let $C_{2,Q} = 4\tilde{C}_{3,Q}$. It is straightforward to demonstrate

$$\begin{aligned} E_\theta (G(\theta, Z_{n+2}^\theta) | Z_n^\theta) - \nabla f(\theta) &= -E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i), X_{n+2}^\theta(i)) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) - \nabla f(\theta) \\ &= -E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (E_\theta (s_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i), X_{n+2}^\theta(i)) | X_{n+1}^\theta) - t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i))) \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (E_\theta (t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) + \nabla f(\theta)) \end{aligned}$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 0$. Then, (73), (78) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|E_\theta (G(\theta, Z_{n+2}^\theta) | Z_n^\theta) - \nabla f(\theta)\| &\leq E_\theta \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|E_\theta (s_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i), X_{n+2}^\theta(i)) | X_{n+1}^\theta) - t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i))\| \middle| X_n^\theta \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|E_\theta (t_\theta(X_{n+1}^\theta(i)) | X_n^\theta) + \nabla f(\theta)\| \\ &\leq \frac{C_{2,Q}}{N} \end{aligned}$$

for each $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$. Consequently,

$$\|(\Pi^2 G)(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta)\| = \|E_\theta (G(\theta, Z_{n+2}^\theta) | Z_n^\theta = z) - \nabla f(\theta)\| \leq \frac{C_{2,Q}}{N}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\|\eta(\theta)\| = \|g(\theta) - \nabla f(\theta)\| = \left\| \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} ((\Pi^2 G)(\theta, z') - \nabla f(\theta)) \pi_\theta(dz') \right\| \leq \frac{C_{2,Q}}{N}$$

for each $\theta \in Q$.

(iii) Owing to Assumption 5.4.a, there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_Q \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k \log p_\theta(x'|x)}{\partial \vartheta_{i_1} \cdots \partial \vartheta_{i_k}} \right| \leq \tilde{C}_Q$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $1 \leq k \leq p$, $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq d_\theta$, where ϑ_i is the i -th component of θ . Then, using the dominated convergence theorem, we conclude that $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable p times.

(iv) Let $\theta \in \Theta$ be an arbitrary vector, while

$$\hat{H}_\eta(x, x') = \log \hat{p}_\eta(x'|x), \quad \hat{f}(\eta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{H}_\eta(x, x') p(x) p(x') dx dx'$$

for $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^{d_\theta}$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. To prove this part of the lemma, it sufficient to show that $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ is analytic in an open vicinity of θ .

Let $V_{\delta_\theta}(\theta) = \{\eta \in \mathbb{C}^{d_\theta} : \|\eta - \theta\| \leq \delta_\theta\}$ (δ_θ is specified in Assumption 5.4.b). Since $V_{\delta_\theta}(\theta) \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ is a compact set, Assumptions 5.3, 5.4.b imply that there exist real numbers $\varepsilon_\theta \in (0, \delta_\theta)$, $C_{1,\theta} \in [1, \infty)$ such that $C_{1,\theta}^{-1} \leq |\hat{p}_\eta(x'|x)| \leq C_{1,\theta}$ for all $\eta \in V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Therefore, $\hat{H}_\eta(x, x')$ is analytic in η for all $\eta \in V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, $|\hat{H}_\eta(x, x')| \leq \log C_{1,\theta}$ for all $\eta \in V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Then, using Cauchy inequality for complex analytic functions, we deduce that there exists a real number $C_{2,\theta} \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\|\nabla_\eta \hat{H}_\eta(x, x')\| \leq C_{2,\theta}$ for all $\eta \in V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. Consequently, the dominated convergence theorem implies that $\hat{f}(\eta)$ is differentiable for all $\eta \in V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$. Hence, $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ is analytic on $V_{\varepsilon_\theta}(\theta)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. For $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$, let

$$(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} F(\theta, z') \tilde{\Pi}_\theta^n(z, dz'),$$

while $\tilde{F}(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)$. On the other side, let $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $\|F(\theta, z)\|$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. Moreover, let $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ be a Lipschitz constant in θ for $F(\theta, z)$ on $Q \times \mathcal{X}^{2N}$.²⁹ Then, Lemma 11.1 implies

$$\|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \|F(\theta, z')\| |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta}^n|(z, dz') \leq C_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{1,Q} \delta_Q^n \quad (79)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$. The same lemma also yields

$$\|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta', z) - (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta'', z)\| \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \|F(\theta', z') - F(\theta'', z')\| |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^n|(z, dz') \quad (80)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} \|F(\theta'', z')\| |\tilde{\Pi}_{\theta'}^n - \tilde{\Pi}_{\theta''}^n|(z, dz') \\ &\leq 2C_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \delta_Q^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| < \infty$ for any $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. As Q is any compact set, we conclude that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$, $\tilde{F}(\theta, z)$ is well-defined and satisfies $(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)$. Consequently,

$$\tilde{F}(\theta, z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = (\tilde{\Pi}^0 F)(\theta, z) = F(\theta, z) - \int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} F(\theta, z') \pi_{\theta}(dz') = F(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$.³⁰ Thus, Assumption 3.2 holds.

Due to (79), we have

$$\max\{\|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| \leq C_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{1,Q} (1 - \delta_Q)^{-1},$$

for each $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. On the other side, (80) yields

$$\|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta', z) - (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta'', z)\| \leq 2C_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{1,Q} \tilde{C}_{2,Q} (1 - \delta_Q)^{-2} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^{2N}$. Hence, Assumption 3.3 holds, too. On the other side, Lemma 11.1 yields

$$\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| \leq C_{2,Q}/N$$

on Λ_Q (notice that $C_{2,Q}$ does not depend on N). Then, the theorem's assertion directly follows from Theorem 3.1 and Parts (i), (iii), (iv) of Lemma 11.1. \square

12. Proof Theorem 6.1

In this section, we rely on the following notation. Functions $F(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\eta(\cdot)$ are defined by

$$\eta(\theta) = \nabla f_N(\theta) - \nabla f(\theta), \quad F(\theta, z) = \psi_{N,\theta}(y_{1:N}) - \eta(\theta)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $z = (x_{1:N}, y_{1:N}) \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$. Stochastic processes $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are defined as

$$Z_{n+1} = (X_{nN+1:(n+1)N}, Y_{nN+1:(n+1)N}), \quad \eta_n = \eta(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq 0$. $\Pi(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the transition kernel of $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (notice that $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ does not depend on $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, and consequently, $\Pi(\cdot, \cdot)$ does not depend on θ). Then, it is straightforward to show that the algorithm (31) is of the same form as the recursion studied in Section 3 (i.e., $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $F(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\Pi(\cdot, \cdot)$ defined in Section 4 and here admit (15), (16)).

²⁹Owing to Assumption 5.3, $G(\theta, z)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ (see (66)). As $\nabla f(\cdot)$, $g(\cdot)$ are locally Lipschitz continuous (due to Lemma 11.2), $F(\theta, z)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in θ .

³⁰Notice that $\int_{\mathcal{X}^{2N}} F(\theta, z') \pi_{\theta}(dz') = g(\theta) - \eta(\theta)$.

Lemma 12.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 6.1 – 6.3 hold. Let $Q \subset \Theta$ be any compact set. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous.
- (ii) There exists a real number $C_Q \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of N) such that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq C_Q/N$ for all $\theta \in Q$.
- (iii) If Assumption 6.4.a is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is p times differentiable.
- (iv) If Assumption 6.4.b is satisfied, $f(\cdot)$ is real-analytic.

Proof. (i), (iii), (iv) First, we consider the case when models $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ are naturally parameterized. To do so, we rely on the following notation. $\mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_x}$ is the set of $N_x \times N_x$ (row) stochastic matrices whose all entries are strictly positive. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_y}$ is the set of $N_x \times N_y$ (row) stochastic matrices whose all entries are also strictly positive. On the other side, $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the function defined by $h(A, B) = f(\theta)$ for $A = [a_{i,j}] \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_x}$, $B = [b_{i,k}] \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_y}$, $\theta = [a_{1,1} \cdots a_{N_x, N_x} \ b_{1,1} \cdots b_{N_x, N_y}]^T$. Then, [50, Theorem 1] and Assumption 6.1 imply that $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is real-analytic on $\mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_x} \times \mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_y}$.

Using function $h(\cdot, \cdot)$, we now consider any parameterization satisfying Assumptions 6.2, 6.3. For $\theta \in \Theta$, let P_θ be the $N_x \times N_x$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is $p_\theta(j|i)$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq N_x$), while Q_θ is the $N_x \times N_y$ matrix whose (i, k) entry is $q_\theta(k|i)$ ($1 \leq i \leq N_x, 1 \leq k \leq N_y$). Then, Assumption 6.2 implies $P_\theta \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_x}$, $Q_\theta \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x \times N_y}$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$. Consequently, $f(\theta) = h(P_\theta, Q_\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$. On the other side, due to Assumption 6.3, P_θ, Q_θ are differentiable (in θ), while their derivatives are locally Lipschitz continuous (in θ). Therefore, $f(\cdot)$ is differentiable and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous (notice that $h(\cdot, \cdot)$ is real-analytic). If Assumption 6.4.a is satisfied, then P_θ, Q_θ are p times differentiable, and consequently, $f(\cdot)$ is p times differentiable, too. Similarly, if Assumption 6.4.b is satisfied, then P_θ, Q_θ are real-analytic, and hence, $f(\cdot)$ is also real-analytic.

(ii) Let \mathcal{P}^{N_x} be the set of N_x -dimensional probability vectors, while e is the N_x -dimensional vector whose all components are one. For $\theta \in \Theta$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, let

$$r_\theta(y, x'|x) = q_\theta(y|x')p_\theta(x'|x),$$

while $R_\theta(y)$ is the $N_x \times N_x$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is $r_\theta(y, i|j)$. For $\theta \in \Theta$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $u \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x}$, $V \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_x}$, let

$$\Phi_\theta(y, u) = \log(e^T R_\theta(y)u), \quad \Psi_\theta(y, u, V) = \nabla_\theta \Phi_\theta(y, u) + V \nabla_u \Phi_\theta(y, u).$$

Then, owing to Assumptions 6.2, there exists a real number $\delta_Q \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$r_\theta(y, x'|x) \geq \delta_Q \tag{82}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. Combining this with Assumption 6.3, we conclude that there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_{1,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\|\Psi_\theta(y, u, V)\| \leq \tilde{C}_{1,Q}(1 + \|V\|), \tag{83}$$

$$|\Phi_\theta(y, u') - \Phi_\theta(y, u'')| \leq \tilde{C}_{1,Q}\|u' - u''\|, \tag{84}$$

$$\|\Psi_\theta(y, u', V') - \Psi_\theta(y, u'', V'')\| \leq \tilde{C}_{1,Q}(\|u' - u''\| + \|V' - V''\|)(1 + \|V'\| + \|V''\|) \tag{85}$$

for each $\theta \in Q$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $u, u', u'' \in \mathcal{P}^{N_x}$, $V, V', V'' \in \mathbb{R}^{N_x \times N_x}$.

For $\theta \in \Theta$, $y_{1:n} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, $n \geq 1$, let $u_{0,\theta}$, $u_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n})$ be the N_x -dimensional vectors whose i -th components are

$$u_{0,i,\theta} = \pi_\theta(i), \quad u_{n,i,\theta}(y_{1:n}) = P_\theta(X_n^\theta = i | Y_{1:n}^\theta = y_{1:n})$$

(notice that $\{u_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n})\}_{n \geq 1}$ is the optimal filter for the model $\{(X_n^\theta, Y_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$). For the same θ , $y_{1:n}$, n , let

$$V_{0,\theta} = \nabla_\theta u_{0,\theta}, \quad V_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}) = \nabla_\theta u_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}).$$

Then, it is straightforward to verify

$$\log P_\theta(Y_1^\theta = y) = \Phi_\theta(y, u_{0,\theta}), \quad \log \left(\frac{P_\theta(Y_{1:n+1}^\theta = y_{1:n+1})}{P_\theta(Y_{1:n}^\theta = y_{1:n})} \right) = \Phi_\theta(y_{n+1}, u_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}))$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $y_{1:n+1} = (y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}) \in \mathcal{Y}^{n+1}$, $n \geq 0$. Since

$$\phi_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}) = -\frac{1}{n} \left(\log P_\theta(Y_1^\theta = y_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \log \left(\frac{P_\theta(Y_{1:i+1}^\theta = y_{1:i+1})}{P_\theta(Y_{1:i}^\theta = y_{1:i})} \right) \right)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $y_{1:n} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, $n \geq 1$, we conclude

$$\phi_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Phi_\theta(y_{i+1}, u_{i,\theta}(y_{1:i})) \quad (86)$$

for the same θ , $y_{1:n}$, n . Differentiating (86) (in θ), we get

$$\psi_{n,\theta}(y_{1:n}) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \Psi_\theta(y_{i+1}, u_{i,\theta}(y_{1:i}), V_{i,\theta}(y_{1:i})) \quad (87)$$

for $\theta \in \Theta$, $y_{1:n} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathcal{Y}^n$, $n \geq 0$.

Let $U_0^\theta = u_{0,\theta}$, $U_n^\theta = u_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n})$ and $V_0^\theta = V_{0,\theta}$, $V_n^\theta = V_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n})$ for $\theta \in \Theta$, $n \geq 1$. Then, using [49, Theorems 4.1, 4.2] and (82) – (85), we conclude that $\{(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}, U_n^\theta, V_n^\theta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic for each $\theta \in \Theta$. We also deduce that there exist functions $g : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and real numbers $\varepsilon_Q \in (0, 1)$, $\tilde{C}_{2,Q} \in [1, \infty)$ (independent of N) such that

$$\max\{|E(\Phi_\theta(Y_{n+1}, U_n^\theta)) - g(\theta)|, \|E(\Psi_\theta(Y_{n+1}, U_n^\theta, V_n^\theta)) - h(\theta)\|\} \leq \tilde{C}_{2,Q} \varepsilon_Q^n \quad (88)$$

for all $\theta \in Q$, $n \geq 0$. As a result of (86) – (88), we get

$$g(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\phi_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n})), \quad h(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\psi_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n})) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nabla_\theta E(\phi_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n}))$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$. Therefore, $g(\theta) = f(\theta)$, $h(\theta) = \nabla f(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ (notice that $E(\psi_{n,\theta}(Y_{1:n}))$ converges to $h(\theta)$ uniformly in θ on each compact subset of Θ).

In the rest of the proof, we assume that $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is in steady-state (i.e., X_0 is distributed according to the invariant distribution of $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 0}$). Then, we have

$$f_N(\theta) = E(\phi_{N,\theta}(Y_{1:N})), \quad \nabla f_N(\theta) = E(\psi_{N,\theta}(Y_{1:N}))$$

for each $\theta \in \Theta$. Combining this with (87), (88), we get

$$\|\eta(\theta)\| = \|\nabla f_N(\theta) - \nabla f(\theta)\| = \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (E(\Psi_\theta(Y_{i+1}, U_i^\theta, V_i^\theta)) - h(\theta)) \right\| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{2,Q}}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \varepsilon_Q^i \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_{2,Q}}{(1 - \varepsilon_Q)N}$$

for all $\theta \in Q$. Then, it can easily be deduced that there exists $C_Q \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of N) such that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq C_Q/N$ for all $\theta \in Q$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Due to Assumption 6.1, $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is geometrically ergodic. Let $\nu(\cdot)$ be the invariant probability of $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, while $\tilde{\Pi}^n(z, z') = \Pi^n(z, z') - \nu(z')$ for $z, z' \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$, $n \geq 0$. Then, there exist real numbers $\rho \in (0, 1)$, $\tilde{C} \in [1, \infty)$ such that $|\tilde{\Pi}^n(z, z')| \leq \tilde{C} \rho^n$ for each $z, z' \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$, $n \geq 0$. On the other side, due to Assumption 6.3, there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_Q \in [\tilde{C}, \infty)$ such that

$$\|F(\theta, z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q, \quad \|F(\theta', z) - F(\theta'', z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$.

For $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$, $n \geq 0$, let

$$(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z) = \sum_{z' \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N} F(\theta, z') \tilde{\Pi}^n(z, z'),$$

while $\tilde{F}(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)$. Then, we have

$$\|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q^2 \rho^n, \quad (89)$$

$$\|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta', z) - (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta'', z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q^2 \rho^n \|\theta' - \theta''\| \quad (90)$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| < \infty$ for any $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$. As Q is any compact set, we conclude that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$, $\tilde{F}(\theta, z)$ is well-defined and satisfies $(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)$. Consequently,

$$\tilde{F}(\theta, z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z) = (\tilde{\Pi}^0 F)(\theta, z) = F(\theta, z) - \sum_{z' \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N} F(\theta, z') \nu(z') = F(\theta, z) - \nabla f(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$.³¹ Thus, Assumption 3.2 holds.

Owing to (89), we have

$$\max\{\|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta, z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q^2 (1 - \rho)^{-1},$$

for each $\theta \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$. On the other side, (90) yields

$$\|(\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|(\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta', z) - (\tilde{\Pi}^n F)(\theta'', z)\| \leq \tilde{C}_Q^2 (1 - \rho)^{-1} \|\theta' - \theta''\|$$

for all $\theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N$. Hence, Assumption 3.3 holds, too. On the other side, Lemma 12.1 yields

$$\eta = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| \leq C_Q / N$$

on Λ_Q (notice that C_Q does not depend on N). Then, the theorem's assertion directly follows from Theorem 3.1 and Parts (i), (iii), (iv) of Lemma 12.1. \square

Appendix 1

In this section, a global version of Theorem 2.1 is presented. It is also demonstrated how Theorem 2.1 can be extended to the randomly projected stochastic gradient search.

First, the stability and the global asymptotic behavior of algorithm (1) are considered. To analyze these properties, we introduce the following two assumptions.

Assumption A1.1. $f(\cdot)$ is uniformly lower bounded (i.e., $\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}} f(\theta) > -\infty$), and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is (globally) Lipschitz continuous. Moreover, there exist real numbers $c \in (0, 1)$, $\rho \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| \geq c$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \geq \rho$.

Assumption A1.2. $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ admits the decomposition $\xi_n = \zeta_n + \eta_n$ for each $n \geq 0$, where $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued stochastic processes satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \max_{n \leq j < a(n, t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| < \infty \quad (91)$$

almost surely for any $t \in (0, \infty)$. In addition to this, there exists a real number $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| < \delta \quad (92)$$

almost surely. Here, $g, h : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are the (scaling) functions defined by

$$g(\theta) = (\|\nabla f(\theta)\| + 1)^{-1}, \quad h(\theta) = \begin{cases} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|^{-1}, & \text{if } \|\theta\| \geq \rho \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ (ρ is specified in Assumption A1.1).

³¹Notice that $\sum_{z' \in \mathcal{X}^N \times \mathcal{Y}^N} F(\theta, z') \nu(z') = \nabla f_N(\theta) - \eta(\theta)$.

Assumption A1.1 is a stability condition. In this or a similar form, it is involved in the stability analysis of stochastic gradient search and stochastic approximation (see e.g., [9], [14], [21] and references cited therein). Assumption A1.1 is restrictive, as it requires $\nabla^2 f(\cdot)$ to be uniformly bounded. Assumption A1.1 also requires $\nabla f(\cdot)$ to grow at most linearly as $\theta \rightarrow \infty$. Using the random projections (see (107)), these restrictive conditions can considerably be relaxed.

Assumption A1.2 is a noise condition. It requires the effect of the gradient estimator's error $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ to be compensated by the gradient of the objective function $f(\cdot)$ (i.e., by the stability of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\cdot)$). Assumption A1.2 is true whenever (4) holds almost surely. It is also satisfied for stochastic gradient search with Markovian dynamics (see Theorem A2.1, Appendix 2). Assumption A1.2 and the results based on it (Theorem A1.1, below) are motivated by the scaled ODE approach to the stability analysis of stochastic approximation [13].³²

Our results on the stability and asymptotic bias of algorithm (1) are provided in the next theorem.

Theorem A1.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, A1.1 and A1.2 hold. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *There exists a compact (deterministic) set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ such that $P(\Lambda_Q) = 1$ (Λ_Q is specified in (8)).*
- (ii) *There exists a (deterministic) non-decreasing function $\psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi(t) = \psi(0) = 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{R}) \leq \psi(\eta)$$

almost surely.

- (iii) *If $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.3.b, there exists a real number $K \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq K\eta^{q/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) - \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_n) \leq K\eta^q$$

almost surely (q is specified in the statement of Theorem 2.1).

- (iv) *If $f(\cdot)$ satisfies Assumption 2.3.c, there exist real numbers $r \in (0, 1)$, $L \in (0, \infty)$ (independent of η and depending only on $f(\cdot)$) such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq L\eta^{1/2}, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(f(\theta_n), f(\mathcal{S})) \leq L\eta, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\theta_n, \mathcal{S}) \leq L\eta^r$$

almost surely.

Proof. Owing to Assumption A1.1, there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_1 \in [1, \infty)$ such that the following is true:

- (i) $f(\theta) > -\tilde{C}_1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, and (ii) $f(\theta) \leq \tilde{C}_1$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \leq \rho + 1$. Moreover, due to Assumption A1.2, there also exists an event $N_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ with the following properties: (i) $P(N_0) = 0$, and (ii) (91), (92) hold on N_0^c for all $t \in (0, \infty)$.

Let $\varepsilon = (1 - \delta)/6$, $T = 2\tilde{C}_1\varepsilon^{-1}c^{-2}$ and let $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the function defined by

$$\phi(z) = \sup\{\|\nabla f(\theta)\| : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}, \|\theta\| \leq z\}$$

for $z \in [0, \infty)$. As $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, $\phi(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous, too. $\phi(\cdot)$ is also non-negative and satisfies $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| \leq \phi(\|\theta\|)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$.

For $z \in [0, \infty)$, let $\lambda(\cdot; z)$ be the solution to the ODE $dz/dt = 2\phi(z)$ satisfying $\lambda(0; z) = z$. As $2\phi(\cdot)$ is non-negative and locally Lipschitz continuous, $\lambda(\cdot; \cdot)$ is well-defined and locally Lipschitz continuous (in both arguments) on $[0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$. We also have

$$\lambda(t; z) = z + 2 \int_0^t \phi(\lambda(s; z)) ds \tag{93}$$

for all $t, z \in [0, \infty)$. Then, there exists $\rho_1 \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1 \geq \rho + 1$ and such that $|\lambda(t; z)| \leq \rho_1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, $z \in [0, \rho + 1]$.

³²The main difference between [13] and the results presented here is the choice of the scaling functions. The scaling adopted in [13] is (asymptotically) proportional to $\|\theta\|$. In this paper, the scaling is (asymptotically) proportional to $\|\nabla f(\theta)\|$.

Let $\rho_2 = \rho_1 + 1$, $Q = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : \|\theta\| \leq \rho_2\}$, while Λ is the event defined by

$$\Lambda = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\|\theta_n\| < \rho\} = \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{\|\theta_n\| < \rho\}.$$

Let also $\tilde{C}_2 \in [1, \infty)$ stand for a (global) Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ and for an upper bound of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ on Q . Finally, let $\tilde{C}_3 = 2\tilde{C}_2 \exp(2\tilde{C}_2)$, $\tilde{C}_4 = 12\tilde{C}_1\tilde{C}_2\tilde{C}_3$, while $\tau = 4^{-1}\tilde{C}_4^{-1}\varepsilon c^2$.

In order to prove the theorem's assertion, it is sufficient to show $N_0^c \subseteq \Lambda$ (i.e., to establish that on N_0^c , $\|\theta_n\| \leq \rho_2$ for all, but finitely many n).³³ To prove this, we use contradiction. We assume that $\|\theta_n\| > \rho_2$ for infinitely many n and some $\omega \in N_0^c$. Notice that all formulas which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

Owing to (91), (92), there exists an integer $k_1 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that

$$g(\theta_n) \max_{n \leq j < a(n, T)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \leq \tau^2, \quad h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| \leq \delta \quad (94)$$

for $n \geq k_1$. Due to Assumption 2.1 and (91), we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \|\alpha_n \zeta_n\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \|\alpha_n \eta_n\| = 0. \quad (95)$$

Since

$$g(\theta_n) \|\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n\| \leq \alpha_n + g(\theta_n) \|\alpha_n \zeta_n\| + g(\theta_n) \|\alpha_n \eta_n\|$$

for $n \geq 0$, Assumption 2.1 and (95) imply $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \|\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n\| = 0$. Then, (6) implies that there exists an integer $k_2 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that

$$\sum_{i=n}^{a(n, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\tau, \quad g(\theta_n) \|\theta_{n+1} - \theta_n\| \leq \tau \quad (96)$$

for $n \geq k_2$.

Let $k_0 = \max\{k_1, k_2\}$. Moreover, let l_0, m_0, n_0 be the integers defined as follows. If $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., if $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n), let

$$l_0 = \min\{n > k_0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}, \quad m_0 = \min\{n > l_0 : \|\theta_n\| > \rho_2\}, \quad n_0 = \max\{n \leq m_0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}. \quad (97)$$

Otherwise, if $\omega \in \Lambda^c$ (i.e., if $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for finitely many n), let

$$l_0 = \max\{n > 0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}, \quad m_0 = \infty, \quad n_0 = \max\{k_0, l_0\}.$$

Then, we have $k_0 < n_0 \leq m_0$ and $\|\theta_n\| \geq \rho$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$.

Let $\phi_n(\tau), \phi_{1,n}(\tau), \phi_{2,n}(\tau)$ have the same meaning as in Section 8. Now, the asymptotic properties of $\phi_n(\tau)$ are analyzed. As $\|\theta_n\| \geq \rho$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$, (94) implies

$$\left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| + \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\eta_i\| \leq \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) + \delta \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \quad (98)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j < \min\{m_0, a(n, T)\}$ (notice that $\|\eta_i\| \leq \delta \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\|$ when $\|\theta_i\| \geq \rho$). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(\theta_j)\| &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \|\nabla f(\theta_j) - \nabla f(\theta_n)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \|\theta_j - \theta_n\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) + 2\tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \end{aligned}$$

³³Assumption 2.2 is a consequence of Assumption A1.2, and therefore, Parts (ii) – (iv) directly follow from Part (i) and Theorem 2.1.

for $n_0 \leq n < j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$.³⁴ Combining this with Bellman-Gronwall inequality (see e.g. [14, Appendix B]), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla f(\theta_j)\| &\leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n)\right) \exp\left(2\tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i\right) \\ &\leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n)\right) (1 + \tilde{C}_3 \tau) \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + (\tilde{C}_3 \tau + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 + \tilde{C}_2 \tilde{C}_3 \tau^3) g^{-1}(\theta_n) \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_4 \tau g^{-1}(\theta_n)\end{aligned}$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$.³⁵ Then, (98) implies

$$\left\|\sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \xi_i\right\| \leq \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) + \delta \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_4 \tau g^{-1}(\theta_n)\right) \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \leq \delta \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) \quad (99)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j < \min\{m_0, a(n, \tau)\}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\theta_j - \theta_n\| &\leq \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \left\|\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i\right\| \\ &\leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_4 \tau g^{-1}(\theta_n)\right) \left(\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i + \delta \tau\right) + 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) \\ &\leq 3\tau g^{-1}(\theta_n)\end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$ (notice that $\delta < 1$, $\tilde{C}_4 \tau \leq 1/4$). Therefore,

$$|\phi_{1,n}(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_2 \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i \|\theta_i - \theta_n\| \leq 3\tilde{C}_2 \tau g^{-1}(\theta_n) \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i \leq 3\tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 g^{-2}(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$. We also have

$$|\phi_{2,n}(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_2 \|\theta_{a(n,\tau)} - \theta_n\|^2 \leq 9\tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 g^{-2}(\theta_n)$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$. Thus,

$$|\phi_n(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-2}(\theta_n) \quad (101)$$

when $n \geq n_0$, $a(n, \tau) < m_0$. Additionally, as a result of (96), (99), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\|\sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i\right\| &\geq (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| - 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) \\ &= 5\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| - 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n) \\ &\geq 3\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|\end{aligned}$$

when $n \geq n_0$, $a(n, \tau) < m_0$.³⁶ Then, (32), (101) imply

$$f(\theta_{a(n,\tau)}) - f(\theta_n) \leq -3\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 + \tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-2}(\theta_n) \leq -\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 \leq -\varepsilon \tau c^2 \quad (102)$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$.³⁷

³⁴Notice that τ, T are defined as $\tau = 4^{-1} \tilde{C}_4^{-1} \varepsilon c^2$, $T = 2\tilde{C}_1 \varepsilon^{-1} c^{-2}$. Notice also $\tau < 1 < T$ since $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_4 \in [1, \infty)$, $\varepsilon, c \in (0, 1)$.

³⁵Notice that $\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau < 1$ when $n \leq j \leq a(n, \tau)$. Notice also $g^{-1}(\theta_n) > \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|$ and $\exp(2\tilde{C}_2 \tau) \leq 2\tilde{C}_2 \tau \exp(2\tilde{C}_2) = \tilde{C}_3 \tau$.

³⁶Notice that $1 - \delta = 6\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon c \geq 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau$. Notice also that $2\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \geq \varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \varepsilon \tau c \geq 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_n)$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$.

³⁷ Notice that $2\varepsilon \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 \geq \varepsilon \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 + \varepsilon c^2 \geq \tilde{C}_4 \tau g^{-2}(\theta_n)$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$.

Let $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence recursively defined by $n_{k+1} = a(n_k, \tau)$ for $k \geq 0$. Now, we show by contradiction $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n). We assume the opposite. Then, $m_0 = \infty$ and $\|\theta_n\| \geq \rho$ for $n \geq n_0$, while (102) implies $f(\theta_{n_{k+1}}) - f(\theta_{n_k}) \leq -\varepsilon\tau c^2$ for $k \geq 0$. Hence, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_{n_k}) = -\infty$. However, this is impossible due to Assumption A1.1. Thus, $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n). Therefore, m_0, n_0 are defined through (97), and thus, $\|\theta_{n_0-1}\| < \rho$, $\|\theta_{m_0}\| > \rho_2$. Combining this with (96), we conclude

$$\|\theta_{n_0} - \theta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \tau g^{-1}(\theta_{n_0-1}) \leq \tau(\tilde{C}_2 + 1) \leq 1/2$$

(notice that $\|\nabla f(\theta_{n_0-1})\| \leq \tilde{C}_2$, $\tilde{C}_2\tau \leq 1/4$). Consequently,

$$\|\theta_{n_0}\| \leq \|\theta_{n_0-1}\| + \|\theta_{n_0} - \theta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \rho + 1/2 < \rho_2. \quad (103)$$

Hence, $n_0 < m_0$, $f(\theta_{n_0}) \leq \tilde{C}_1$.

Let i_0, j_0 be the integers defined by $j_0 = \max\{j \geq 0 : n_j < m_0\}$, $i_0 = n_{j_0}$. Then, we have $n_0 \leq i_0 = n_{j_0} < n_{j_0+1} = m_0 \leq a(i_0, \tau)$. As a result of this and (100), we get

$$\|\theta_{m_0} - \theta_{i_0}\| \leq 3\tau g^{-1}(\theta_{i_0}) \leq 3\tau(\tilde{C}_2 + 1) \leq 1/2$$

(notice that $\|\nabla f(\theta_{i_0})\| \leq \tilde{C}_2$, $\tilde{C}_2\tau \leq 1/12$). Consequently,

$$\|\theta_{i_0}\| \geq \|\theta_{m_0}\| - \|\theta_{m_0} - \theta_{i_0}\| \geq \rho_2 - 1/2 > \rho_1. \quad (104)$$

Let $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\theta_0(\cdot)$ have the same meaning as in Section 7. Now, we show by contradiction that $\gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \geq T$. We assume the opposite. Then, (98), (103) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_0(t)\| &= \|\theta_j\| \leq \|\theta_{n_0}\| + \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \\ &\leq \|\theta_{n_0}\| + \tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_{n_0}) + 2 \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \\ &\leq \rho + 1 + 2 \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \phi(\|\theta_i\|) \\ &\leq \rho + 1 + 2 \int_{\gamma_{n_0}}^t \phi(\|\theta_0(s)\|) ds \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

for $t \in [\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1})$, $n_0 \leq j \leq i_0$.³⁸ Applying the comparison principle (see [30, Section 3.4]) to (93), (105), we conclude $\|\theta_0(t)\| \leq \lambda(t - \gamma_{n_0}; \rho + 1) \leq \rho_1$ for all $t \in [\gamma_{n_0}, \gamma_{i_0}]$. Thus, $\|\theta_{i_0}\| = \|\theta_0(\gamma_{i_0})\| \leq \rho_1$. However, this is impossible, due to (104). Hence, $\gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \geq T$. Consequently,

$$T \leq \gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{j_0-1} (\gamma_{n_{j+1}} - \gamma_{n_j}) \leq j_0 \tau \quad (106)$$

(notice that $n_{j_0} = i_0$, $\gamma_{n_{j+1}} - \gamma_{n_j} = \sum_{i=n_j}^{n_{j+1}-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau$).

Owing to (102), we have $f(\theta_{n_{j+1}}) - f(\theta_{n_j}) \leq -\varepsilon\tau c^2$ for $0 \leq j \leq j_0$. Combining this with (106), we get

$$f(\theta_{i_0}) = f(\theta_{n_{j_0}}) \leq f(\theta_{n_0}) - j_0 \varepsilon \tau c^2 \leq \tilde{C}_1 - \varepsilon c^2 T \leq -\tilde{C}_1.$$

However, this is impossible, since $f(\theta) > -\tilde{C}_1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Hence, $\|\theta_n\| > \rho_2$ for finitely many n . \square

In the rest of the section, Theorem 2.1 is extended to randomly projected stochastic gradient algorithms. These algorithms are defined by the following difference equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_n &= \theta_n - \alpha_n (\nabla f(\theta_n) + \xi_n), \\ \theta_{n+1} &= \vartheta_n I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| \leq \beta_{\sigma_n}\}} + \theta_0 I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| > \beta_{\sigma_n}\}}, \\ \sigma_{n+1} &= \sigma_n + I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| > \beta_{\sigma_n}\}}, \quad n \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

³⁸As $j \leq i_0 < m_0$, we have $\gamma_j - \gamma_{n_0} \leq \gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \leq T$ and $j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n_0, T)\}$. We also have $\tau^2 g^{-1}(\theta_{n_0}) \leq \tau^2(\tilde{C}_2 + 1) \leq 1/2$.

Here, $\nabla f(\cdot)$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ have the same meaning as in Section 2, while $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an increasing sequence of positive real numbers satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n = \infty$. $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a (deterministic) vector satisfying $\|\theta_0\| \leq \beta_0$, while $\sigma_0 = 0$. For further details on randomly projected stochastic gradient search and stochastic approximation, see [21], [48] and references cited therein.

To study the asymptotic behavior of (107), we introduce the following two assumption.

Assumption A1.3. $f(\cdot)$ is uniformly lower bounded (i.e., $\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\theta) > -\infty$) and $\nabla f(\cdot)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. Moreover, there exist real numbers $c \in (0, 1)$, $\rho \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\|\nabla f(\theta)\| \geq c$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \geq \rho$.

Assumption A1.4. $\{\xi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ admits the decomposition $\xi_n = \zeta_n + \eta_n$ for each $n \geq 0$, where $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are \mathbb{R}^{d_θ} -valued stochastic processes satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq j < a(n, t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q, n} > j\}} = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} < \infty \quad (108)$$

almost surely for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. In addition to this, there exists a real number $\delta_Q \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} < \delta_Q \quad (109)$$

almost surely for any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Here, $\tau_{Q, n}$ and $h(\cdot)$ are (respectively) the stopping time and the (scaling) function defined by

$$\tau_{Q, n} = \inf \{j \geq n : \theta_j \neq \vartheta_{j-1} \text{ or } \theta_j \notin Q\} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad h(\theta) = \begin{cases} \|\nabla f(\theta)\|^{-1}, & \text{if } \|\theta\| \geq \rho, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $n \geq 0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ (ρ is specified in Assumption A1.3).

Assumption A1.3 is a stability condition. It is one of the weakest conditions under which the stability of the ODE $d\theta/dt = -\nabla f(\theta)$ can be demonstrated. On the other side, Assumption A1.4 is a noise condition. It can be considered as a version of the noise conditions adopted in [48].

Our results on the asymptotic behavior of algorithm (107) are provided in the next theorem.

Theorem A1.2. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be generated by recursion (107). Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, A1.3 and A1.4 hold. Then, all conclusions of Theorem A1.1 are true.

Proof. Due to Assumption A1.3, there exists a real number $\tilde{C}_1 \in [1, \infty)$ such that the following is true: (i) $f(\theta) > -\tilde{C}_1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, and (ii) $f(\theta) \leq \tilde{C}_1$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \leq \rho + 1$. Without loss of generality, it can also be assumed $\|\theta_0\| < \rho$. On the other side, owing to Assumption A1.4, there exists an event $N_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ with the following properties: (i) $P(N_0) = 0$, and (ii) (108), (109) hold on N_0^c for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ and any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$.

Let $\varepsilon = (1 - \delta)/5$, $T = 2\tilde{C}_1\varepsilon^{-1}c^{-2}$, while $\phi(\cdot)$, $\lambda(\cdot; \cdot)$ have the same meaning as in the proof of Theorem A1.1. Then, there exists $\rho_1 \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\rho_1 \geq \rho + 1$ and such that $|\lambda(t; z)| \leq \rho_1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$, $z \in [0, \rho + 1]$. Moreover, (93) holds for all $t, z \in [0, \infty)$.

Let $\rho_2 = \rho_1 + 1$, $Q = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : \|\theta\| \leq \rho_2\}$. Moreover, let

$$\sigma = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n, \quad \Lambda = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\|\theta_n\| < \rho\} = \bigcap_{m=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{\|\theta_n\| < \rho\},$$

while $\tilde{\rho} = \rho_2 I_\Lambda + \beta(\sigma) I_{\Lambda^c}$, $\tilde{Q} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} : \|\theta\| \leq \tilde{\rho}\}$. As $\sigma < \infty$ on Λ^c , we have $\theta_n, \vartheta_n \in \tilde{Q}$ for $n \geq 0$ on the same event. We also have $\tilde{\rho} < \infty$ everywhere. Consequently, $\delta_{\tilde{Q}} < 1$ everywhere, while

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq j < a(n, t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{\tilde{Q}, n} > j\}} = 0, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} < \infty, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} < \delta_{\tilde{Q}} \quad (110)$$

for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ on N_0^c .

Let $\tilde{C}_2 \in [1, \infty)$ stand for a local Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ on \tilde{Q} and for an upper bound of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$ on the same set. In addition to this, let $\tilde{C}_3 = 2\tilde{C}_2 \exp(2\tilde{C}_2)$, $\tilde{C}_4 = 20\tilde{C}_1\tilde{C}_3^3$, while $\tau = 2^{-1}\tilde{C}_4^{-1}\varepsilon c^2$.

In order to prove the theorem's assertion, it is sufficient to show $N_0^c \subseteq \Lambda_Q$ (i.e., to demonstrate that on N_0^c , $\|\vartheta_n\| \leq \rho_2$ for all, but finitely many n).³⁹ We use contradiction to demonstrate this: We assume that $\|\vartheta_n\| > \rho_2$ for infinitely many n and some $\omega \in N_0^c$. Notice that all formulas which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

Let $\delta = \delta_{\tilde{Q}}$. As $\{\beta(\sigma_n)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is non-decreasing, we have $\beta(\sigma_n) > \rho_2$ for all, but finitely many n .⁴⁰ Hence, there exists an integer k_1 (depending on ω) such that $\beta(\sigma_n) > \rho_2$ for $n \geq k_1$. On the other side, due to (110), there exists an integer $k_2 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that

$$\max_{n \leq j < a(n, T)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{\tilde{Q}, n} > j\}} \leq \tau^2, \quad h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} \leq \delta \quad (111)$$

for $n \geq k_2$. Owing to Assumption 2.1 and (110), we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\alpha_n \zeta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\alpha_n \eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} = 0. \quad (112)$$

Since

$$\|\vartheta_n - \theta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} \leq \left(\tilde{C}_2 \alpha_n + \|\alpha_n \zeta_n\| + \|\alpha_n \eta_n\| \right) I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}}$$

for $n \geq 0$, Assumption 2.1 and (112) imply $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\vartheta_n - \theta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} = 0$. Then, (6) implies that there exists an integer $k_3 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that

$$\sum_{i=n}^{a(n, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\tau, \quad \|\vartheta_n - \theta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in \tilde{Q}\}} \leq \tau \quad (113)$$

for $n \geq k_3$.

Let $k_0 = \max\{k_1, k_2, k_3\}$. Moreover, let l_0, m_0, n_0 be the integers defined as follows. If $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., if $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n), let

$$l_0 = \min\{n > k_0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}, \quad m_0 = \min\{n > l_0 : \|\vartheta_{n-1}\| > \rho_2\}, \quad n_0 = \max\{n \leq m_0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}. \quad (114)$$

Otherwise, if $\omega \in \Lambda^c$ (i.e., if $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for finitely many n), let

$$l_0 = \max\{n > 0 : \|\theta_{n-1}\| < \rho\}, \quad m_0 = \infty, \quad n_0 = \max\{k_0, l_0\}.$$

Then, we have $k_0 < n_0 \leq m_0$ and $\theta_n = \vartheta_{n-1}$, $\rho \leq \|\theta_n\| \leq \tilde{\rho}$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$.⁴¹ Therefore,

$$c \leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \tilde{C}_2, \quad \theta_n \in \tilde{Q}, \quad \tau_{n, \tilde{Q}} \geq m_0 \quad (115)$$

for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$, while

$$\theta_j = \theta_n - \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \nabla f(\theta_i) - \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \quad (116)$$

for $n_0 \leq n < j < m_0$.

³⁹On Λ_Q , the following holds: $\sigma < \infty$ and $\theta_n = \vartheta_n$, $\tau_{Q, n} = \infty$ for $n > \sigma$. Hence, algorithm (107) asymptotically reduces to (1) on Λ_Q , while (4) holds almost surely on the same event. Therefore, Parts (ii) – (iv) of the theorem directly follow from Part (i) and Theorem 2.1.

⁴⁰If $\sigma < \infty$, then $\rho_2 < \|\theta_n\| = \|\vartheta_{n-1}\| \leq \beta(\sigma_{n-1})$ for all, but finitely many n . On the other side, if $\sigma = \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta(\sigma_n) = \infty$.

⁴¹If $\theta_n \neq \vartheta_{n-1}$, we have $\|\theta_n\| = \|\theta_0\| < \rho$. On the other side, if $\omega \in \Lambda$, then $\|\theta_n\| = \|\vartheta_{n-1}\| \leq \rho_2 = \tilde{\rho}$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$. Moreover, if $\omega \in \Lambda^c$, then $\|\theta_n\| \leq \beta(\sigma_{n-1}) \leq \beta(\sigma) = \tilde{\rho}$ for $n > 0$.

Let $\phi_n(\tau)$, $\phi_{1,n}(\tau)$, $\phi_{2,n}(\tau)$ have the same meaning as in Section 8. Now, the asymptotic properties of $\phi_n(\tau)$ are analyzed relying on similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem A1.1. Due to (111), (115), we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| + \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\eta_i\| \leq \tau^2 + \delta \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \quad (117)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j < \min\{m_0, a(n, T)\}$. Using (116), (117), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(\theta_j)\| &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \|\nabla f(\theta_j) - \nabla f(\theta_n)\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \|\theta_j - \theta_n\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 + 2\tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \end{aligned}$$

for $n_0 \leq n < j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$ (notice that $\tau < T$ and $\theta_n, \theta_j \in \tilde{Q}$ for $n_0 \leq n < j < m_0$). Then, Bellman-Gronwall inequality (see e.g., [14, Appendix B]) and (115) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(\theta_j)\| &\leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 \right) \exp \left(2\tilde{C}_2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \right) \\ &\leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 \right) (1 + \tilde{C}_3 \tau) \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_2 \tilde{C}_3 \tau + \tilde{C}_2 \tau^2 + \tilde{C}_2 \tilde{C}_3 \tau^3 \\ &\leq \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_4 \tau \end{aligned}$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$.⁴² As a result of this and (117), we get

$$\left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \tau^2 + \delta \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + \tilde{C}_4 \tau \right) \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \leq \delta \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 \quad (118)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j < \min\{m_0, a(n, \tau)\}$. Owing to (115), (116), (118), we have

$$\|\theta_j - \theta_n\| \leq \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \left(\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| + 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau \right) \left(\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i + \tau \right) \leq 4\tilde{C}_2 \tau \quad (119)$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n, \tau)\}$ (notice that $\tilde{C}_4 \tau \leq 1/2$). Consequently,

$$|\phi_{1,n}(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_2 \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i \|\theta_i - \theta_n\| \leq 4\tilde{C}_2^3 \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n,\tau)-1} \alpha_i \leq 4\tilde{C}_2^3 \tau^2$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$ (notice that $\|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \leq \tilde{C}_2$ and $\theta_n, \theta_i \in \tilde{Q}$ for $n_0 \leq n \leq i < m_0$). We also have

$$|\phi_{2,n}(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_2 \|\theta_{a(n,\tau)} - \theta_n\|^2 \leq 16\tilde{C}_2^3 \tau^2$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$ (notice that and $\theta_n, \theta_{a(n,\tau)} \in \tilde{Q}$ when $n \geq n_0$, $a(n, \tau) < m_0$). Hence,

$$|\phi_n(\tau)| \leq \tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 \quad (120)$$

⁴²Notice that $\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau < 1$ when $n \leq j \leq a(n, \tau)$. Notice also that $\exp(2\tilde{C}_2 \tau) \leq 2\tilde{C}_2 \tau \exp(2\tilde{C}_2 \tau) \leq \tilde{C}_3 \tau$.

when $n \geq n_0$, $a(n, \tau) < m_0$. On the other side, (113), (115), (118) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n, \tau)-1} \alpha_i - \left\| \sum_{i=n}^{a(n, \tau)-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| &\geq (1 - \delta - \varepsilon) \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| - 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 \\ &= 4\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| - 2\tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$.⁴³ Then, (32), (115), (120) imply

$$f(\theta_{a(n, \tau)}) - f(\theta_n) \leq -2\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 + \tilde{C}_4 \tau^2 \leq -\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 \leq -\varepsilon \tau c^2 \quad (121)$$

for $n \geq n_0$ satisfying $a(n, \tau) < m_0$ (notice that $\varepsilon \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|^2 \geq \varepsilon c^2 \geq \tilde{C}_4 \tau$ when $n_0 \leq n < m_0$).

Let $\{n_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence recursively defined by $n_{k+1} = a(n_k, \tau)$ for $k \geq 0$. As in the proof of Theorem A1.1, we now show by contradiction $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n). We assume the opposite. Then, $m_0 = \infty$ and $\theta_n = \vartheta_n$, while (121) yields $f(\theta_{n_{k+1}}) - f(\theta_{n_k}) \leq -\varepsilon \tau c^2$ for $k \geq 0$. Hence, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(\theta_{n_k}) = -\infty$. However, this is impossible due to Assumption A1.3. Thus, $\omega \in \Lambda$ (i.e., $\|\theta_n\| < \rho$ for infinitely many n). Therefore, m_0, n_0 are defined through (114), while $\|\theta_{n_0-1}\| < \rho$, $\|\vartheta_{m_0-1}\| > \rho_2$. Combining this with (113), we conclude $\|\vartheta_{n_0-1} - \theta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \tau \leq 1/2$. Consequently,

$$\|\vartheta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \|\theta_{n_0-1}\| + \|\vartheta_{n_0-1} - \theta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \rho + 1/2 < \rho_2. \quad (122)$$

Hence, $n_0 < m_0$, $f(\theta_{n_0}) \leq \tilde{C}_1$ (notice that $\|\theta_{n_0}\| = \|\vartheta_{n_0-1}\| \leq \rho + 1$).

Let i_0, j_0 be the integers defined by $j_0 = \max\{j \geq 0 : n_j < m_0\}$, $i_0 = n_{j_0}$. Then, we have $n_0 \leq i_0 = n_{j_0} < m_0 \leq a(i_0, \tau) = n_{j_0+1}$. Combining this with (113), (119), we get

$$\|\vartheta_{m_0-1} - \theta_{m_0-1}\| \leq \tau \leq 1/2, \quad \|\theta_{i_0} - \theta_{m_0-1}\| \leq 4\tilde{C}_2 \tau \leq 1/2.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\theta_{i_0}\| \geq \|\vartheta_{m_0-1}\| - \|\vartheta_{m_0} - \theta_{m_0-1}\| - \|\theta_{i_0} - \theta_{m_0-1}\| > \rho_2 - 1 = \rho_1. \quad (123)$$

Let $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\theta_0(\cdot)$ have the same meaning as in Section 7. As in the proof of Theorem A1.1, we now show by contradiction that $\gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \geq T$. We assume the opposite. Then, (116), (117), (122) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \|\theta_0(t)\| = \|\theta_j\| &\leq \|\theta_{n_0}\| + \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| + \left\| \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \xi_i \right\| \\ &\leq \|\theta_{n_0}\| + \tau^2 + 2 \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| \\ &\leq \rho + 1 + 2 \sum_{i=n_0}^{j-1} \alpha_i \phi(\|\theta_i\|) \\ &\leq \rho + 1 + 2 \int_{\gamma_{n_0}}^t \phi(\|\theta_0(s)\|) ds \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

for $t \in [\gamma_j, \gamma_{j+1})$, $n_0 \leq j \leq i_0$.⁴⁴ Owing to the comparison principle (see [30, Section 3.4]) and (93), (124), we have $\|\theta_0(t)\| \leq \lambda(t - \gamma_{n_0}; \rho + 1) \leq \rho_1$ for all $t \in [\gamma_{n_0}, \gamma_{i_0}]$. Thus, $\|\theta_{i_0}\| = \|\theta_0(\gamma_{i_0})\| \leq \rho_1$. However, this is impossible, due to (123). Hence, $\gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \geq T$. Consequently,

$$T \leq \gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} = \sum_{j=0}^{j_0-1} (\gamma_{n_{j+1}} - \gamma_{n_j}) \leq j_0 \tau \quad (125)$$

⁴³Notice that $1 - \delta = 5\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon c \geq \tilde{C}_4 \tau$. Notice also that $\varepsilon \tau \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\| \geq \varepsilon \tau c \geq \tilde{C}_4 \tau^2$ for $n_0 \leq n < m_0$.

⁴⁴Since $j \leq i_0 < m_0$, we have $\gamma_j - \gamma_{n_0} \leq \gamma_{i_0} - \gamma_{n_0} \leq T$ and $j \leq \min\{m_0 - 1, a(n_0, T)\}$. We also have $\tau^2 \leq 1/2$.

(notice that $n_{j_0} = i_0$, $\gamma_{n_{j+1}} - \gamma_{n_j} = \sum_{i=n_j}^{n_{j+1}-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau$).

Due to (121), we have $f(\theta_{n_{j+1}}) - f(\theta_{n_j}) \leq -\varepsilon\tau c^2$ for $0 \leq j \leq j_0$. Then, (125) implies

$$f(\theta_{i_0}) = f(\theta_{n_{j_0}}) \leq f(\theta_{n_0}) - j_0\varepsilon\tau c^2 \leq \tilde{C}_1 - \varepsilon c^2 T \leq -\tilde{C}_1.$$

However, this is impossible, since $f(\theta) > -\tilde{C}_1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$. Hence, $\|\theta_n\| > \rho_2$ for finitely many n . \square

Appendix 2

In this section, a global version of Theorem 3.1 is presented. It is also shown how Theorem 3.1 can be extended to the randomly projected stochastic gradient search with Markovian dynamics. The results provided in this section can be considered as a combination of Theorems A1.1, A1.2 (Appendix 1) with Theorem 3.1 (Section 3).

First, the stability and the global asymptotic behavior of algorithm (15) are studied. To analyze these properties, we use the following two assumptions.

Assumption A2.1. *There exists a Borel-measurable function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\|F(\theta, z)\|, \|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} &\leq \varphi(z)(\|\nabla f(\theta)\| + 1), \\ \|(\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| &\leq \varphi(z)\|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. In addition to this,

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} E(\varphi^2(Z_n) | \theta_0 = \theta, Z_0 = z) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$.

Assumption A2.2. $\eta_n = \eta(\theta_n)$ for $n \geq 0$, where $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is a continuous function. Moreover, there exists a real number $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq \delta\|\nabla f(\theta)\|$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \geq \rho$ (ρ is specified in Assumption A1.1).

Assumption A2.1 is a global version of Assumption 3.3. In a similar form, it is involved in the stability analysis of stochastic approximation carried out in [9, Section II.1.9]. On the other side, Assumption A2.2 is related to the bias of the gradient estimator. It requires the bias $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ to be a deterministic function of the algorithm iterates $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. As demonstrated in Sections 4 – 6, this is often satisfied in practice. Assumption A2.2 can be considered as one of the weakest conditions under which the stability of the perturbed ODE $d\theta/dt = -(\nabla f(\theta) + \eta(\theta))$ can be shown.

Our results on the stability and asymptotic bias of algorithm (15) are provided in the next theorem.

Theorem A2.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, A1.1, A2.1 and A2.2 hold. Then, the following is true:*

- (i) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.a, Part (i) of Theorem A1.1 holds.*
- (ii) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.b, Part (ii) of Theorem A1.1 holds.*
- (iii) *If $f(\cdot)$ (specified in Assumption 3.2) satisfies Assumption 2.3.c, Part (iii) of Theorem A1.1 holds.*

Proof. Let $g(\cdot)$, $h(\cdot)$ be the functions defined in Assumption A1.2. Then, due to Assumption A2.2, $g(\theta)\eta(\theta)$ is uniformly bounded in $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, while $h(\theta)\eta(\theta) \leq \delta$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \geq \rho$. Let $C \in [1, \infty)$ stand for a (global) Lipschitz constant of $\nabla f(\cdot)$ and for an (global) upper bound of $g(\cdot)\eta(\cdot)$. Define $\tau = 1/(18C^2)$ and let $\{\zeta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\zeta_{1,n}\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\zeta_{2,n}\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\zeta_{3,n}\}_{n \geq 0}$ have the same meaning as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, while τ_n is the stopping time defined by

$$\tau_n = \min\{j \geq n : g(\theta_n)g^{-1}(\theta_j) > 3\} \cup \{\infty\}$$

for $n \geq 0$. Finally, for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, let $E_{\theta,z}(\cdot)$ denote the conditional mean given $\theta_0 = \theta$, $Z_0 = z$.

As a direct consequence of Assumptions 3.1, A2.1, we get

$$E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 \varphi^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. We also have

$$g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_n\| \leq \varphi(Z_{n+1}) + 1 \leq 2\varphi(Z_{n+1})$$

for $n \geq 0$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \varphi(Z_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_n\| = 0 \quad (126)$$

almost surely.

Let $\{m_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the sequence recursively defined by $m_0 = 0$ and $m_{k+1} = a(m_k, \tau)$ for $k \geq 0$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\theta_0, Z_0, \dots, \theta_n, Z_n\}$ for $n \geq 0$. Due to Assumption 3.2, we have

$$E_{\theta,z} (g(\theta_n) \zeta_{1,j} I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} | \mathcal{F}_j) = g(\theta_n) \left(E_{\theta,z} (\tilde{F}(\theta_j, Z_{j+1}) | \mathcal{F}_j) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta_j, Z_j) \right) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} = 0$$

almost surely for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $0 \leq n \leq j$ (notice that $\{\tau_n > j\}$ is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_j). Moreover, Assumption A2.1 implies

$$g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{1,j}\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \leq g(\theta_n) g^{-1}(\theta_j) (\varphi(Z_j) + \varphi(Z_{j+1})) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \leq 3(\varphi(Z_j) + \varphi(Z_{j+1}))$$

for $0 \leq n \leq j$. Then, as a result of Doob inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta,z} \left(\max_{n < j < a(n, \tau)} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i g(\theta_n) \zeta_{1,i} \right\|^2 I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \right) &\leq E_{\theta,z} \left(\max_{n < j < a(n, \tau)} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i g(\theta_n) \zeta_{1,i} I_{\{\tau_n > i\}} \right\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{i=n+1}^{a(n, \tau)-1} \alpha_i^2 g^2(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{1,i}\|^2 I_{\{\tau_n > i\}} \right) \\ &\leq 72E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{i=n+1}^{a(n, \tau)} \alpha_i^2 (\varphi^2(Z_i) + \varphi^2(Z_{i+1})) \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $n \geq 0$. Combining this with Assumptions 3.1, A2.1, we deduce

$$E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g^2(\theta_{m_k}) \max_{m_k < j < m_{k+1}} \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} \right\|^2 I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} \right) \leq 72E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \varphi^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $n \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_{m_k}) \max_{m_k < j < m_{k+1}} \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} = 0 \quad (127)$$

almost surely.

Since $\alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} = O(\alpha_n^2)$, $\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1} = O(\alpha_n^2)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see the proof of Theorem 3.1), Assumptions 3.1, A2.1 yield

$$E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} \varphi^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty, \quad E_{\theta,z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}| \varphi^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. Additionally, due to Assumptions A2.1, A2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{2,j}\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} &\leq g(\theta_n) \varphi(Z_j) \|\theta_j - \theta_{j-1}\| I_{\{\tau_n > j-1\}} \\ &\leq \alpha_{j-1} g(\theta_n) \varphi(Z_j) (\|F(\theta_{j-1}, Z_j)\| + \|\eta_{j-1}\|) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \\ &\leq \alpha_{j-1} g(\theta_n) g^{-1}(\theta_{j-1}) \varphi(Z_j) (\varphi(Z_j) + C) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \\ &\leq 6C \alpha_{j-1} \varphi^2(Z_j) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n < j$ (notice that $\varphi(z) \geq 1$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$). We also have

$$g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{3,j}\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \leq g(\theta_n) g^{-1}(\theta_j) \varphi(Z_{j+1}) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \leq 3\varphi(Z_{j+1}) \leq 3\varphi^2(Z_{j+1})$$

for $0 \leq n \leq j$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\theta_n) \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} &\leq \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{2,i}\| I_{\{\tau_n > i\}} \leq 6C \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \alpha_{i+1} \varphi^2(Z_{i+1}), \\ g(\theta_n) \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} &\leq \sum_{i=n+1}^j |\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}| g(\theta_n) \|\zeta_{3,i}\| I_{\{\tau_n > i\}} \leq 3 \sum_{i=n+1}^j |\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}| \varphi^2(Z_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n < j$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \max_{j > n} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \max_{j > n} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} = 0 \quad (128)$$

almost surely (notice that $\alpha_{j+1}/\alpha_j = O(1)$ for $j \rightarrow \infty$). Moreover, (126) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \max_{j \geq n} \alpha_{j+1} \|\zeta_{3,j}\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} = 0 \quad (129)$$

almost surely. Combining (126) – (129) with (48), we deduce

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_{n_k}) \max_{m_k \leq j < m_{k+1}} \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} = 0 \quad (130)$$

almost surely.

Owing to Assumptions A1.1, A2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\theta_{j+1}) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} &\leq g^{-1}(\theta_n) + \|\nabla f(\theta_{j+1}) - \nabla f(\theta_n)\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \\ &\leq g^{-1}(\theta_n) + C \|\theta_{j+1} - \theta_n\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \\ &\leq g^{-1}(\theta_n) + C \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} + C \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} + C \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \|\eta_i\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \\ &\leq g^{-1}(\theta_n) + C \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} + 2C^2 \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i g^{-1}(\theta_i) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n \leq j$ (notice that $\|\eta(\theta)\| \leq Cg^{-1}(\theta)$ for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$). Combining this with Bellman-Gronwall inequality (see e.g., [14, Appendix B]), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\theta_{j+1}) I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} &\leq \left(g^{-1}(\theta_n) + C \max_{n \leq j < a(n, \tau)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \right) \exp \left(2C^2 \sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \right) \\ &\leq 2g^{-1}(\theta_n) \left(1 + Cg(\theta_n) \max_{n \leq j < a(n, \tau)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_n > j\}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n \leq j \leq a(n, \tau)$.⁴⁵ Then, (130) yields

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_{m_k}) \max_{m_k \leq j < m_{k+1}} g^{-1}(\theta_{j+1}) I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} \leq 2 \quad (131)$$

almost surely.

Let N_0 be the event where (130) or (131) does not hold. Then, in order to prove the theorem's assertion, it is sufficient to show that (91), (92) are satisfied on N_0^c for any $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let ω be any sample in N_0^c , while $t \in (0, \infty)$ is any real number. Notice that all formula which follow in the proof correspond to ω .

⁴⁵Notice that $\sum_{i=n}^{j-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau$ for $n \leq j \leq a(n, \tau)$. Notice also that $\exp(2C^2\tau) \leq \exp(1/2) \leq 2$.

Due to Assumption A2.2, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| \leq C < \infty, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| \leq \delta < 1.$$

Moreover, Assumption 3.1 and (6), (131) imply that there exists an integer $k_0 \geq 0$ (depending on ω) such that

$$\sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \alpha_i \geq \tau/2, \quad g(\theta_{m_k}) \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} \leq \tau, \quad g(\theta_{m_k}) g^{-1}(\theta_{j+1}) I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} \leq 3 \quad (132)$$

for $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq j < m_{k+1}$. As $\tau_n > n$ for $n \geq 0$, we conclude $\tau_{m_k} > m_{k+1}$ for $k \geq k_0$.⁴⁶ Consequently, $I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} = 1$ for $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq j \leq m_{k+1}$. Combining this with (132), we get $g(\theta_{m_k}) \leq 3g(\theta_{j+1})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\theta_{j+1}) &\geq g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) - \|\nabla f(\theta_{j+1}) - \nabla f(\theta_n)\| \\ &\geq g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) - C \|\theta_{j+1} - \theta_n\| \\ &\geq g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) - C \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \|\nabla f(\theta_i)\| - C \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| - C \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \|\eta_i\| \\ &\geq g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) - 2C^2 \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i g^{-1}(\theta_i) - C \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \\ &\geq g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) (1 - 6C^2\tau - C\tau) \\ &\geq 3^{-1} g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) \end{aligned} \quad (133)$$

for $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq j < m_{k+1}$.⁴⁷ Hence, $3^{-1}g(\theta_{m_k}) \leq g(\theta_j) \leq 3g(\theta_{m_k})$ for $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq j \leq m_{k+1}$.

Let $n_0 = m_{k_0}$, while $k(n) = \max\{k \geq 0 : m_k \leq n\}$, $m(n) = m_{k(n)}$ for $n \geq 0$. Then, (133) implies $g(\theta_n) \leq 3g(\theta_{m(n)})$, $g(\theta_{m_k}) \leq 3g(\theta_{m_{k+1}})$ for $n \geq n_0$, $k \geq k_0$ (notice that $k(n) \geq k_0$, $m_{k(n)} \leq n < m_{k(n)+1}$ when $n \geq n_0$). Hence, $g(\theta_n) \leq C_{n,k} g(\theta_{m_k})$ for $n \geq n_0$, $k \geq m(n)$, where $C_{n,k} = 3^{k-k(n)+1}$.⁴⁸ Since

$$2^{-1}(k(j) - k(n))\tau \leq \sum_{k=k(n)+1}^{k(j)} \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \leq t$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq a(n, \tau)$, we conclude $k(j) - k(n) \leq 2t/\tau$ for the same n, j . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\theta_n) \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| &= g(\theta_n) \left\| \sum_{k=k(n)}^{k(j)} \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \alpha_i \zeta_i - \sum_{i=m(n)}^{n-1} \alpha_i \zeta_i + \sum_{i=m(j)}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=k(n)}^{k(j)-1} C_{n,k} g(\theta_{m_k}) \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| + C_{n,k(n)} g(\theta_{m(n)}) \left\| \sum_{i=m(n)}^{n-1} \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \\ &\quad + C_{n,k(j)} g(\theta_{m(j)}) \left\| \sum_{i=m(j)}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \\ &\leq C(t) \max_{\substack{m_k \leq l < m_{k+1} \\ k(n) \leq k}} g(\theta_{m_k}) \left\| \sum_{i=m_k}^l \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| \end{aligned}$$

for $n_0 \leq n \leq j \leq a(n, t)$,⁴⁹ where $C(t) = (2t/\tau + 3)3^{2t/\tau+3}$. Since $\tau_{m_k} > m_{k+1}$ for $k \geq k_0$ (i.e., $I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j\}} = 1$

⁴⁶If $\tau_{m_k} \leq m_{k+1}$, then $\tau_{m_k} = j$ and $g(\theta_{m_k})g^{-1}(\theta_j)I_{\{\tau_{m_k} > j-1\}} = g(\theta_{m_k})g^{-1}(\theta_j) > 3$ for some j satisfying $m_k < j \leq m_{k+1}$.

⁴⁷Notice that $g^{-1}(\theta_i) \leq 3g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k})$, $\sum_{i=m_k}^{m_{k+1}-1} \alpha_i \leq \tau$ when $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq i < m_{k+1}$. Notice also that $6C^2\tau = 1/3$, $C\tau \leq 1/3$.

⁴⁸ Notice that $g(\theta_n)g^{-1}(\theta_{m(n)}) \leq 3$, $g(\theta_{m(n)})g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}) \leq 3^{k-k(n)}$ when $n \geq n_0$, $k \geq m(n)$. Notice also $g(\theta_n) = (g(\theta_n)g^{-1}(\theta_{m(n)}))(g(\theta_{m(n)})g^{-1}(\theta_{m_k}))g(\theta_{m_k})$.

⁴⁹Here, the following convention is used: If the lower limit of a sum is (strictly) greater than the upper limit, then the sum is zero.

for $k \geq k_0$, $m_k \leq j \leq m_{k+1}$), (130) implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta_n) \max_{n \leq j < a(n,t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| = 0$$

(notice that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k(n) = \infty$). Hence, (91), (92) hold. \square

In the rest of the section, Theorem 3.1 is extended to randomly projected stochastic gradient algorithms with Markovian dynamics. These algorithms are defined by the following difference equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta_n &= \theta_n - \alpha_n (F(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) + \eta_n), \\ \theta_{n+1} &= \vartheta_n I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| \leq \beta_{\sigma_n}\}} + \theta_0 I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| > \beta_{\sigma_n}\}}, \\ \sigma_{n+1} &= \sigma_n + I_{\{\|\vartheta_n\| > \beta_{\sigma_n}\}}, \quad n \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

Here, $H(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{Z_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\eta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ have the same meaning as in Section 3, while θ_0 , $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ have the same meaning as in the case of recursion (107).

To analyze the asymptotic behavior of (134), we use the following two assumptions.

Assumption A2.3. For any compact set $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, there exists a Borel-measurable function $\varphi_Q : \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\|F(\theta, z)\|, \|\tilde{F}(\theta, z)\|, \|(\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta, z)\|\} &\leq \varphi_Q(z), \\ \|(\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta', z) - (\Pi\tilde{F})(\theta'', z)\| &\leq \varphi_Q(z)\|\theta' - \theta''\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\theta, \theta', \theta'' \in Q$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. In addition to this,

$$\sup_{n \geq 0} E(\varphi_Q^2(Z_n) | \theta_0 = \theta, Z_0 = z) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$.

Assumption A2.4. $\eta_n = \eta(\theta_n)$ for $n \geq 0$, where $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ is a continuous function. Moreover, $\|\eta(\theta)\| < \|\nabla f(\theta)\|$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ satisfying $\|\theta\| \geq \rho$ (ρ is specified in Assumption A1.3).

In a similar form, Assumptions A2.3 and A2.4 are involved in the analysis of randomly projected stochastic approximation carried out in [48].

Our result on the asymptotic behavior of algorithm (134) are provided in the next theorem.

Theorem A2.2. Let $\{\theta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be generated by recursion (134). Suppose that Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, A1.3, A2.3 and A2.4 hold. Then, all conclusions of Theorem A1.2 are true.

Proof. Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ be any compact set, while $t \in (0, \infty)$ is any real number. Moreover, let $C_Q \in [1, \infty)$ be an upper bound of $\|\nabla f(\cdot)\|$, $\|\eta(\cdot)\|$ on Q . In order to prove the theorem's assertion, it is sufficient to show that (108), (108) hold almost surely.

Due to Assumption A2.4, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq C_Q < \infty, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\theta_n) \|\eta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq \delta_Q < 1$$

almost surely ($h(\cdot)$ is specified in Assumption A1.4). On the other side, Assumptions 3.1, A2.3 imply

$$E_{\theta, z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. Assumption A2.3 also yields

$$\|\zeta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq (\|F(\theta_n, Z_{n+1})\| + \|\nabla f(\theta_n)\|) I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1}) + C_Q \leq 2C_Q \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1})$$

for $n \geq 0$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n \|\zeta_n\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} = 0 \quad (135)$$

almost surely.

Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\theta_0, Z_0, \dots, \theta_n, Z_n\}$ for $n \geq 0$. Owing to Assumption 3.2, we have

$$E_{\theta, z}(\zeta_{1,n} I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} | \mathcal{F}_n) = (E_{\theta, z}(\tilde{F}(\theta_n, Z_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n) - (\Pi \tilde{F})(\theta_n, Z_n)) I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} = 0$$

almost surely for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$, $n \geq 0$. On the other side, Assumption A2.3 implies

$$\|\zeta_{1,n}\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq \varphi_Q(Z_n) + \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1})$$

for $n \geq 0$. Combining this with Assumptions 3.1, A2.3, we get

$$E_{\theta, z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^2 \|\zeta_{1,n}\|^2 I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \right) \leq 2E_{\theta, z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n^2 + \alpha_{n+1}^2) \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. Then, using Doob theorem, we conclude that $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \zeta_{1,n} I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}}$ converges almost surely. Since

$$\left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} I_{\{\theta_i \in Q\}} \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}}$$

for $0 \leq n \leq j$ (notice that $\theta_i \in Q$ for $n \leq i < \tau_{Q,n}$), we deduce

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{j \geq n} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} = 0 \quad (136)$$

almost surely.

As $\alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} = O(\alpha_n^2)$, $\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1} = O(\alpha_n^2)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$ (see the proof of Theorem 3.1), Assumptions 3.1, A2.3 yield

$$E_{\theta, z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty, \quad E_{\theta, z} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1}| \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1}) \right) < \infty$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. On the other side, owing to Assumptions A2.3, A2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\zeta_{2,j}\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} &\leq \varphi_Q(Z_j) \|\theta_j - \theta_{j-1}\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} \\ &\leq \alpha_{j-1} \varphi(Z_j) (\|F(\theta_{j-1}, Z_j)\| + \|\eta_{j-1}\|) I_{\{\theta_{j-1} \in Q\}} \\ &\leq \alpha_{j-1} \varphi_Q(Z_j) (\varphi_Q(Z_j) + C_Q) \\ &\leq 2C_Q \alpha_{j-1} \varphi_Q^2(Z_j) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n < j$ (notice that $\varphi_Q(z) \geq 1$ for any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$). We also have

$$\|\zeta_{3,n}\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \leq \varphi_Q(Z_{n+1}) \leq \varphi_Q^2(Z_{n+1})$$

for $n \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} &\leq \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \|\zeta_{2,i}\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > i\}} \leq 2C_Q \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \alpha_{i+1} \varphi_Q^2(Z_{i+1}), \\ \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} &\leq \sum_{i=n+1}^j |\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}| \|\zeta_{3,i}\| I_{\{\theta_i \in Q\}} \leq \sum_{i=n+1}^j |\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}| \varphi_Q^2(Z_{i+1}) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n < j$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{j > n} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{j > n} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} = 0 \quad (137)$$

almost surely. On the other side, (135) yields

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_{n+1} \|\zeta_{3,n}\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} = 0 \quad (138)$$

almost surely.

Since $\theta_i = \vartheta_{i-1}$ for $n \leq i < \tau_{Q,n}$, Assumption 3.2 and (48) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} &= \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} + \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} - \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} - \alpha_{j+1} \zeta_{3,j} + \alpha_{n+1} \zeta_{3,n} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{1,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} + \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j \alpha_i \zeta_{2,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} + \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^j (\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}) \zeta_{3,i} \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} \\ &\quad + \alpha_{j+1} \|\zeta_{3,j}\| I_{\{\theta_j \in Q\}} + \alpha_{n+1} \|\zeta_{3,n}\| I_{\{\theta_n \in Q\}} \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq n < j$. Combining this with (135) – (138), we deduce

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{n \leq j < a(n,t)} \left\| \sum_{i=n}^j \alpha_i \zeta_i \right\| I_{\{\tau_{Q,n} > j\}} = 0$$

almost surely. Thus, (108), (109) hold almost surely. \square

References

- [1] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, and V. B. Tadić, *On-line parameter estimation in general state-space models*, IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2005.
- [2] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, S. S. Singh, and V. B. Tadić, *Particle Methods for Change Detection, System Identification, and Control*, Proceedings of IEEE, 92 (2004), pp. 423 – 438.
- [3] J.-P. Aubin and A. Celina, *Differential Inclusions*, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [4] J. Baxter and P. Bartlett, *Infinite-horizon policy-gradient estimation*, Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 15 (2001) pp. 319 – 350.
- [5] M. Benaïm, *A dynamical system approach to stochastic approximations*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 34 (1996), pp. 437 – 472.
- [6] M. Benaïm, *Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms*, in *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1709 (1999), pp. 1 – 68.
- [7] M. Benaïm, J. Hofbauer, and S. Sorin, *Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 44 (2005), pp. 328 – 348.
- [8] M. Benaïm, J. Hofbauer, and S. Sorin, *Perturbations of set-valued dynamical systems with applications to game theory*, Dynamics, Games and Applications, 2 (2012), pp. 195 – 205.
- [9] A. Benveniste, M. Metivier, and P. Priouret, *Adaptive Algorithms and Stochastic Approximations*, Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [10] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Neuro-Dynamic Programming*, Athena Scientific, 1996.

- [11] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *Gradient convergence in gradient methods with errors*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 10 (2000), pp. 627 – 642.
- [12] E. Bierstone and P. D. Milman, *Semianalytic and subanalytic sets*, Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, Publications Mathématiques, 67 (1988), pp. 5 – 42.
- [13] V. S. Borkar and S. P. Meyn, *The ODE method for convergence of stochastic approximation and reinforcement learning*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 38 (2000), pp. 447 – 469.
- [14] V. S. Borkar, *Stochastic Approximation: A Dynamical Systems Viewpoint*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [15] X.-R. Cao, *Stochastic Learning and Optimization*, Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [16] O. Cappe, E. Moulines, and T. Ryden, *Inference in Hidden Markov Models*, Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [17] O. Cappe, A. Guillin, J.-M. Marin, and C. P. Robert, *Population Monte Carlo*, Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics, 13 (2004), pp. 907 – 929.
- [18] O. Cappe, R. Douc, A. Guillin, J.-M. Marin, and C. P. Robert, *Adaptive importance sampling in general mixture classes*, Statistics and Computing, 18 (2008), pp. 447 – 459.
- [19] H.-F. Chen, L. Guo, and A.-J. Gao, *Convergence and robustness of the Robbins-Monro algorithm truncated at randomly varying bounds*, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications, 27 (1988), pp. 217 – 231.
- [20] H.-F. Chen, A.-J. Gao, *Robustness analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms*, Stochastics and Stochastics Reports, 26 (1989), pp. 3 – 20.
- [21] H.-F. Chen, *Stochastic Approximation and Its Application*, Kluwer, 2002.
- [22] C. G. Cassandras and S. Lafortune, *Introduction to Discrete Event Systems*, 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, 2008.
- [23] A. Cichocki and S. Amari, *Adaptive Blind Signal and Image Processing: Learning Algorithms and Applications*, Wiley, 2002.
- [24] R. Douc, A. Guillin, J.-M. Marin, and C. P. Robert, *Convergence of adaptive mixtures of importance sampling schemes*, Annals of Statistics, 35 (2007), pp. 420 – 448.
- [25] A. Doucet, N. de Freitas and N. Gordon (Eds.), *Sequential Monte Carlo Methods in Practice*, Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [26] A. Doucet and V. B. Tadić, *Parameter estimation in general state-space models using particle methods*, Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics, 55 (2003), pp. 409 – 422.
- [27] S. G. Henderson, S. P. Meyn and V. B. Tadić, *Performance evaluation and policy selection in multiclass networks*, Discrete Event Dynamic Systems, 13 (2003), pp. 149 – 189.
- [28] M. Hurley, *Chain recurrence, semiflows, and gradients*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 7 (1995), pp. 437 – 435.
- [29] N. Kantas, A. Doucet, S.S. Singh, and J.M. Maciejowski, *An Overview of sequential Monte Carlo methods for parameter estimation in general state-space models*, IFAC Symposium on System Identification, 2009.
- [30] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*, 3rd edition, Prentice Hall, 2002.
- [31] V. R. Konda and J. N. Tsitsiklis, *On actor-critic algorithms*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 42 (2003), pp. 1143 – 1166.
- [32] K. Kurdyka, *On gradients of functions definable in o-minimal structures*, Annales de l’Institut Fourier (Grenoble), 48 (1998), pp. 769 – 783.

- [33] H. J. Kushner and G. G. Yin, *Stochastic Approximation and Recursive Algorithms and Applications*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [34] L. Ljung, *System Identification: Theory for the User*, 2nd edition, Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [35] S. Łojasiewicz, *Sur le problème de la division*, *Studia Mathematica*, 18 (1959), pp. 87 – 136.
- [36] S. Łojasiewicz, *Sur la géométrie semi- et sous-analytique*, *Annales de l’Institut Fourier (Grenoble)*, 43 (1993), pp. 1575 – 1595.
- [37] M. Metivier and P. Priouret, *Applications of a Kushner-Clark lemma to general classes of stochastic algorithms*, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 30 (1984), pp. 140 – 151.
- [38] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*, 2nd Edition, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [39] G. Ch. Pflug, *Optimization of Stochastic Models: The Interface Between Simulation and Optimization*, Kluwer 1996.
- [40] G. Poyiadjis, A. Doucet, and S. S. Singh, *Particle approximations of the score and observed information matrix in state space models with application to parameter estimation*, *Biometrika*, 98 (2011), pp. 65 – 80.
- [41] W. B. Powell, *Approximate Dynamic Programming: Solving the Curses of Dimensionality*, Wiley, 2007.
- [42] C. P. Robert and G. Casella, *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*, 2nd edition, Springer Verlag, 2004.
- [43] R. Y. Rubinstein and A. Shapiro, *Discrete Event Systems: Sensitivity Analysis and Stochastic Optimization*, Wiley, 1993.
- [44] R. Y. Rubinstein and D. P. Kroese, *Simulation and the Monte Carlo Methods*, 2nd Edition, Wiley, 2007.
- [45] T. Ryden, *Consistent and asymptotically normal parameter estimates for hidden Markov models*, *Annals of Statistics*, 22 (1994), pp. 1884 – 1895.
- [46] T. Ryden, *On recursive estimation for hidden Markov models*, *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 66 (1997), pp. 79 – 96.
- [47] J. C. Spall, *Introduction to Stochastic Search and Optimization*, Wiley, 2003.
- [48] V. B. Tadić, *Stochastic approximation with random truncations, state-dependent noise and discontinuous dynamics*, *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, 64 (1998), pp. 283 – 326.
- [49] V. B. Tadić and A. Doucet, *Exponential forgetting and geometric ergodicity for optimal filtering in general state-space models*, *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 115 (2005), pp. 1408 – 1436.
- [50] V. B. Tadić, *Analyticity, convergence and convergence rate of recursive maximum likelihood estimation in hidden Markov models*, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56 (2010), pp. 6406 – 6432.
- [51] V. B. Tadić, *Convergence and convergence rate of stochastic gradient search in the case of multiple and non-isolated extrema*, *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 125 (2015), pp. 1715 – 1755 (an extended version is available at [arXiv.org](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.1020) as [arXiv:0907.1020](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.1020)).
- [52] V. B. Tadić and A. Doucet, *Asymptotic properties of recursive maximum likelihood estimation in non-linear/non-Gaussian state-space models*, in preparation.
- [53] Y. Yomdin, *The geometry of critical and near critical values of differentiable mappings*, *Mathematische Annalen*, 264 (1983), pp. 495 – 515.