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Large deviations for additive path functionals of stochastic processes have attracted significant research interest, in particular in the context of stochastic particle systems and statistical physics. Efficient numerical ‘cloning’ algorithms have been developed to estimate the scaled cumulant generating function, based on importance sampling via cloning of rare event trajectories. So far, attempts to study the convergence properties of these algorithms in continuous time have led to only partial results for particular cases. Adapting previous results from the literature of particle filters and sequential Monte Carlo methods, we establish a first comprehensive and fully rigorous approach to bound systematic and random errors of cloning algorithms in continuous time. To this end we develop a method to compare different algorithms for particular classes of observables, based on the martingale characterization of stochastic processes. Our results apply to a large class of jump processes on compact state space, and do not involve any time discretization in contrast to previous approaches. This provides a robust and rigorous framework that can also be used to evaluate and improve the efficiency of algorithms.

1. Introduction. Cloning algorithms have been introduced to the theoretical physics literature [1, 2] as numerical methods to study large deviations of particle currents and other dynamic observables in stochastic particle systems. They combine importance sampling with a stochastic selection mechanism which is used to evaluate numerically the scaled cumulant generating function for time-additive path functionals of stochastic processes. Based on classical ideas of evolutionary algorithms [3, 4], a fixed size population of copies of the original system evolves in parallel, subject to cloning or killing in such a way as to favor the realization of atypical trajectories contributing to rare events. Various variants of the approach are now applied on a regular basis to different systems and large deviation phenomena of interest [5–7], including also current fluctuations of non-equilibrium lattice gas models [6, 8–10], glassy dynamics [11] and heat waves in climate models [12]. Due to its widespread applications, the mathematical justification and convergence properties of the algorithm have recently become a subject of research interest with only partial progress. Formal approaches so far are based on a branching process interpretation of the algorithm in discrete time [13], with limited and mostly numerical results in continuous time [14–17].

†This work was supported by The Alan Turing Institute under the EPSRC grant EP/N510129/1 and the Lloyd’s Register Foundation–Alan Turing Institute Programme on Data-Centric Engineering; AMJ was partially supported by EPSRC grant EP/R034710/1.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 65C35, 60F25, 62L20; secondary 60F10, 60J75, 60K35

Keywords and phrases: cloning algorithm, dynamic large deviations, interacting particle systems, Lp convergence, Feynman-Kac formulae, jump processes
In this paper, we provide a novel interpretation of the cloning algorithm through Feynman-Kac models and their particle approximations (see [18–21] for comprehensive reviews), which is itself an established approach to understanding sequential Monte Carlo methods and particle filtering. Previous results provide rigorous control on convergence properties and error bounds of particle filters and related algorithms, mostly for models in discrete time, beginning with the chain of research initiated by [22] with a good recent survey provided in [20]. Fewer results address continuous-time dynamics, dating back to [23] in the filtering context, with a Feynman-Kac-based treatment provided by [18] and references therein; a good survey of the filtering literature is provided by [24, Chapter 9]. In the current context, particularly relevant recent works include [25–28]. This literature generally considers diffusive dynamics and relies upon approximative time-discretisations of those dynamics. Adapting those results to the context of jump processes on compact state spaces, for which exact simulation from the dynamics is possible, we can establish first rigorous convergence results for the cloning algorithm in continuous time including $L^p$ bounds on the random error and bounds on the systematic error. These bounds include the explicit dependence on the clone size distribution, which is the main important parameter of the cloning algorithm. The setting of finite activity pure jump processes in which cloning algorithms are mostly allows these algorithms to avoid time discretisation by simulating exactly from the law of the underlying process and allows the use of different approximating particle systems. Similar methods have been previously employed in the probabilistic rare event analysis literature in both discrete and continuous time, via explicit Feynman-Kac approximations, e.g. [29], and splitting algorithms (see [30] and references therein); however, both the underlying processes and approximations considered are quite different to those for which cloning algorithms are usually employed. Practically, an important contribution of our approach is a systematic method to compare different cloning algorithms and particle approximations for particular classes of observables of interest, based on the martingale characterization of continuous-time stochastic processes.

This framework provides a novel perspective on the underlying structure of cloning algorithms in terms of McKean representations [20, Section 1.2.2], and can be used to systematically explore several degrees of freedom in the design of algorithms that can be used to improve performance, as illustrated in [31] for current large deviations of the inclusion process [10]. Here we focus on presenting full rigorous results obtained by applying this approach to the classical variant of the cloning algorithm in continuous time [2]. In contrast to previous work in the context of cloning algorithms [13, 14], our mathematical approach does not require a time discretization and works in the very general setting of a pure jump Markov process on a compact state space. This covers in particular any finite-state Markov chain or stochastic particle systems on finite lattices with bounded total mass. We comment on possible extensions of our results to locally compact state spaces in the discussion, but since in practice computer implementations of any system are necessarily finite, lifting this restriction is not essential for the practical applicability of our results.
The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation and the Feynman-Kac interpretation of the scaled cumulant generating function (SCGF) of additive observables of pure jump Markov processes. In Section 3 we first provide the infinitesimal description of the classical mean field particle approximation as well as the cloning algorithm, and then we rigorously discuss their connection by comparing their generators and martingale characterizations. In Section 4 we present our main results on the convergence properties and sampling errors of the cloning algorithm for two practical estimators for the SCGF based on the rate of cloning events. We conclude with a short discussion.


2.1. Dynamics and Large Deviations. We consider a continuous-time homogeneous Feller process \((X_t : t \geq 0)\) taking values on a compact Polish state space \((E, \mathcal{B}(E))\), where \(\mathcal{B}(E)\) is the Borel field on \(E\). We allow \(\mathcal{M}(E)\) and \(\mathcal{P}(E)\) to denote the sets of measures and probability measures, respectively, on \((E, \mathcal{B}(E))\) endowed with the \(\sigma\)-algebra generated by the bounded measurable functions from \(E\) to \(\mathbb{R}\). We denote by \((P_t : t \geq 0)\) the semigroup associated with \(X_t\), which is considered as acting on the Banach space \(\mathcal{C}(E)\) of (bounded) continuous functions \(f : E \to \mathbb{R}\), endowed with the supremum norm

\[ \|f\| = \sup_{x \in E} |f(x)|. \]

We use the standard notation \(P\) and \(E\) for the distribution and the corresponding expectation on the usual path space

\[ \Omega := \{ \omega : [0, \infty) \to E \text{ right continuous with left limits} \}. \]

The measurable structure on \(\Omega\) is given by the Borel \(\sigma\)-algebra induced by the Skorokhod topology (see [32], Chapter 3).

If we want to emphasize a particular initial condition \(x \in E\) or distribution \(\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)\) of the process we write \(P_x\) and \(E_x\), or \(P_\mu\) and \(E_\mu\), respectively.

The semigroup \(P(t)\) acts on continuous functions \(f\) and probability measures \(\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)\) via

\[ P(t) f(x) = E_x[f(X_t)], \quad \mu P(t) (f) := \int_E P(t) f(x) \mu(dx) = E_\mu[f(X_t)], \]

where the latter provides a weak characterization of the probability \(\mu P(t)\). Here and in the following we use the common notation \(\mu f\) for expectations of \(f \in \mathcal{C}(E)\) w.r.t. measures \(\mu\) on \(E\).

Using the Hille-Yosida Theorem (see e.g. [33], Chapter 3), it is possible to associate to the above Feller process an infinitesimal generator \(\mathcal{L}\) acting on a dense subset \(\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}(E)\) so that

\[ \frac{d}{dt} P(t) f = \mathcal{L} P(t) f = P(t) \mathcal{L} f, \]
for all \( f \in \mathcal{D} \) and \( t \geq 0 \).

In this work, we restrict ourselves to nonexplosive pure jump Feller processes. We denote by \( \lambda(x) \) the escape rate from state \( x \in E \) and the target state is chosen with the probability kernel \( p(x, dy) \), so that the overall transition rate is

\[
W(x, dy) := \lambda(x) \cdot p(x, dy)
\]

for \( (x, y) \in E^2 \).

We assume \( \lambda : E \to [0, \infty) \) to be a non-negative, bounded and continuous function and \( x \mapsto p(x, A) \) to be a continuous function for every \( A \in \mathcal{B}(E) \). Under these assumptions, the pure jump process possesses an infinitesimal generator with full domain \( \mathcal{D} = C(E) \) given by

\[
(Lf)(x) = \int_E W(x, dy)[f(y) - f(x)], \quad \forall f \in C(E), \ x \in E.
\]

Along with jump processes on continuous compact space such as continuous-time random walks (see e.g. [34]), this setting includes in particular finite-state continuous-time Markov chains. Typical examples we have in mind are given by stochastic particle systems on \( E = S^\Lambda \), with finite local state space \( S \) and lattice \( \Lambda \). Classical examples are spin systems with \( S = \{-1, 1\} \) or exclusion processes with \( S = \{0, 1\} \), in which particles can jump only onto empty sites (see e.g. [35]).

We are interested in studying the large deviations associated with a time-additive observable \( A_T : \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \), taken to be a real measurable function of the paths of \( X_t \) over the time interval \([0, T]\) of the form

\[
A_T(\omega) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t \leq T} g(\omega(t-), \omega(t)) + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(\omega(t))dt.
\]

(1)

Here \( g \in C(E^2) \) is such that \( g(x, x) = 0 \), for any \( x \in E \), and \( h \in C(E) \), with \( \omega \in \Omega \) a realization of \((X_t : t \geq 0)\). Note that \( A_T \) is well defined since the bound on \( \lambda(x) \) implies that the process does not explode and the first sum contains almost surely only finitely many non-zero terms for any \( T \geq 0 \).

More precisely, we are interested in studying the limiting behaviour, as \( T \to \infty \), of the family of probability measures \( \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}(A_T \in \cdot) = \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0} \circ A_T^{-1} \) on \((\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))\), where \( \mu_0 \) represents the initial distribution of the underlying process. This can be characterized by the large deviation principle (LDP) [36, 37], in terms of a rate function. We assume that an LDP with convex rate function \( I \) holds, which can be written as

\[
\frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{P}_{\mu_0}(A_T \in B) \to \inf_{x \in B} I(x) \quad \text{as} \ T \to \infty
\]

for all intervals \( B \subset \mathbb{R} \), since they generate the field \( \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \). For the study of large deviations, a key role is played by the scaled cumulant generating function (SCGF)

\[
\Lambda_k := \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}[e^{kA_T}] \in (-\infty, \infty].
\]

(3)
Indeed, if the rate function $I$ is convex and the limit $\Lambda_k$ in (3) exists and is finite for every $k \in \mathbb{R}$, then $I$ is fully characterized by the SCGF via Legendre duality (see [36], Theorem 4.5.10), i.e.

$$\Lambda_k = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \{ka - I(a)\} \quad \text{and} \quad I(a) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} \{ka - \Lambda_k\}.$$ 

As will be explained in detail later, the SCGF is also the object that can be numerically approximated by cloning algorithms [1, 2] and related approaches. In this work, we are interested in providing a method for rigorously understanding the convergence properties of such algorithms for evaluating the SCGF based on Feynman-Kac models. Possible subtleties regarding the LDP are not our focus and we restrict ourselves to settings where $\Lambda_k$ exists and is finite.

2.2. The Feynman-Kac Interpretation. In order to interpret the SCGF via Feynman-Kac models, we start by introducing an auxiliary infinitesimal generator, known in the physics literature as tilted generator [38].

Lemma 2.1. For pure jump processes, for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$ the family of operators $(P_k(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on $C(E)$ defined by

$$P_k(t)f(x) := \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t) e^{ktA_t}], \quad (4)$$

with $f \in C(E)$, is well defined and it is a non-conservative semigroup.

Moreover, the infinitesimal generator associated with $P_k(t)$, $t \geq 0$, in the sense of the Hille-Yosida Theorem, can be written in the form

$$(\mathcal{L}_k f)(x) = \int_E W(x, dy)[e^{kg(x,y)} f(y) - f(x)] + kh(x)f(x), \quad (5)$$

for $f \in C(E)$ and all $x \in E$, with $g$ and $h$ the continuous functions which characterize $A_T$ via (1). In particular, the semigroup $P_k(t)$ satisfies the differential equations

$$\frac{d}{dt}P_k(t)f = P_k(t)\mathcal{L}_k f = \mathcal{L}_k P_k(t)f, \quad (6)$$

for all $f \in C(E)$ and $t \geq 0$.

Proof. See [38], Appendix A.1. \qed

Observe that, if the SCGF (3) is independent of the choice of the initial distribution $\mu_0$, we can write

$$\Lambda_k = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left( P_k(t) 1(x) \right), \quad (7)$$

for all $x \in E$, and $\Lambda_k$ is the spectral radius of the generator $\mathcal{L}_k$ (see also (9) below). Similar to the work in [26], in order to control the asymptotic behaviour of $P_k(t)$, we have to further assume that $\Lambda_k$ is in fact an isolated eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_k$ which is ensured by the following.
ASSUMPTION 2.2 (Asymptotic Stability). We assume that there exists a probability measure \( \mu_\infty \in \mathcal{P}(E) \) and constants \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( \rho \in (0, 1) \) such that
\[
\|e^{-t\Lambda_k} P_k(t)(f)(\cdot) - \mu_\infty(f)\| \leq \|f\| \cdot \alpha \rho^t,
\]
for every \( t \geq 0 \) and \( f \in \mathcal{C}(E) \).

Note that this assumption implies the independence of the SCGF from the initial distribution, \( \mu_0 \), and thus (7) holds for every initial state \( x \in E \). Asymptotic stability is for example guaranteed for all irreducible, finite-state continuous-time Markov chains which necessarily have a spectral gap. For alternative sufficient conditions implying asymptotic stability in a more general context including continuous state spaces, see Appendix A. Note that (8) implies in particular that \( \mu_0 e^{-t\Lambda_k} P_k(t) \to \mu_\infty \) weakly for all initial distributions \( \mu_0 \), and that \( \mu_\infty \) is the unique invariant probability measure for the modified semigroup \( t \mapsto e^{-t\Lambda_k} P_k(t) \). Therefore we have from the generator \( L_k - \Lambda_k \) of this semigroup
\[
\mu_\infty(L_k f) = \Lambda_k \mu_\infty(f) \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{C}(E). \tag{9}
\]

Neither the semigroup \( P_k(t) \) nor the modified one \( e^{-t\Lambda_k} P_k(t) \) conserve probability, and therefore do not provide a corresponding process to sample from and use standard MCMC methods to estimate the SCGF \( \Lambda_k \). This can be achieved by interpreting \( P_k \) through Feynman-Kac models, so that we can adapt already established results from Feynman-Kac theory \([18, 20, 25]\) for approximating \( \Lambda_k \).

**Lemma 2.3.** The infinitesimal generator \( L_k \) (5) can be rewritten as
\[
L_k(f)(x) = \widehat{L}_k(f)(x) + \mathcal{V}_k(x) \cdot f(x), \tag{10}
\]
for all \( f \in \mathcal{C}(E) \) and \( x \in E \). Here
\[
\widehat{L}_k(f)(x) := \int_E W(x, dy) e^{kg(x,y)} [f(y) - f(x)]
\]
(11)
is the infinitesimal generator of a pure jump process with modified rates \( \widehat{W}_k(x, dy) := W(x, dy) e^{kg(x,y)} \), and
\[
\mathcal{V}_k(x) := \widehat{\lambda}(x) - \lambda(x) + kh(x) \in \mathcal{C}(E),
\]
is a diagonal or potential term with \( \widehat{\lambda}(x) := \int_E W(x, dy) e^{kg(x,y)} \) the escape rate function of \( \widehat{L}_k \).

**Proof.** Follows directly from the definition of \( L_k \) in (5).

Observe that
\[
L_k 1(x) = \mathcal{V}_k(x), \tag{13}
\]
thus, we get with (9) another representation of the SCGF
\[ \Lambda_k = \mu_\infty(V_k) . \]  

We introduce the measures \( \nu_{t,\mu_0} \) for any general initial distribution \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E) \) and \( t \geq 0 \), defined by
\[ \nu_{t,\mu_0}(f) := \mu_0(P_k(t)f) , \] for any \( f \in \mathcal{C}(E) \). We note that \( \nu_{t,\mu_0} \) depends upon \( k \), as will many of the quantities defined in the remainder of this paper; we occasionally suppress this dependence from the notation in the interests of readability. In [19], \( \nu_{t,\mu_0} \) is known as the unnormalised \( t \)-marginal Feynman-Kac measure. Applying Lemma 2.3, we can see that \( \nu_{t,\mu_0} \) solves the evolution equation
\[ \frac{d}{dt}\nu_{t,\mu_0}(f) = \nu_{t,\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}_k f) = \nu_{t,\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}_k f + V_k \cdot f) , \] for any \( f \in \mathcal{C}(E) \), \( t \geq 0 \) and \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E) \). The measures with which one can most naturally associate a process are the corresponding normalised \( t \)-marginal Feynman-Kac measures in \( \mathcal{P}(E) \),
\[ \mu_{t,\mu_0}(f) := \frac{\nu_{t,\mu_0}(f)}{\nu_{t,\mu_0}(1)} , \] defined for any \( t \geq 0 \) and \( f \in \mathcal{C}(E) \).

**Proposition 2.4.** For any \( k \in \mathbb{R} \) and every \( t \geq 0 \), we have that
\[ \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}[e^{ktA_t}] = \int_0^t \mu_{s,\mu_0}(V_k) \, ds , \] where \( V_k \) is defined in (12). In particular, with Assumption 2.2 we have for all \( \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(E) \)
\[ \Lambda_k^T := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mu_{s,\mu_0}(V_k) \, ds \rightarrow \Lambda_k \quad \text{as} \quad T \rightarrow \infty . \]

**Proof.** Recalling the evolution equation (16) of \( \nu_{t,\mu_0} \), we have
\[ \frac{d}{dt}\log \nu_{t,\mu_0}(1) = \frac{1}{\nu_{t,\mu_0}(1)} \cdot \frac{d}{dt}\nu_{t,\mu_0}(1) = \frac{\nu_{t,\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}_k 1)}{\nu_{t,\mu_0}(1)} = \mu_{t,\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}_k 1) . \] And, thus,
\[ \nu_{t,\mu_0}(1) = \exp \left( \int_0^t \mu_{s,\mu_0}(\mathcal{L}_k 1) \, ds \right) , \] since \( \nu_{0,\mu_0}(1) = 1 \). We can conclude by observing that \( \mathcal{L}_k 1(x) = V_k(x) \) and
\[ \nu_{t,\mu_0}(1) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0}[e^{ktA_t}] , \] using that the SCGF is well defined under Assumption 2.2. \( \Box \)
As a direct consequence of Assumption 2.2, there exist constants $\alpha \geq 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$,

$$|\mu_t(f) - \mu_\infty(f)| \leq \|f\| \cdot \alpha \rho^t,$$

and in particular we have weak convergence $\mu_t \to \mu_\infty$ as $t \to \infty$.

For any $t < T$, we define

$$\Lambda_k^{aT,T} := \frac{1}{T-t} \int_t^T \mu_s(V_k) ds. \tag{20}$$

**Lemma 2.5.** Under Assumption 2.2, there exist constants $\alpha' > 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ such that

$$|\Lambda_k^{aT,T} - \Lambda_k| \leq \|V_k\| \cdot \frac{\alpha' \rho^{aT}}{T},$$

for every $a \in [0, 1)$.

**Proof.** By (19), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{(1-a)T} \int_{aT}^T \mu_t(V_k) dt - \mu_\infty(V_k) \right| \leq \frac{1}{(1-a)T} \int_{aT}^T |\mu_t(V_k) - \mu_\infty(V_k)| dt$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{(1-a)T} \int_{aT}^T \|V_k\| \cdot \alpha \rho^t dt$$

$$= \frac{\alpha \|V_k\|}{(1-a)T} \cdot \frac{\rho^T - \rho^{aT}}{\log \rho}$$

$$\leq \|V_k\| \cdot \frac{\alpha' \rho^{aT}}{T},$$

where $\alpha' := \alpha / (- (1-a) \log \rho)$. In particular, $\lim_{T \to \infty} \Lambda_k^{aT,T} = \mu_\infty(V_k) = \Lambda_k$, by (14).

Note that for $a = 0$ the above result only implies a convergence rate of order $1/T$, since errors from the arbitrary initial condition have to be averaged out over time. In contrast for $a > 0$ (corresponding to the usual idea of burn in in conventional Markov chain Monte Carlo approximations – see [39], for example), we get a much better exponential rate of convergence dominated by the asymptotic stability parameter $\rho \in (0, 1)$.

### 2.3. McKean Interpretations

Lemma 2.5 states in particular that $\Lambda_k$ can be well approximated as a time average of $\mu_t,\mu_0(V_k)$. Now, we want to outline the evolution of the time-marginal distribution $\mu_t,\mu_0$ in terms of interacting jump-type infinitesimal generators. The content presented in the rest of this section is based on the works of Del Moral and Miclo [18–20] since, as we have seen, the large-deviation conditioning problem can be reformulated through the Feynman-Kac theory. In this established framework it is possible to define generic Markov processes with time
marginals $\mu_t$ and then use Monte Carlo sampling techniques for approximating those marginals, and thus the SCGF $\Lambda_k$.

For simplicity, in the rest of this article the initial distribution $\mu_0$ is fixed and we write $\mu_t$ instead of $\mu_t, \mu_0$.

Lemma 2.6. For every $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$ and $t \geq 0$, the normalised $t$-marginal $\mu_t$ solves the non-linear evolution equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t(f) = \mu_t(\hat{L}_k f) + \mu_t(V_k f) - \mu_t(f) \cdot \mu_t(V_k).$$

(21)

Proof. Recalling the evolution equation (16) of $\nu_t$, we see that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t(f) = \frac{d}{dt}\nu_t(f)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\nu_t(1)} \cdot \nu_t(\mathcal{L}_k f) - \frac{\nu_t(f)}{\nu_t(1)^2} \nu_t(\mathcal{L}_k 1)$$

$$= \mu_t(\mathcal{L}_k f) - \mu_t(f) \cdot \mu_t(\mathcal{L}_k 1)$$

$$= \mu_t(\hat{L}_k f) + \mu_t(V_k f) - \mu_t(f) \cdot \mu_t(V_k),$$

where the last equality follows by the decomposition (10) of $\mathcal{L}_k$. \qed

Observe that the first term of the evolution equation (21) already corresponds to a jump process with generator $\hat{L}_k$ given in (11). We want to rewrite the second, non-linear part to be in the form of another infinitesimal generator. Note that all generators defined in the following share the same domain $\mathcal{C}(E)$.

Lemma 2.7. For every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$, we have the following equivalence for every $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$

$$\mu(V_k f) - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(V_k) = \mu(\bar{L}_{\mu,c}^- f + \bar{L}_{\mu,c}^+ f),$$

where the operators $\bar{L}_{\mu,c}^-$ and $\bar{L}_{\mu,c}^+$ depend on the probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ and an arbitrary constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and are given respectively by

$$\bar{L}_{\mu,c}^- f(x) := (V_k(x) - c)^- \int_{E} (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dy),$$

(22)

and

$$\bar{L}_{\mu,c}^+ f(x) := \int_{E} (V_k(y) - c)^+ (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dy),$$

(23)

using the standard notation $a^+ = \max\{0, a\}$ and $a^- = \max\{0, -a\}$ for positive and negative part of $a \in \mathbb{R}$. 

Proof. It is enough to observe that
\[
\mu(V_k f) - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(V_k) = \int_E V_k(x) f(x) \mu(dx) - \int_{E^2} V_k(x) f(y) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
= - \int_{E^2} V_k(x) \cdot (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) \\
= - \int_{E^2} (V_k(x) - c) \cdot (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dx) \mu(dy),
\]
where the last identity holds for all \(c \in \mathbb{R}\) using the trivial fact
\[
\int_{E^2} (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dx) \mu(dy) = 0.
\]
Using the decomposition \(V_k(x) - c = (V_k(x) - c)^+ - (V_k(x) - c)^-\) we conclude the proof.

Lemma 2.6, combined with Lemma 2.7, implies that for every \(f \in \mathcal{C}(E)\) and \(t \geq 0\), the normalised \(t\)-marginal \(\mu_t\) solves the evolution equation
\[
\frac{d}{dt}\mu_t(f) = \mu_t(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,cf}),
\]
with
\[
\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c} = \mathcal{L}_k + \mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}^- + \mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}^+,
\]
where \(\mathcal{L}_k\) is given by (11).

The infinitesimal generator \(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}\) defines a Markov process \((X_t : t \geq 0)\) on \(E\) also known as a McKean representation of the Feynman-Kac semigroup \(P_k\) [19, 20]. The first part of the operator \(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}\) defines a pure jump process similar to the original dynamics with modified rates as given in (11), whereas the operators \(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}^-\) and \(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}^+\) describe jump processes on \(E\) with rates
\[
\tilde{W}_{\mu,c}^-(x, dy) := (V_k(x) - c)^- \mu(dy), \quad \tilde{W}_{\mu,c}^+(x, dy) := (V_k(y) - c)^+ \mu(dy).
\]
These depend on the current distribution \(\mu_t\) so that the McKean process \((X_t : t \geq 0)\) is non-linear and in particular time-inhomogeneous. The potential \(V_k\) can be shifted by an arbitrary constant \(c \in \mathbb{R}\), since (21) is independent under this transformation.

It is important to note that the time evolution of \(\mu_t\) is uniquely determined by (21) and therefore independent of the McKean representation in (25). Equation (21) itself results from the unique decomposition (10) of the non-conservative generator \(\mathcal{L}_k\) into the off-diagonal part \(\mathcal{L}_k\) and the diagonal part \(V_k\). The latter, together with normalization of \(\nu_t\) (17), leads to the nonlinear second part in (21). The representation of this part in Lemma 2.7 is not unique, leading to various possible
McKean representations different from (25) (see e.g. [26, 31]). One other possible representation of (21) we want to mention explicitly here is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mu_t(f) = \mu_t(\hat{L}_k + L^{V_k}_{\mu_t}),$$

with

$$L^{V_k}_{\mu} f(x) := \int_E \left( V_k(y) - V_k(x) \right)^+ (f(y) - f(x)) \mu(dy).$$

The operator $L^{V_k}_{\mu}$ defines an inhomogeneous pure jump process on $E$ in which every jump strictly increases the value of the potential $V_k$ in contrast to the representation in Lemma 2.7. We will see in the next section that $V_k$ can be interpreted as a fitness potential for the overall process. Further McKean representations of (21) are discussed in [31], here we focus on cloning algorithms which are based on (24).

3. Interacting Particle Systems and the Cloning Process. Independent of the particular representation, the rates of the McKean process \( \langle X_t : t \geq 0 \rangle \) depend on the distribution $\mu_t$ itself, which is in general not known. A standard approach is to sample such processes through particle approximations [21], which consist in running in parallel $N$ copies or clones $\xi_t := (\xi^1_t, \ldots, \xi^N_t) \in E^N$ of the process (called particles), and then approximating $\mu_t$ by the empirical distribution $m(\xi_t)$ of the realizations. For any $x \in E^N$ the latter is defined as

$$m(x)(dy) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}(dy) \in P(E).$$

We denote the empirical distribution associated to an $N$-particle system $\xi_t = (\xi^i_t)$ by

$$\mu^N_t(\cdot) := m(\xi_t)(\cdot).$$

This leads to an estimator for the SCGF using (18), given by

$$\Lambda^{t,T,N}_{k} := \frac{1}{T-t} \int_t^T \mu^N_s(V_k) ds = \frac{1}{T-t} \int_t^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N V_k(x_i^t) ds,$$

which is random and depends on the realization of the particle approximation. The full dynamics can be set up in various different ways such that $\mu^N_t \to \mu_t$ converges in an appropriate sense as $N \to \infty$ for any $t \geq 0$.

Introduce the unnormalized empirical measure

$$\nu^N_t(f) := \nu^N_t(1) \mu^N_t(f), \quad \nu^N_t(1) := \exp \left( \int_0^t \mu^N_s(V_k) ds \right).$$

Proposition 3.1. Let $L^N_k$ be the infinitesimal generator of a generic $N$-particle system. Assume that for every $F \in C(E^N)$ in the form $F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i)$, $f \in C(E)$, the following equality holds,

$$L^N_k F(x) = m(x)(\overline{L_{m(x)},, f}),$$
where $\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}$ is the infinitesimal generator given by (25). Then, $\nu_t^N$ is an unbiased estimator of the unnormalized $t$-marginal $\nu_t$ (15), i.e.

$$
E[\nu_t^N(f)] = \nu_t(f) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } N \geq 1,
$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$.

**Proof.** First observe that

$$
\frac{d}{dt} E[\nu_t^N(f)] = E\left[\nu_t^N(f)\mu_t^N(V_k) + \nu_t^N(1)L_c \mu_t^N(f)\right].
$$

By Assumption (31), decomposition (25) of $\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}$ into mutation and cloning part and Lemma 2.7, we have

$$L_c \mu_t^N(f) = \mu_t^N(\hat{L}_k f) + \mu_t^N(V_k f) - \mu_t^N(V_k) \cdot \mu_t^N(f).
$$

Inserting into (33), this simplifies to

$$
\frac{d}{dt} E[\nu_t^N(f)] = E\left[\nu_t^N(\hat{L}_k f) + \nu_t^N(V_k f)\right].
$$

Since $L_k = \hat{L}_k + V_k$ also generates the time evolution of $\nu_t(f)$, a simple Gronwall argument with $E[\nu_0^N(f)] = \nu_0(f)$ gives (32).

Note that choosing $f \equiv 1$ implies that the normalization $\nu_t^N(1)$ is an unbiased estimator of $e^{t\Lambda_{\mu,c}}$.

A generic version of interacting particle systems, directly related to the above McKean representations has been studied in the applied probability literature in great detail [21, 26], providing quantitative control on error bounds for convergence. After reviewing those results, we present a different approach taken in the theoretical physics literature under the name of cloning algorithms [1, 5], which provides some computational advantages but lacks general rigorous error control so far [13, 14]. Our main results are Theorems 3.3 and 4.2, which underline the common aspects of these two approaches and provide first rigorous error bounds for cloning algorithms in continuous time.

3.1. Mean Field Particle Approximation. The most basic particle approximation is simply to run the McKean dynamics in parallel on each of the particles, replacing the distribution $\mu_t$ by the empirical measure. Formally, the mean field $N$-particle model $(\xi_t : t \geq 0)$ with $\xi_t = (\xi_i^t : i = 1, \ldots, N)$, associated to the generator $(\mathcal{L}_{\mu,c})$ given in (25) is a Markov process on $E^N$ with homogeneous infinitesimal generator $\mathcal{L}_c^N$ defined by

$$
\mathcal{L}_c^N F(x^1, \ldots, x^N) := \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{L}_{\mu,c}^{(i)}(F)(x^1, \ldots, x^i, \ldots, x^N),
$$

(34)
for any $F \in \mathcal{C}(E^N)$. Here $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)}_m(z)$ stands for the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)}_m(z)$ acting on the function $x^i \mapsto F(x^1, \ldots, x^i, \ldots, x^N)$, where the dependence on $\mu$ in (25) has been replaced by the empirical distribution $m(z)$.

In analogy to (25), the generator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_c$ can be written as $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_c = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_k + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_c + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_c$ with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_k F(z) := \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)}_k F(z),$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_c F(z) := \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_{m(z),c} F(z),$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_c F(z) := \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_{m(z),c} F(z),$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{(i)}_k$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_{m(z),c}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_{m(z),c}$ stand respectively for the operators $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_k$, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_{m(z),c}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_{m(z),c}$ acting on the function $x^i \mapsto F(z)$.

Using definitions (22) and (23), we can write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{-N}_{m(z),c} F(z) = (V_k(x_i) - c)^- \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (F(x^i,x_j) - F(z)),$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^{+N}_{m(z),c} F(z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (V_k(x_j) - c)^+ \cdot (F(x^i,x_j) - F(z)),$$

with $x^i,y := (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_N)$. By a change of summation variables, we can then rewrite the mean field generator (34) as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_c F(z) = \sum_{i=1}^N \int_E \tilde{W}_k(x_i, dy) (F(x^{i,y}) - F(z))$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^N (V_k(x_i) - c)^- \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (F(x_i,x_j) - F(z))$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^N (V_k(x_i) - c)^+ \cdot \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (F(x^j,x_i) - F(z)).$$

In this decomposition, the first line associated to $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^N_k (35)$ generates the so-called mutation dynamics, where the particles evolve independently under the dynamics given by $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_k$ in Lemma 2.3. The second and third line correspond to the non-linear parts in Lemma 2.7 and can be interpreted as selection dynamics leading to mean-field interactions between particles. Selection events in the above representation happen with a rate depending only on the fitness of the particle $i$ and can be
interpreted as *killing* and *cloning* events associated to \( \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_c^{-N} \) (36) and \( \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_c^{+N} \) (37), respectively: if \( \mathcal{V}_k(x_i) < c \), particle \( i \) is ‘killed’ with rate \( (\mathcal{V}_k(x_i) - c)^- \) and replaced by a copy of a particle \( j \) uniformly chosen from the whole population, whereas if \( \mathcal{V}_k(x_i) > c \), particle \( i \) is ‘cloned’ with rate \( (\mathcal{V}_k(x_i) - c)^+ \) and its offspring replaces a uniformly chosen particle \( j \). In this interpretation \( \mathcal{V}_k \) plays the role of a fitness potential for the population of particles or clones as mentioned earlier in Section 2. Note that different particle approximations based on the McKean interpretation (27) could reduce the total selection rate, since then particles are only replaced with fitter ones in the metric \( \mathcal{V}_k \), which is not the case in (40) even for optimal choices of the constant \( c \). On the other hand, implementation of selection dynamics based on (27) are in general computationally more expensive since rates do not simply depend on fitnesses of single particles. These aspects related to improved choices of particle approximations are discussed in detail in [31]. Here we focus on rigorous convergence results for the cloning algorithm introduced later, which is a particular particle approximation originating in the physics literature, based on the McKean interpretation (25).

Observe that, for any function \( F \) on \( E^N \) of the form \( F(x) = m(x)(f) \), with \( f \in C(E) \), we have that

\[
\mathcal{L}^N_{c} F(x) = m(x)(\mathcal{L}m(x),c,f),
\]

\[
\Gamma^{N}_{c}(F, F)(x) = \frac{1}{N}m(x)(\Gamma m(x), (f, f)),
\]

where the bilinear operator

\[\Gamma_B(\gamma, \varphi) := B(\gamma \cdot \varphi) - \gamma \cdot B(\varphi) - \varphi \cdot B(\gamma),\]

with \( \gamma, \varphi \in C(E) \), is the *carré-du-champs* associated with a linear operator \( B \) on \( C(E) \) or \( C(E^N) \). Analogous relations hold also for the single mutation, killing and cloning parts. Since generators are linear (41) is immediate. (42) is quadratic in \( F \), but off-diagonal terms in the corresponding double sum turn out to vanish in a straightforward computation, leading to the additional factor \( 1/N \). Test functions of the form \( F(x) = m(x)(f) \) describe observables averaged over the clone ensemble which are generally of most interest, e.g. for the estimator (30) of the SCGF it is sufficient to consider such functions.

We denote by \( C^0,1_b(E \times \mathbb{R}^+) \) the set of bounded continuous functions on \( E \) with continuous time derivative. Following the standard martingale characterization of Feller-type Markov processes (see e.g. [26], Proposition 3.3), we know that for every \( \varphi \in C^0,1_b(E \times \mathbb{R}^+) \), the process

\[
\mathcal{M}^N_t(\varphi) := \mu^N_t(\varphi_t) - \mu^N_0(\varphi_0) - \int_0^t \mu^N_s(\partial_s \varphi_s + \mathcal{L}^{N}_{m,c}(\varphi_s))ds
\]

is a local martingale with predictable quadratic variation given by

\[
\langle \mathcal{M}^N(\varphi) \rangle_t = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t \mu^N_s(\Gamma^{N}_{m,c}(\varphi_s, \varphi_s))ds.
\]
We can see, in particular, that the empirical measure solves the differential equation
\[ d\mu_t^N(f) = \mu_t^N((L\mu_t^N,c)(f)) \, dt + dM_t^N(f), \]
which is a perturbation of the dynamics (24) of \( \mu_t \) by a martingale whose predictable quadratic variation is of order \( 1/N \), and thus \( M_t^N \) vanishes in \( L^p \)-sense as \( N \to \infty \), for any \( p \geq 1 \) and \( t \geq 0 \) (see e.g. [40], Section 11).

Following established results in [20, 21, 26], under Assumption 2.2 on exponential stability, the random quantity \( \Lambda_0^{0,T,N} \) defined in (30) is an asymptotically (in \( N \)) unbiased estimator of \( \Lambda_T^k \) (18), with a systematic error (bias) bounded by
\[ \sup_{T \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_0^{0,T,N} - \Lambda_T^k] \right| \leq \frac{C}{N}, \tag{43} \]
and with \( L^p \)-error bounded by
\[ \sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[ |\Lambda_0^{0,T,N} - \Lambda_T^k|^p \right]^{1/p} \leq \frac{C_p}{\sqrt{N}}, \tag{44} \]
for every \( p \geq 1 \).

3.2. The Cloning Algorithm. Cloning algorithms have been proposed in the theoretical physics literature [1, 2] for evaluating large deviation functions associated to Markov processes similar to the mean field system (34), using the same rates \( \hat{W}_k \) for mutations (11), but combining the cloning (or killing) events with mutations. Henceforth, we assume for simplicity that
\[ c \leq \inf_{x \in E} \mathcal{V}_k(x). \tag{45} \]
This is not essential but it removes the killing part of the generator (40), and thus significantly simplifies the presentation of our results. The killing part can also be included in the same fashion as in the mean field particle model (34) running independently of the mutation-cloning part, see [31] for further details.

Every particle (clone) \( i \) makes transitions at its mutation rate \( \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \), where \( x_i \in E \) is its current state. Transition events are a combination of mutation and cloning: a set \( A \) of particles is chosen at random from the ensemble with probability \( p_{x_i}(A) \) and every particle \( j \in A \) is replaced by a clone of \( i \). Then the particle \( i \) mutates from its state \( x_i \) to a state \( y \). To simplify presentation, we denote by \( \mathcal{N} = 2^{\{1, \ldots, N\}} \) the set of all subsets of \( N \) particle indices.

The infinitesimal description of a cloning algorithm as a continuous-time Markov process on the state space \( E^N \) is given by the generator
\[ L^N F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} \int_{y \in E} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{p}(x_i, dy) \left( F(x^{A,x_i: i,y}) - F(x) \right), \tag{46} \]
for any $F \in \mathcal{C}(E^N)$ and $x \in E$, where $x^{A,w}$ denotes the vector $(z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in E^N$, with
\[
z_j := \begin{cases} x_j & j \not\in A \\ w & j \in A, \end{cases}
\]
and, similarly, $x^{A,w; i,y}$ denotes the vector $(z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in E^N$ with
\[
z_j := \begin{cases} x_j & j \not\in A, j \neq i \\ w & j \in A, j \neq i \\ y & j = i, \end{cases}
\]
for $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $w, y \in E$.

Before we specify necessary properties of the cloning distribution $p_x(A)$ we make some simplifying assumptions, which are all satisfied by common choices in the theoretical physics literature. For any $x \in E$ the probability of choosing a set $A$ depends only on its size $|A|$ and not on its elements, i.e.
\[
p_x(A) = p_{x,|A|}/\binom{N}{|A|}
\]
with $p_{x,0}, \ldots, p_{x,N}$ such that $\sum_{n=0}^{N} p_{x,n} = 1$.

Denote the mean and second moment of this distribution by
\[
M(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} np_{x,n}, \quad Q(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{N} n^2 p_{x,n}.
\]
(47)

Of course, $p_{x,\cdot}$ and its moments also depend on $N$, which we omit in the notation for simplicity.

**Assumption 3.2.** For each $N$ the probabilities $p_{x,\cdot}$ should satisfy
\[
M(x) = \frac{\left(\nu_k(x) - c\right)^+}{\hat{\lambda}(x)} \quad \text{for all } x \in E,
\]
(48)
and the support of $p_{x,\cdot}$ is uniformly bounded in $N$, i.e. there exists $K > 0$ such that $p_{x,k} = 0$ for all $k \geq K$, $x \in E$ and $N \geq 1$. We further assume $N \geq K$, i.e. $N$ is large enough so that the process (46) is well defined.

To underline the dependence of $c$ in the choice of probability distributions $p_{x,\cdot}$ in the construction of the cloning algorithm, from now on, we will denote the generator of the cloning algorithm by $L^N_c$ instead of $L^N$.

Assumption 3.2 implies that probabilities $(p_{x,\cdot})$ with the prescribed mean exist, which ensures that the average number of clones per unit time originating from particle $i$ is $\hat{\lambda}(x_i) M(x_i) = (\nu_k(x_i) - c)^+$ as required in (40). A simple choice for $(p_{x,\cdot})$ made in the physics literature [1, 2, 7] is for $|A|$ to take only the values of the
two nearest integers around $M(x)$ with appropriate probabilities, which is discussed in more detail in Section 4. There we also present our main convergence result for the cloning algorithm, which is based on the following connection with the standard mean field particle system (34).

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $L^N_c$ be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning algorithm, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Then, for any test function of the form $F(x) = m(x)(f)$ with $f \in C(E)$, and $N$ large enough

$$L^N_c F(x) = \mathcal{L}^N_c F(x) = m(x)(\mathcal{L}^{m(x),c}f),$$

$$\Gamma_{L^N_c}(F, F)(x) \leq 2 \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}^N_c}(F, F) + \frac{8}{N} \|\hat{\lambda} Q\| \cdot \|f\|^2.$$

(49)

Recall that $\mathcal{L}^N_c$ (35) (37) is the mutation part of the mean field particle system with generator $L^N_c$ (34), whereas $\mathcal{L}^{m(x),c}$ and $L_k$ are given in (25).

**Proof.** The first part of (49) and (50) is proved through Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 below, and the second part follows by equalities (41)-(42).

**Lemma 3.4.** For any test function $F \in C(E^N)$ of the form $F(x) = m(x)(f)$, $f \in C(E)$, the generator $L^N_c$ can be decomposed as

$$L^N_c F(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}^{(i)} F(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \bar{L}^{(i)} F(x),$$

(51)

where $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$ stands for the mutation operator $\mathcal{L}_k$ (11) acting on the function $x^i \mapsto F(x)$ as in (35), and $\bar{L}^{(i)}$ is defined by

$$\bar{L}^{(i)} F(x) := \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in N} p_{x_i}(A) (F(x^{A,x_i}) - F(x)).$$

(52)

Furthermore, the carré du champ $\Gamma_{L^N_c}$ associated to the cloning algorithm can be bounded by

$$\Gamma_{L^N_c}(F, F)(x) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \Gamma_{\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_k}(F, F)(x) + \Gamma_{\bar{L}^{(i)}}(F, F)(x) \right).$$

(53)

**Remark.** Due to the linearity of the generator, the combined mutation/cloning events in the cloning algorithm can be decomposed easily, which leads to extra terms only in the quadratic carré du champ. The operator $\bar{L}^{(i)}$ can be seen as the infinitesimal generator of a cloning process independent of the mutation events, with escape rate $\hat{\lambda}(x_i)$ and with kernel $p_{x_i}(A)$, $A \in N$, which represents the probability of cloning the $i$-th particle $|A|$ times and substituting all the particles in $A$. 
Proof. First, observe that

\[ F(\underline{x}^{A,x; i,y}) - F(\underline{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (f(x_j^{A,x; i,y}) - f(x_j)) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{N} (f(y) - f(x_i)) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in A} (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) \]

\[ = (F(\underline{x}^{i,y}) - F(\underline{x})) + (F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x})). \]

Thus, we have

\[ \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} \int_{y \in E} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) \left( F(\underline{x}^{A,x; i,y}) - F(\underline{x}) \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} \int_{y \in E} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) \left( (F(\underline{x}^{i,y}) - F(\underline{x})) + (F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x})) \right) \]

\[ = \int_{E} \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) (F(\underline{x}^{i,y}) - F(\underline{x})) + \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) (F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x})) \]

since \( \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) = \int_{E} \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) = 1 \). Substituting this into the definition of the generator \( L_N^c \) (46), we obtain the decomposition (51).

In order to establish the second part of the statement, recall Definition (46) of \( L_N^c \) and note that one can write the corresponding carré du champ as

\[ \Gamma_{L_N^c}(F, F)(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{\lambda}(x_i) \int_{y \in E} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) \cdot \left( F(\underline{x}^{A,x; i,y}) - F(\underline{x}) \right)^2. \]

(54)

Now we can bound

\[ (F(\underline{x}^{A,x; i,y}) - F(\underline{x}))^2 = \left( \frac{f(y) - f(x_i)}{N} + (F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x})) \right)^2 \]

\[ \leq \frac{2}{N^2} (f(y) - f(x_i))^2 + 2(F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x}))^2, \]

using the standard inequality \( (a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2) \). It is easy to see that

\[ \tilde{\lambda}(x_i) \int_{y \in E} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) \cdot \frac{(f(y) - f(x_i))^2}{N^2} = \Gamma_{L_N^c}^{(i)}(F, F)(\underline{x}), \]

and

\[ \tilde{\lambda}(x_i) \int_{y \in E} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) \cdot \tilde{\rho}(x_i, dy) \cdot (F(\underline{x}^{A,x_i}) - F(\underline{x}))^2 = \Gamma_{L_N^c}^{(i)}(F, F)(\underline{x}), \]

and, combining this bound with (54), we obtain (53). \( \square \)
Lemma 3.5. Under Assumption 3.2, for any test function of the form $F(x) = \tilde{m}(x)(f)$ with $f \in C(E)$ and $N$ large enough we have for the combined cloning part $\tilde{L}^N F := \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{L}^{(i)} F$,

$$\tilde{L}^N F = \tilde{L}^{+N}_c F,$$

(55)

$$\Gamma_{\tilde{L}_N} (F, F)(x) \leq \frac{4}{N} \| \tilde{\lambda} Q \| \cdot \| f \|^2,$$

(56)

where $\tilde{L}^{+N}_c$ (37) is the cloning part of the mean field particle system.

Proof. The number of subsets of $\{1, \ldots, N\}$ of cardinality $n$ and containing a given element $j$ is $\binom{N-1}{n-1}$. Therefore, as by Assumption 3.2 $p_{x,n} (A) = p_{x,n} / \binom{N}{n}$ for $|A| = n$, we have

$$\tilde{L}^{(i)} m(x)(f) = \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}_A} p_{x_i} (A) \left( m(x^A x_i)(f) - m(x)(f) \right)$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}_A} p_{x_i} (A) \sum_{j \in A} (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) / N$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{n=1}^n \left( N - 1 \right) \cdot \frac{n}{\binom{N}{n}} \cdot (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) / N$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{n=1}^n \frac{n}{N} \cdot p_{x_i, n} \cdot (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) / N$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \frac{M(x_i)}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) / N.$$

We can exclude $A = \emptyset$ from the summation since it does not contribute. With $M(x_i) = (V_k(x_i) - c)^+ / \hat{\lambda}(x_i)$ by Assumptions 3.2, and recalling the decomposition (39) of $\tilde{L}^{+N}_c$ (37), we obtain the identity (55) after summation over $i$ and exchanging summation indices.

By Definition (52) of the generator $\tilde{L}^{(i)}$, we can write

$$\Gamma_{\tilde{L}^{(i)}} (m(x)(f), m(x)(f))$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}_A} p_{x_i} (A) \cdot \left( \sum_{j \in A} (f(x_i) - f(x_j)) \right)^2$$

$$\leq \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}_A} p_{x_i} (A) \cdot |A| \sum_{j \in A} (f(x_i) - f(x_j))^2$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{j=1}^N (f(x_i) - f(x_j))^2 \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{n}{\binom{N}{n}} \cdot \left( N - 1 \right)$$

$$= \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \cdot Q(x_i) \frac{N(x_i)}{N^3} \sum_{j=1}^N (f(x_i) - f(x_j))^2.$$
The statement follows by summation over $i$. \hfill \Box

Using again the notation (29) for empirical measures and the martingale characterization of Feller processes (see [26], Proposition 3.3), Lemma 3.5 implies that for every $\varphi \in C^{0,1}(E \times \mathbb{R}^+)$, the process

$$M_t(\varphi \cdot) := \mu^N_t(\varphi_t) - \mu^N_0(\varphi_0) - \int_0^t \mu^N_s(\partial_s \varphi_s + \mathcal{L}_{\mu^N_s,\varphi_s}) \, ds$$

is a local martingale with predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M(\varphi \cdot) \rangle_t \leq \frac{2}{N} \int_0^t \left( \mu^N_s \left( \Gamma \hat{L}_k(\varphi_s, \varphi_s) \right) + 4 \| \mathcal{L}_k \| \cdot \| \varphi_s \|_2^2 \right) \, ds.$$  \hspace{1cm} (58)

Jumps are bounded by

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \| \Delta M_t(\varphi \cdot) \| \leq \frac{2K \cdot \| \varphi \|}{N},$$

where $K > 0$ bounds the size of cloning events as defined in Assumption 3.2.

**Remark.** By Lemma 2.7, martingale (57) can be written as

$$M_t(\varphi \cdot) = \mu^N_t(\varphi_t) - \mu^N_0(\varphi_0) - \int_0^t \mu^N_s(\partial_s \varphi_s + \mathcal{L}_k \varphi_s + (V_k - \mu^N_s(V_k)) \cdot \varphi_s) \, ds.$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)

From (57), we obtain in particular the evolution equation

$$d\mu^N_t(f) = \mu^N_t(\mathcal{L}_{\mu^N_s,\varphi_s}) \, dt + dM_t(f),$$

for every $f \in C(E)$. This is again a perturbation of the evolution equation of $\mu_t(f)$ (24) by a martingale $M_t(f)$ whose quadratic variation process has an upper bound of order $1/N$. This is sufficient to derive error bounds analogous to (43) and (44) as presented in the next section.


We present in this section the convergence results for the cloning algorithm, which is our main result. The error estimates we obtain are based on results in [26] for mean field particle approximations (see estimations (43) and (44)), that can be extended thanks to the connections between the two models provided in Theorem 3.3. Technical details of the adaptation of relevant proofs in [26] are postponed to Appendix B. In addition to the empirical measures $\mu^N_t$ as in (29) for the cloning process, recall the notation $\Lambda^{t,T}_k$ (20) and the corresponding estimator $\Lambda^{t,T,N}_k$ (30) for the SCGF $\Lambda_k$ (3).
Proposition 4.1. Let $L^N$ be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning algorithm, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Under Assumption 2.2 on asymptotic stability, for every $p \geq 1$ there exist constants $c_p, c', \gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ such that for the empirical measures $(29)$ of the cloning process

$$
\mathbb{E}
\left[
\left(\mu_t^N(f) - \mu_t(f)\right)^p
\right]^{1/p} \leq c_p \|f\| \cdot \left(\frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N}\right)^{1/2},
$$

and

$$
\left|\mathbb{E}[\mu_t^N(f) - \mu_t(f)]\right| \leq c' \|f\| \cdot \frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N},
$$

for any $t \geq 0$, $N \geq K$ and $f \in C(E)$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 in [26]. For full details of the proof, see Appendix B, where we have made explicit the passages that differ from [26] and identified the dependence on $\|\hat{\lambda}Q\|$.

Remark. Observe that, by Markov’s inequality, Proposition 4.1 implies

$$
P\left(\left|\mu_t^N(f) - \mu_t(f)\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{c_p^p \cdot \|f\|^p}{\varepsilon^p \cdot N^{p/2}},
$$

for every $\varepsilon, t > 0, f \in C(E), N \geq K$ and $p \geq 1$, where $\hat{\gamma}_p > 0$ does not depend on $N$. In particular, considering $p > 2$, we can see that $\mu_t^N(f)$ converges almost surely to $\mu_t(f)$ for any $f \in C(E)$, by a Borel-Cantelli argument. The existence of a countable determining class allows this to be further strengthened to the almost sure convergence of $\mu_t^N$ to $\mu_t$ in the weak topology (see, for example, [41, Theorem 4]).

Theorem 4.2. Let $L^N$ be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning algorithm, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Under Assumption 2.2 on asymptotic stability, for every $p \geq 1$ and $a \in [0, 1)$ there exist constants $c_p, \gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ such that for every $N \geq K$

$$
\sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Lambda_{k,T}^{aT,N} - \Lambda_{k,T}^{|\rho|}|^{1/p}\right]^{1/p} \leq c_p \|\mathcal{V}_k\| \cdot \left(\frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (61)
$$

Furthermore, there exist $\alpha' > 0$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ such that

$$
\sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{E}\left[|\Lambda_{k,T}^{aT,N} - \Lambda_{k,T}^{|\rho|}|^{1/p}\right]^{1/p} \leq c_p \|\mathcal{V}_k\| \cdot \left(\frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N}\right)^{1/2} + \|\mathcal{V}_k\| \cdot \frac{\alpha' \rho^aT}{T}. \quad (62)
$$

Proof. The first part of the statement follows from Proposition 4.1, by observing that

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[|\Lambda_{k,T}^{aT,N} - \Lambda_{k,T}^{|\rho|}|^{1/p}\right]^{1/p} \leq \frac{1}{(1-a)T} \int_{aT}^T \mathbb{E}\left[|\mu_t^N(\mathcal{V}_k) - \mu_t(\mathcal{V}_k)|^{1/p}\right] dt.
$$
For the second part, first note that
\[
\mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T}|^{p}]^{1/p} \leq \mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T}|^{p}]^{1/p} + |\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T} - \Lambda_{k}|. 
\]
We conclude by Lemma 2.5.

**Remark.** Similarly to the discussion below Proposition 4.1, this implies that \(\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N}\) also converges almost surely to \(\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T}\) as \(N \to \infty\).

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \(L_{c}^{N}\) be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning algorithm, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Under Assumption 2.2 on asymptotic stability, for every \(a \in (0,1)\) there exist constants \(c', \gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0\) such that for every \(N \geq K\)
\[
\sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T}|] \leq c'|\mathcal{V}_k| \cdot \frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N}. 
\]
Furthermore, there exist constants \(\alpha' > 0\) and \(0 < \rho < 1\) such that
\[
\sup_{T \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[|\Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}|] \leq c'|\mathcal{V}_k| \cdot \frac{\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda}Q\|}{N} + |\mathcal{V}_k| \cdot \frac{\alpha' \rho^{aT}}{T}. 
\]

**Proof.** The proof follows by Proposition 4.1 and is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3 provide the \(L^p\) and bias estimates of the approximation error in analogy to (44) and (43) for the mean field particle system. The bound depends on the cloning distribution \(p_x(A)\) only through its second moment \(Q\) (47). The most common choice in the physics literature (see e.g. recent summary in [7]) for the distribution \(p_{x,n}\) of the size of cloning events is
\[
p_{x,n} = \begin{cases} 
M(x) - \lfloor M(x) \rfloor & n = \lfloor M(x) \rfloor + 1, \\
\lfloor M(x) \rfloor + 1 - M(x) & n = \lfloor M(x) \rfloor, \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]
This corresponds to a binary distribution on the two integers nearest to the prescribed mean and satisfies Assumption 3.2. It minimizes the second moment \(Q\) of the distribution for a given mean and thus its contribution to the bound for the \(L^p\) and bias estimates. Even though the bounds are presumably not sharp in practice, this indicates that the above simple choice is reasonable also from a computational perspective.

In principle, the size distribution \(p_{x,n}\) could also be chosen such that \(Q\) scales with \(N\), but our error bounds strongly suggest the use of distributions for which \(Q\) is uniformly bounded in \(N\) as in the above example. In this case, \(L^p\) error and bias
vanish as $N \to \infty$ with order respectively given by $1/\sqrt{N}$ and $1/N$, which coincide with the rate of convergence for mean field particle approximations given in (44) and (43). The necessarily finite simulation time $T$ leads to an additional error of order $\rho^a T / T$, with $\rho \in (0,1)$ which is controlled by asymptotic stability properties of the process. As usual, this suggests the use of a “burn in” procedure with $a > 0$ to obtain an exponential convergence rate with increasing simulation time.

4.2. The Cloning Factor. Most results in the physics literature do not use the estimator $\Lambda_{k,T,T,N}^{aT,T,N}$ (30) based on the ergodic average of the mean fitness of the clone ensemble, but an estimator based on a ‘cloning factor’ (see e.g. [1, 5, 7]). This is essentially a continuous-time jump process $(C^N_t : t \geq 0)$ on $(0, \infty)$ with $C^N_0 = 1$, where at each cloning event of size $n$ at a given time $\tau$, the value is updated as

$$C^N_t = C^N_{t-} \left(1 + \frac{n}{N}\right).$$

In our context, we can define the dynamics of $C^N_t$ jointly with the cloning process via an extension of the generator $L^N_c$ (46) to the state space $E^N \times (0, \infty)$,

$$L^{(N,\star)}_c F^\star(x, \varsigma) := \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda(x_i) \sum_{A \in N^*} \int \left( F^\star\left(x,\varsigma \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|A|}{N}\right)\right) - F^\star(x, \varsigma) \right) \cdot d\mu_{x_i}(A) \cdot \hat{p}(x_i, dy)$$

where the test function $F^\star$ now has a second counting coordinate and denoting $\varsigma_A := \varsigma \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|A|}{N}\right)$.

We introduce the simple function $G(x, \varsigma) := \varsigma$ in order to observe only the cloning factor, $G(C^N_0, C^N_t) = C^N_t$. Note that $E^N \times (0, \infty)$ is no longer compact, and in general we have to restrict test functions to decay at infinity (see e.g. [33]), which is not the case for $G$. However, since the range of the clone size distribution is uniformly bounded (see Assumption 3.2), $t \mapsto \log C^N_t$ is a pure birth process on $[0, \infty)$ with bounded jump length, and the generator (66) and associated semigroup is therefore well defined for the test function $G$.

**Proposition 4.4 (Unbiasedness of the cloning factor).** Let $L^{(N,\star)}_c$ be the extension (66) of the cloning generator $L^N_c$ (46). Then, the quantity $e^{tc} C^N_t$ is an unbiased estimator for $\nu_t(1)$ (15), i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{tc} C^N_t] = \mathbb{E}[^N(1)] = \nu_t(1),$$

for every $t \geq 0$ and $N \geq 1$.

**Proof.** First, observe that

$$L^{(N,\star)}_c G(x, \varsigma) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{n=0}^N \lambda(x_i) p_{x_i,n} \cdot (\varsigma n/N)$$

$$= \frac{\varsigma}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\nu_k(x_i) - c\right)^+, \quad (67)$$


by Assumption 3.2. Therefore, recalling that \( c \leq \inf \mathcal{V}_k \),
\[
\mathcal{L}^{(N, \star)}_{\mathcal{C}} G(\xi, \varsigma) = \varsigma m(\xi) (\mathcal{V}_k - c),
\]
and analogously to (33), the expected time evolution of \( \mathcal{C}_t^N \) is then given by
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_t^N] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{C}_t^N \cdot \mu_t (\mathcal{V}_k - c)].
\]
This is also the evolution of \( \nu_t^N (e^{-tc}) = e^{-tc} \nu_t^N (1) \), since
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E}[\nu_t^N (e^{-tc})] = \mathbb{E}[\mu_t (\mathcal{V}_k) \cdot e^{-tc} \nu_t^N (1) - c e^{-tc} \nu_t^N (1)]
= \mathbb{E}[\nu_t^N (e^{-tc}) \cdot \mu_t (\mathcal{V}_k - c)].
\]
With initial conditions \( \mathcal{C}_0^N (0) = 1 = \nu_0^N (1) \), the statement follows by a Gronwall argument analogous to (32) and by Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 4.4 leads to an alternative estimator for \( \Lambda_{k,t}^{t,T} (20) \) given by
\[
\Lambda_{k,t}^{t,T} := \frac{1}{T-t} (\log C_T^N - \log C_t^N) + c. \tag{68}
\]
Note that this is not itself unbiased as a consequence of the nonlinear transformation involving the logarithm.

In order to study the convergence of the new estimator to the SCGF, it is convenient to use the martingale characterization of the process, which is given by the following result.

**PROPOSITION 4.5.** Let \( L_c^N \) be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning process, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Then, the process
\[
\mathcal{M}_t^* := \log C_t^N - \int_0^t L_c^{(N, \star)} H (\zeta_s^N, C_s^N) ds,
\]
with \( H (\xi, \varsigma) = \log \varsigma \), is a local martingale satisfying
\[
\mathcal{M}_t^* = \log C_t^N - \int_0^t (\mu_s^N (\mathcal{V}_k) - c) ds + t \cdot O \left( \frac{1}{N} \right),
\]
and with predictable quadratic variation
\[
\langle \mathcal{M}_t^* \rangle_t \leq \frac{t}{N} \cdot \| \hat{\lambda} Q \| + t \cdot O \left( \frac{1}{N^2} \right).
\]
Proof. Observe that we can rewrite (66) as

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{c}^{(N,\ast)} H(x,\varsigma) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\lambda}(x_i) \sum_{A \in \mathcal{N}} p_{x_i}(A) \log(1 + |A|/N) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{n=1}^{K} \hat{\lambda}(x_i) p_{x_i,n} \cdot \log(1 + n/N) \\
&= m(x)(V_k) - c + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right),
\end{align*}
\]

by Assumption 3.2 and using the expansion of \(\log(1 + x)\). Moreover,

\[
\begin{align*}
\Gamma L_{c}^{(N,\ast)} (H,H)(x,\varsigma) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \hat{\lambda}(x_i) p_{x_i,n} \cdot \left(\log(1 + n/N)\right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N} m(x)(\hat{\lambda} Q) + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right).
\end{align*}
\]

The statement corresponds to the martingale problem associated to \(L_{c}^{(N,\ast)} H\).

By Proposition 4.5 and recalling the definition of the SCGF estimators \(\Lambda_{k}^{t,T,N}(30)\) and \(\bar{\Lambda}_{k}^{t,T,N}(68)\) we immediately get

\[
\Lambda_{k}^{t,T,N} = \bar{\Lambda}_{k}^{t,T,N} - \frac{M_{T} - M_{t}}{T - t}.
\]

In what follows, we discuss the convergence of \(\bar{\Lambda}_{k}^{t,T,N}\) to the SCGF \(\Lambda_{k}\).

**Theorem 4.6.** Let \(L_{c}^{N}\) be the infinitesimal generator associated to a cloning process, such that the average number of clones per transition event satisfies Assumption 3.2. Then, for every \(p \geq 1\) and \(a \in [0,1)\), there exists a constant \(C_{p}^{*}\) such that for all \(N\) large enough

\[
\left| E \left[ \left| \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} \right|^p \right] \right|^{1/p} \leq C_{p}^{*} \cdot \frac{\max_{m \in \{2,p\}} \| \hat{\lambda} Q \|^{1/m}}{N^{1+1/p} \cdot \sqrt{T}}.
\]

If in addition Assumption 2.2 on asymptotic stability holds, there exist constants \(\gamma_{p}^{*}, c_{p}^{*}, \alpha' > 0\) and \(0 < \rho < 1\) (dependent of \(a, p, \hat{\lambda}, Q\) and \(V_k\)) such that

\[
\left| E \left[ \left| \Lambda_{k}^{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k} \right|^p \right] \right|^{1/p} \leq \frac{\gamma_{p}^{*}}{N^{1+1/p} \cdot \sqrt{T}} + \frac{c_{p}^{*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\alpha' \rho^{aT}}{T},
\]

for every \(T \geq 1\).
Proof. Thanks to Jensen’s inequality, it is enough to prove the inequality for all \( p = 2^q, q \in \mathbb{N}_0 \). First, we can write
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \Lambda_{aT,T,N} - \Lambda_{k}^{qT,T,N} \right|^{2^q} \right] = \frac{1}{(N \cdot (1-a)T)^{2^q}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathcal{M}_T^* - \mathcal{M}_T^* \right|^{2^q} \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{(N \cdot (1-a)T)^{2^q}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathcal{M}_T^* \right|^{2^q} \right].
\]
Observe that under Assumption 3.2 \( \sup_{t \leq T} |\mathcal{M}_t^*| < \infty \), so the assumptions of Lemma B.4 are satisfied. Thus, using first Lemma B.4 and then Proposition 4.5, we obtain
\[
\frac{1}{N^{2^q} \cdot T^{2^q}} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathcal{M}_T^* \right|^{2^q} \right] \leq \frac{C_q}{N^{2^q} \cdot T^{2^q}} \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ ((\mathcal{M}_T^*)^{2^k}) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{C_q}{N^{2^q}} \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} \frac{1}{T^{2^q-2^k}} \left( \frac{1}{N^{2^q}} \cdot \|\hat{\lambda} Q\|^{2^k} + O \left( \frac{1}{N^{2^q+1}} \right) \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{q \cdot C_q}{N^{2^q+1} \cdot T^{2^q-1}} \cdot \max_{m \in \{1, 2^{q-1}\}} \|\hat{\lambda} Q\|^{m}.
\]
The second part of the Theorem follows directly by Theorem 4.2.

Therefore, the \( L^p \)-error for estimator \( \Lambda_{k}^{qT,T,N,*} \) has rate of convergence \( 1/\sqrt{N} \), which coincides with that for \( \Lambda_{k}^{qT,T,N} \) (Theorem 4.2). Analogous results hold for the bias estimates, which have order of convergence \( 1/N \), as for the estimator \( \Lambda_{k}^{qT,T,N} \) (Theorem 4.3).

5. Discussion. In this work we have established a framework to compare different versions of cloning algorithms and understand their connections with mean field particle approximations. This allowed us to obtain first rigorous results on the convergence properties of cloning algorithms. Our results apply in the general setting of jump Markov processes on compact state spaces. Our approach could be adapted also to locally compact spaces under appropriate boundedness assumptions on the rates using an approach similar to that employed in [26]. This may also imply having to restrict the domain of generators and semigroups to continuous functions vanishing at infinity (see e.g. [33] for a discussion). Since this excludes the constant function \( f(x) = 1 \) which we have made heavy use of, this would require a significant adaption and complication of the presentation of our results. In order to focus attention on the main novelty we have chosen to restrict to compact spaces, which naturally includes the common application cases of these algorithms. Essential conditions for our approach are summarized in Assumptions 2.2 on asymptotic stability of the process and 3.2 on the clone size distribution.

The cloning algorithm is computationally cheaper and simpler to implement than mean field particle systems, since only the mutation process has to be sampled...
independently for all particles and cloning events happen simultaneously. However, as discussed in [31], this choice reduces in general the accuracy of the estimator since it does not consider the potential of the replaced particles during the cloning events. Adjusting the algorithm by allowing only substitutions of particles with lower potential could improve the accuracy. The approach developed in this paper can be used to conduct a systematic study of this question, which is current work in progress.

APPENDIX A: ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY

We present sufficient conditions for asymptotic stability as formulated in Assumption 2.2. The discussion is based on the work of Tweedie et al. [42, 43].

Recall that the SCGF $\Lambda_k$ (3) is given by the spectral radius of the tilted generator $L_k$ (5).

**Assumption A.1.** We assume that, for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a spectral gap $\rho^* > 0$ between the largest two eigenvalues of $L_k$.

**Remark.** Sufficient conditions for the existence of a spectral gap can be found, for instance, in [44], Theorem 6.1, and [45], Theorem 2.5. These are of course satisfied if $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ is an irreducible, finite-state Markov chain, including for example stochastic particle systems on finite lattices with a fixed number of particles.

Assumption A.1 implies in particular that $\Lambda_k$ is a distinct eigenvalue of $L_k$, and we make a further assumption on the corresponding left and right eigenfunctions $l_k$ and $r_k$.

**Assumption A.2.** We assume that there exist a positive function $r_k \in C(E)$ such that $r_k \geq 1$ and a probability measure $l_k \in P(E)$ satisfying respectively,

\[
L_k r_k = \Lambda_k r_k,
\]

and

\[
l_k(L_k f) = \Lambda_k l_k(f) \quad \text{for any } f \in C(E) .
\]

We define the auxiliary semigroup $P^{\Lambda_k}_k$ on $C(E)$ by

\[
P^{\Lambda_k}_k(t)f(x) := \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_t)e^{k t A_t - t \Lambda_k}],
\]

for every $f \in C(E)$, $x \in E$, where $X_t$ is the initial Feller process, $A_t$ is the considered observable and $\Lambda_k$ is the SCGF. Let $L^{\Lambda_k}_k$ be the corresponding infinitesimal generator. Recalling Lemma 2.1, we can write $L^{\Lambda_k}_k$ in terms of the operator $L_k$ and $\Lambda_k$,

\[
L^{\Lambda_k}_k f(x) = L_k f(x) - \Lambda_k f(x) \quad \text{for all } f \in D.
\]

**Remark.** The left eigenmeasure $l_k$ associated to $\Lambda_k$ is invariant for the operator $L^{\Lambda_k}_k$, i.e. $l_k(L^{\Lambda_k}_k f) = 0$. 

We further introduce a tilted version of that generator

\[ L^r_k := r_k \Lambda_k (r_k \cdot). \]

Observe that \( L^r_k 1 = 0 \), so that it is a probability generator associated to a Markov process \( X^r_t \) and with probability semigroup defined for any \( f \in C(E) \) by

\[ P^r_k(t) f := r_k^{-1} P^k_\Lambda_k(t)(r_k f). \]

This process has been introduced also in [38] as the driven process and we will use it below to establish a sufficient condition for asymptotic stability.

**Definition A.3.** A Feller process \( Y_t \) is said to be \( \phi \)-irreducible for a non-trivial measure \( \phi \) (i.e. \( \phi(E) > 0 \)) on \((E, B(E))\), if \( \mathbb{E}_x \left[ \int_0^\infty 1_{Y_t \in A} dt \right] > 0 \) for every \( x \in E \) and every set \( A \in B(E) \) such that \( \phi(A) > 0 \). We simply say that \( Y_t \) is irreducible if it is \( \phi \)-irreducible for some \( \phi \).

**Definition A.4.** A \( \phi \)-irreducible Feller process \( Y_t \) is called aperiodic if there exists a measurable set \( C \in B(E) \), \( \phi(C) > 0 \), such that the associated Markov semigroup \( P(t) \) satisfies the following conditions:

- there exists a non-trivial measure \( \eta \) and \( t > 0 \) such that \( P(t)(x, B) \geq \eta(B) \), for all \( x \in C \) and \( B \in B(E) \);
- there exists a time \( \tau \geq 0 \) such that \( P(t)(x, C) > 0 \), for all \( t \geq \tau \) and \( x \in C \).

**Lemma A.5.** Let \( Y_t \) be a \( \phi \)-irreducible and aperiodic Feller process on a compact state space such that \( \text{supp} \phi \) has non-empty interior. Denote by \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( P(t) \) the associated infinitesimal generator and the semigroup, respectively. Assume that for a given function \( h \in C(E) \) such that \( h \geq 1 \), there exist constants \( b, c > 0 \) and a compact set \( S \in B(E) \) such that for all \( x \in E \)

\[ \mathcal{L} h(x) \leq -c \cdot h(x) + b 1_S(x). \]

Then there exist constants \( \alpha \geq 0 \) and \( 0 < \rho < 1 \) such that for any test function \( f \in C(E) \) and \( t \geq 0 \), \( x \in E \)

\[ |P(t)f(x) - \pi(f)| \leq \|f\| h(x) \cdot \alpha \rho^t, \]

where \( \pi \) is the invariant measure for \( \mathcal{L} \).

**Proof.** See Theorem 5.2(c) in [42], using the fact that if a Feller process \( Y_t \) is \( \phi \)-irreducible and \( \text{supp} \phi \) has non-empty interior, then every compact set is petite (See [43], Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 5.1).

**Proposition A.6 (Asymptotic stability).** Under Assumptions A.1 and A.2, if the initial pure jump process \( (X_t : t \geq 0) \) is \( \phi \)-irreducible for some \( \phi \) for which \( \text{supp} \phi \) has non-empty interior, and aperiodic then

\[ \|P^k_\Lambda_k(t)f - I_k(f)\| \leq \|f\| \cdot \alpha \rho^t. \]
Proof. First, note that if the initial process $X_t$ is irreducible and aperiodic, then also the process $X^r_k$ is irreducible and aperiodic.

For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, consider the set

$$K_\varepsilon := \{ x \in E \mid V_k(x) \geq \Lambda_k - \varepsilon \}.$$ 

Observe that $\mathcal{L}_k^*(r_k^{-1})$ is bounded in $K_\varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{L}_k^*(r_k^{-1}) \leq -\varepsilon r_k^{-1}$ for every $x \notin K_\varepsilon$. Therefore, the hypotheses of Lemma A.5 are satisfied for the generator $\mathcal{L}_k^*$, with $h = r_k^{-1}$ and invariant measure $\pi = r_k^{-1} l_k f_k$, and applying the lemma we obtain

$$\| r_k^{-1} (x \cdot \alpha \rho^t) \| \leq \| f \cdot \rho^t \|.$$ 

for any $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$. Dividing by $r_k^{-1} (x)$ and substituting $f$ with $r_k^{-1} f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$, we obtain the statement ($\| r_k^{-1} \| < \infty$ and can be included in the constant $\alpha$).

Proposition A.6 assures asymptotic stability as formulated in Assumption 2.2 and, in particular, we can see that $\mu_\infty = l_k$.

APPENDIX B: ADAPTATION OF THE CONVERGENCE RESULTS

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 4.1. We follow the results presented by Rousset in [26] and make explicit the passages that differ from his proof. Furthermore, we keep track of the dependence of bounds on the second moment of the clone size distribution via $Q$ (47).

The proof makes use of the linearized version of the propagator of $\mu_t$, defined by

$$\Theta_{t,T} f(x) := \frac{P_k(T-t)f(x)}{\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$, where $P_k(t)$ is the semigroup defined in Lemma 2.1. Observe that the propagator $\Theta_{t,T}$ satisfies the propagation equation

$$\mu_T(f) = \mu_t(\Theta_{t,T} f).$$

Throughout this section we assume that Assumption 2.2 and Assumption 3.2 hold.

Lemma B.1. For any $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$, there exists a constant $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\| \Theta_{t,T} f \| \leq \beta \| f \| \quad \text{and} \quad \int_t^T \| \Theta_{s,T} f \| \ ds \leq \beta \| f \| \cdot (T-t).$$

Moreover, for any $\tilde{f} := f - \mu_T(f)$, there exists some $0 < \rho < 1$, such that

$$\| \Theta_{t,T} \tilde{f} \| \leq \beta \cdot \| \tilde{f} \| \cdot \rho^{T-t} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_t^T \| \Theta_{s,T} \tilde{f} \| \ ds \leq \beta \| \tilde{f} \|.$$ 

Proof. The proof can be found in [26], Lemma 5.1. \qed
Lemma B.2. For any test function \( f \in C(E) \) and \( 0 \leq t \leq T \), we have that
\[
\partial_t (\Theta_{t,T} f(x)) = - (\mathcal{L}_k + \nu_k(x) - \mu_t(\nu_k))(\Theta_{t,T} f(x)).
\] (71)

Proof. By definition of \( \Theta_{t,T} \), we can write
\[
\partial_t \Theta_{t,T} f(x) = \partial_t \left( \frac{P_k(T-t)f(x)}{\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)} \right)
= \frac{\partial_t P_k(T-t)f(x) - P_k(T-t)f(x) \cdot \partial_t \mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)}{\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)^2}.
\] (72)

Recalling the differential equations (6) and decomposition (10) of the tilted generator \( \mathcal{L}_k \), we get
\[
\partial_t P_k(T-t)f(x) = - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_k P_k(T-t)f(x) - \nu_k(x) \cdot P_k(T-t)f(x).
\]

Moreover, recalling that \( \mathcal{L}_k 1 = \nu_k \) and that \( \mu_t(f) = \mu_0(P_k(t)f)/\mu_0(P_k(t)1) \) (17), we can see that
\[
\partial_t \mu_t(P_k(T-t)1) = \partial_t \left( \frac{\mu_0(P_k(T)1)}{\mu_0(P_k(t)1)} \right)
= - \frac{\mu_0(P_k(T)1) \cdot \mu_0(P_k(t)\nu_k)}{(\mu_0(P_k(t)1))^2}
= - \mu_t(P_k(T-t)1) \cdot \mu_t(\nu_k).
\]

Therefore, substituting in (72) we obtain
\[
\partial_t \Theta_{t,T} f(x) = - \frac{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_k P_k(T-t)f(x) + \nu_k(x) \cdot P_k(T-t)f(x)}{\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)}
+ \frac{P_k(T-t)f(x) \cdot \mu_t(P_k(T-t)1) \cdot \mu_t(\nu_k)}{(\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1))^2}
= - \frac{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_k P_k(T-t)f(x) + (\nu_k(x) - \mu_t(\nu_k)) \cdot P_k(T-t)f(x)}{\mu_t(P_k(T-t)1)}
= - \hat{\mathcal{L}}_k \Theta_{t,T} f(x) - (\nu_k(x) - \mu_t(\nu_k)) \cdot \Theta_{t,T} f(x).
\]

Substituting (71) in the martingale characterization (60) for \( \varphi_t = \Theta_{t,T} f \), we obtain
\[
\mu_t^N(\Theta_{t,T} f) = \mu_0^N(\Theta_{0,T} f) + \mathcal{M}_t(\Theta_{t,T} f) + \int_0^t \mu_s^N(\Theta_{s,T} f) \cdot (\mu_s^N(\nu_k) - \mu_s(\nu_k)) \, ds.
\] (73)
**Proposition B.3.** For any test function $f \in \mathcal{C}(E)$ there exist constants $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 > 0$ such that
\[
N\langle \mathcal{M}(\Theta \cdot T f) \rangle_t^T \leq \|f\|^2 (T-t) \cdot (\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda} Q\|),
\]
where $\mathcal{M}$ is the martingale characterization (57) of the cloning process. Moreover, for any $\tilde{f} := f - \mu_T(f)$, there exist constants $\gamma'_0, \gamma'_1 > 0$ such that
\[
N\langle \mathcal{M}(\Theta \cdot T \tilde{f}) \rangle_t^T \leq \|f\|^2 \cdot (\gamma'_0 + \gamma'_1 \|\hat{\lambda} Q\|).
\]

**Proof.** First observe that, given the infinitesimal generator of a jump process in the general form
\[
\mathcal{L} f(x) = \int_E W(x,dy) (f(y) - f(x)),
\]
it is easy to see that $\|\mathcal{L} f\| \leq 2 \|W\| \cdot \|f\|$, and thus $\|\Gamma_L(f, f)\| \leq 4 \|W\| \cdot \|f\|^2$. Therefore, recalling the estimation of the predictable quadratic variation (58), we see that
\[
N\langle \mathcal{M}(\Theta \cdot T f) \rangle_t^T \leq 8 \int_t^T \left( \|\hat{\lambda} Q\| \cdot \|\Theta_s, T \tilde{f}\|^2 + \|\hat{\lambda} Q\| \cdot \|\Theta_s, T \tilde{f}\|^2 \right) ds,
\]
where $\hat{\lambda} Q(x, y) = W(x, dy) e^{kq(x,y)}$ is the overall transition rate of $\hat{L}k$ (11) and, by definition, $\|\hat{\lambda} Q\| < \infty$. The statement follows by Lemma B.1.

The following is a useful technical Lemma which bounds the $p$-norm of a martingale by its predictable quadratic variation. It plays a central role in [26] and is also used explicitly in the proof of Theorem 4.6, estimating the $L^p$-error for $\Lambda_k^{aT,T,N,*}$ based on the cloning cloning factor.

**Lemma B.4.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a locally square-integrable martingale with continuous predictable quadratic variation $\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle$, $\mathcal{M}_0 = 0$ and uniformly bounded jumps $\sup_t |\Delta \mathcal{M}_t| \leq a < \infty$. Then, for every $q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $T \geq 0$, there exist constants $D_q, C_q > 0$ such that
\[
\sup_{t \leq T} \mathbb{E}\left[ \mathcal{M}_t^{2^{q+1}} \right] \leq D_q \mathbb{E}\left[ (\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_T)^{2^q} \right] \leq C_q \sum_{k=0}^q a^{2^{q+1}-2^{k+1}} \mathbb{E}\left[ (\langle \mathcal{M} \rangle_T)^{2^k} \right].
\]

**Proof.** See [26], Lemma 6.2.

Applying Lemma B.4 to Proposition B.3 and recalling the bound on the jumps (59), we obtain an estimate of the $p$-norm of the quadratic variation, with $p = 2^q$,
\[
\mathbb{E}\left[ \left( \langle \mathcal{M}(\Theta \cdot T f) \rangle_t^T \right)^p \right]^{1/p} \leq C_p \|f\|^2 (T-t) \cdot \frac{(\gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \|\hat{\lambda} Q\|)}{N},
\]
(74)
where $C_p^\ast > 0$ is a constant dependent only on $p$. Thanks to Jensen inequality, we can extend the result for every $p \geq 1$.

Equation (73) coincides with Equation (10) in [26], whereas Inequality (74) coincides with the one given in Lemma 5.3 in [26], but with the dependence on the second moment $Q$ made explicit. Thus, the proof of Proposition 4.1 follows straightforwardly the proof of Theorem 4.1 and 4.2 in [26], given by Theorem 5.4, Lemma 5.6 and subsequent comments, but keeping track of $Q$ explicitly, as in Proposition B.3 and Inequality (74) above.
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