

Markov chains in random environment with applications in queueing theory and machine learning

Attila Lovas[†]Miklós Rásonyi[‡]

October 10, 2021

Abstract

We prove the existence of limiting distributions for a large class of Markov chains on a general state space in a random environment. We assume suitable versions of the standard drift and minorization conditions. In particular, the system dynamics should be contractive on the average with respect to the Lyapunov function and large enough small sets should exist with large enough minorization constants. We also establish that a law of large numbers holds for bounded functionals of the process. Applications to queueing systems, to machine learning algorithms and to autoregressive processes are presented.

1 Introduction

Markov chains in stationary random environments (MCREs) with a general (not necessarily countable) state space appear in several branches of applied probability. Rough volatility models of mathematical finance (see [9, 10]), queueing models with non-i.i.d. service times (see [5] and Section 4 below) and sequential Monte Carlo methods (see Section 5 below) are prominent examples. It seems that existing studies on the ergodic theory of MCREs (such as [13, 14, 21, 22]) impose conditions that exclude the treatment of relevant models from the applications above.

The article [11], introducing new tools, managed to establish the existence of limiting laws and ergodic theorems for certain classes of MCREs which satisfy suitable versions of the standard drift and minorization conditions of Markov chain theory (as presented e.g. in [18]).

Assumption 2.2 of [11], however, severely restricted the scope of applications by requiring that the system dynamics is contractive whatever the state of the random environment is. The present study aims to remove this restriction: we require only that process dynamics is contractive *on the average*, in the sense of Assumption 2.3 below.

Both authors benefitted from the support of the “Lendület” grant LP 2015-6 of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The second author was also supported by the NKFIH (National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary) grant KH 126505.

[†]Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics and Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest, Hungary

[‡]Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics, Budapest, Hungary

In Section 2 our main results are stated in an abstract framework. Two applications are worked out in detail in Sections 4 and 5. In Section 4, we study a queuing model, where service times are not i.i.d. In Section 5, we treat the stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics with stationary data, a sampling algorithm with important applications in machine learning, see [23, 1]. Some ramifications are presented in Section 3 and they are applied to linear systems in Section 6. Proofs are presented in Section 7.

Notations and conventions. Let $\mathbb{R}_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{N}^+ := \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq 1\}$. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. We denote by $\mathbb{E}[X]$ the expectation of a random variable X . For $1 \leq p < \infty$, L^p is used to denote the usual space of p -integrable real-valued random variables and $\|X\|_p$ stands for the L^p -norm of a random variable X .

We fix a standard Borel space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$. The set of probability Borel measures on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ are denoted by \mathcal{M}_1 . The total variation metric on \mathcal{M}_1 is defined by

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = |\mu_1 - \mu_2|(\mathcal{X}), \quad \mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_1,$$

where $|\mu_1 - \mu_2|$ denotes the total variation of the signed measure $\mu_1 - \mu_2$.

For $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}_1$, let $\mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ denotes the set of probability measures on $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ such that its respective marginals are μ_1 and μ_2 . Then, $d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ can be expressed as twice the optimal transportation cost, between μ_1 and μ_2 , that is

$$\frac{1}{2}d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \inf_{\kappa \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{x \neq y} \kappa(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y). \quad (1)$$

In the sequel, we employ the convention that $\sum_k^l = 0$ and $\prod_k^l = 1$ whenever $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k > l$. Lastly, $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard Euclidean inner product on finite dimensional vector spaces. For example, on \mathbb{R}^d , $\langle x | y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i y_i$.

2 Main results

Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A})$ be a measurable space and $Y : \mathbb{Z} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ a strongly stationary \mathcal{Y} -valued stochastic process which we interpret as the environment which influences the evolution of our main process of interest (X below). We consider a parametric family of stochastic kernels, that is a map $Q : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$ the function $(y, x) \mapsto Q(y, x, B)$ is $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable and for all $(y, x) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$, $B \mapsto Q(y, x, B)$ is a probability measure on \mathcal{B} .

We assume that we are given the \mathcal{X} -valued process X_t , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X_0 = x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ is fixed and

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t+1} \in B | \mathcal{F}_t) = Q(Y_t, X_t, B) \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (2)$$

where the filtration is

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(X_s, 0 \leq s \leq t; Y_s, s \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $\mu_t \in \mathcal{M}_1$ denote the law of X_t for $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

We aim to study the ergodic properties of X_t and the convergence of μ_t to a limiting law as $t \rightarrow \infty$ under various assumptions.

Definition 2.1. Let $P : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a probabilistic kernel. For a bounded measurable function $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$[P\phi](x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \phi(z)P(x, dz), \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

This definition makes sense for any non-negative measurable ϕ , too.

Consistently with Definition 2.1, for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $Q(y)\phi$ will refer to the action of the kernel $Q(y, \cdot, \cdot)$ on ϕ .

Assumption 2.2. (Drift condition) Let $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a measurable function. We assume that there are measurable functions $K, \gamma : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$[Q(y)V](x) \leq \gamma(y)V(x) + K(y).$$

Furthermore, we may and will assume that $K(\cdot) \geq 1$.

In contrast with the drift condition used in [11] (cf. Assumption 2.2 on page 2), the domain of γ is \mathcal{Y} and not \mathbb{N} . Moreover, it is possible that $\gamma(y) \geq 1$ holds for certain $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. This relaxation allows the inclusion of several models that were intractable using the results of [11]. Although $\gamma(y) \geq 1$ may hold, in the next assumption we require that the system dynamics, on average, is contracting in the long run.

Assumption 2.3. (Long-time contractivity condition) We assume that

$$\bar{\gamma} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n} \left(K(Y_0) \prod_{k=1}^n \gamma(Y_k) \right) < 1.$$

The next assumption stipulates the existence of suitable “small sets”. It corresponds to Assumption 2.5 in [11] but we need a different formulation here.

Assumption 2.4. (Minorization condition) Let $\lambda(\cdot)$, $K(\cdot)$ be as in Assumption 2.2. We assume that for some $0 < \varepsilon < 1/\bar{\gamma}^{1/2} - 1$, there is a measurable function $\alpha : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and a probability kernel $\kappa : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\inf_{x \in V^{-1}([0, R(y)])} Q(y, x, A) \geq (1 - \alpha(y))\kappa(y, A), \quad \text{where } R(y) = \frac{2K(y)}{\varepsilon\gamma(y)} \quad (3)$$

and $V^{-1}([0, R(y)]) \neq \emptyset$.

Remark 2.5. If there is $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with $V(x) = 0$ then $V^{-1}([0, R(y)]) \neq \emptyset$ automatically holds.

The larger $\alpha(y)$ is, the weaker condition (3) is. Hence one needs to control the probability of $\alpha(Y_0)$ approaching 1 and enforce the “smallness” of $\alpha(Y_0)$. This is the content of the following condition which will play a very important role in our convergence estimates.

Assumption 2.6. (Smallness condition) There exists $0 < \theta < 1$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n^\theta} (\alpha(Y_0)^n) = 0.$$

Remark 2.7. Assumption 2.6 clearly holds if $\alpha(\cdot) \equiv \alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a constant. To see a simple non-constant example, let $\mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{N}_+$ and assume that

$$\inf_{x \in V^{-1}([0, R(y)])} Q(k, x, A) \geq \frac{1}{k^\chi} \kappa(k, A) \quad (4)$$

holds for a suitable kernel κ , for all $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ with some $\chi \geq 1$. Note that $1 - e^{-1/k^\chi} \leq 1/k^\chi$ hence inequality (3) in the minorization condition holds with $\alpha(k) = e^{-1/k^\chi}$. Let Y_0 satisfy $P(Y_0 = k) = e^{-\delta k} c_\delta$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with a suitable normalizing constant $c_\delta > 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E[\alpha(Y_0)^n] &\leq c_\delta \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n^{\frac{1}{2\chi}} \rfloor} e^{-n/k^\chi} e^{-\delta k} + c_\delta \sum_{k=\lfloor n^{\frac{1}{2\chi}} \rfloor + 1}^{\infty} e^{-n/k^\chi} e^{-\delta k} \\ &\leq c_\delta \lfloor n^{\frac{1}{2\chi}} \rfloor e^{-n^{\frac{1}{2\chi}}} + C_\delta e^{-\delta(\lfloor n^{\frac{1}{2\chi}} \rfloor + 1)} \end{aligned}$$

for a suitable constant $C_\delta > 0$. Then Assumption 2.6 clearly holds with any $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2\chi}$.

Now come the main results of the present paper: with the above presented assumptions, the law of X_t converges to a limiting law as $t \rightarrow \infty$, moreover, bounded functionals of X_t admit ergodic behavior provided that Y_t is ergodic.

Theorem 2.8. *Under Assumptions 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6, there exists a universal probability law μ_* , independent of x_0 , such that $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu_*$ in total variation as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

More precisely, for any $1/2 < \lambda < 1$, there exist $c(\lambda), \nu(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(\mu_N, \mu_*) &\leq \\ 2 \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} &\left[\mathbb{E} \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \right) + \tilde{\gamma}(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 n^{-1/3} + c n^{2/3} e^{-\nu n^{1/3}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

holds for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 2.9. To help decipher the expression (5), we remark that setting $\lambda = 3/4$, (5) is easily seen to be dominated by

$$2 \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left[\max_{0 \leq k \leq n} \alpha(Y_k) \right]^{n^{1/3} - 2} \right) + \tilde{\gamma} n^{2/3/8} + c n^{2/3} e^{-\nu n^{1/3}} \right]$$

for $N \geq 216$, with suitable constants $c, \nu > 0$. In the particular case where $\alpha(\cdot)$ is constant, the latter expression is $O(e^{-\zeta n^{1/3}})$ for some $\zeta > 0$, as easily seen.

To make the explanation self-contained, we give the definition of ergodic environment which we will use in the sequel. Let $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the space of trajectories, $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}}$ the σ -algebra generated by cylinder sets, and $\text{Law}(Y)$ the distribution on $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ induced by Y . We introduce the usual *left shift operation* $S : \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ acting on trajectories like $(Sy)_j = y_{j+1}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. As the environment is assumed to be strongly stationary, the probability $\text{Law}(Y)$ is invariant under the transformation S and thus $(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{A}^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}}, \text{Law}(Y), S)$ forms a dynamical system. We say that an event $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}}$ is invariant iff $S^{-1}(A) = A$ and the process Y is *ergodic* if the σ -algebra generated by invariant events \mathcal{I} , which is a sub- σ -algebra of $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}}$, is trivial for $\text{Law}(Y)$ i.e. for all $A \in \mathcal{I}$, $\text{Law}(Y)(A) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Theorem 2.10. *Let Assumptions 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6 be in force. If Y is ergodic, then for any bounded and measurable $\Phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$*

$$\frac{\Phi(X_1) + \dots + \Phi(X_N)}{N} \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz), \quad N \rightarrow \infty \quad (6)$$

holds in L^p , for all $1 \leq p < \infty$, where μ_ is as in Theorem 2.8 above.*

Remark 2.11. Since Φ is bounded, convergence in (6) takes place in probability iff it happens in L^p for all $1 \leq p < \infty$. We preferred the current formulation of Theorem 2.10 since we obtain L^p rates during the proofs, see also Remark 7.14. However, the expressions for these rates are too complicated to be stated here.

Remark 2.12. The above theorems should be compared to Theorems 2.13 and 2.15 of [11]. Our results are definitely stronger in the sense that [11] requires $\gamma(\cdot) < 1$ while we do not. However, those results are not *subsumed* by the present ones, they are merely *complemented*. For instance, Assumption 2.5 of [11] applies to certain cases where our Assumption 2.4 does not. It is also unclear whether the assumptions of [11] imply our Assumption 2.3 in general.

3 Ramifications

Although many stochastic models, including all discretized diffusion processes (as well as discretely sampled diffusions), fall within the scope of our framework in the previous section, certain classes of processes are not covered in this way. For instance, vector autoregressive models fail to satisfy the one-step drift and minorization conditions.

To make our techniques applicable to a larger class of models, we generalize Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 to cases where we require the drift and minorization conditions to hold only after several steps. In Section 6 we will apply these theorems to vector autoregressive models.

To keep complexity at a tolerable level, we restrict ourselves to the case of constant K in the drift condition below. We also need to assume (7), inspired by Assumption 6 in [7].

Assumption 3.1. *Let $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a measurable function. We assume that there is an integer $p \geq 1$, a measurable function $\gamma : \mathcal{Y}^p \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and a constant $K \geq 1$ such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $(y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathcal{Y}^p$,*

$$[Q(y_p)Q(y_{p-1}) \dots Q(y_1)V](x) \leq \gamma(y_1, \dots, y_p)V(x) + K$$

and

$$[Q(y)V](x) \leq KV(x) + K. \quad (7)$$

The corresponding long-time contractivity condition reads as follows.

Assumption 3.2. *We assume that*

$$\bar{\gamma} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{1/n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \gamma(Y_{(i-1)p+1}, \dots, Y_{ip}) \right) < 1.$$

Similarly, in the minorization condition below, the lower bound is also assumed independent of the environment for simplicity, thus there is no need for a generalized version of the smallness condition i.e. Assumption 2.6.

Assumption 3.3. Let $\gamma(\cdot)$, $K(\cdot)$ be as in Assumption 3.1. We assume that for some $0 < \epsilon < 1/\bar{\gamma}^{1/2} - 1$, there is a constant $0 \leq \alpha < 1$ and a probability κ such that, for all $(y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathcal{Y}^p$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X})$,

$$\inf_{x \in V^{-1}([0, R(y_1, \dots, y_p)])} [Q(y_p)Q(y_{p-1}) \dots Q(y_1)](x, A) \geq (1 - \alpha)\kappa(A), \quad (8)$$

where $R(y_1, \dots, y_p) = \frac{2K}{\epsilon \gamma(y_1, \dots, y_p)}$ and we require $V^{-1}([0, R(y_1, \dots, y_p)]) \neq \emptyset$.

We can now state the following complement to Theorems 2.8 and 2.10.

Theorem 3.4. Under Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, μ_N converges to a limiting law, independent of x_0 , at speed $O(e^{-cN^{1/3}})$. Furthermore, if Y is ergodic, then the law of large numbers holds as stated in Theorem 2.10.

4 A queuing model

We consider a single-server queuing model where customers are numbered by $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The time between the arrival of customers $n+1$ and n is described by the random variable ε_{n+1} , for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The service time for customer n is given by the random variable Y_n , for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The waiting time W_n of customer n satisfies the Lindley recursion

$$W_{n+1} = (W_n + Y_n - \varepsilon_{n+1})_+, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (9)$$

with $W_0 := 0$ (we start with an empty queue hence the 0th customer does not need to wait at all). The textbook example is when $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ are i.i.d. sequences independent of each other. In that case W_n is a Markov chain with state space \mathbb{R}_+ whose ergodic properties have been extensively studied. Here we are interested in a more general setting where the process $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is assumed merely stationary.

The following condition is standard: in a stable system service times should be shorter on the average than inter-arrival times.

Assumption 4.1. The sequence of \mathbb{R}_+ -valued inter-arrival times ε_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is i.i.d. and we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_0] < \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_1].$$

Assumption 4.2. For some $M > 0$, the sequence of service times is included in a strict sense $[0, M]$ -valued stationary process Y_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is independent of $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. There is $\eta > 0$ such that the limit

$$\Gamma(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} e^{\alpha(Y_1 + \dots + Y_n)} \quad (10)$$

exists for all $\alpha \in (-\eta, \eta)$ and Γ is differentiable on $(-\eta, \eta)$.

Remark 4.3. The assumption above is clearly inspired by the Gärtner-Ellis theorem. It follows that sufficient conditions for its fulfillment can be deduced from the literature about large deviation principles. For instance, if $Y_n = \phi(Z_n)$ for some bounded measurable $\phi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and an \mathbb{R}^m -valued geometrically ergodic Markov chain Z_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ started from its invariant distribution then (10) holds true for some $\eta > 0$, see Theorem 4.1 of [15] for a precise formulation. Thus Theorem 4.7 below is applicable to a large class of models.

Infinite moving average processes serve as an example of non-Markovian service time processes. For instance, let $Y_t = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} a_i \zeta_{t-i}$, where ζ_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are independent and identically distributed \mathbb{R}_+ -valued bounded random variables, $a_i \geq 0$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} a_i < \infty$. Assumption 4.2 is satisfied for this process by Theorem 2.1 of [6].

Under suitable conditions, it is possible to relax the boundedness condition on the process Y in Assumption 4.2. Due to tedious technicalities, this is not pursued here.

Now, we turn to the verification of Assumption 2.2 and 2.3 under the previous two conditions.

Lemma 4.4. *Let Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2 be in force. Then there exists $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that for*

$$\begin{aligned} V(w) &:= e^{\bar{\alpha}w} - 1, \quad w \geq 0, \\ \gamma(y) &:= \mathbb{E}[e^{\bar{\alpha}(y-\varepsilon_1)}], \quad y \geq 0, \\ K &:= e^{\bar{\alpha}M}, \\ [Q(y)V](w) &\leq \gamma(y)V(w) + K \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

holds for all $y \in \mathcal{Y} := [0, M]$, $w \in \mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}_+$, where Q is defined as

$$Q(y, w, A) := \mathbb{P}[(w + y - \varepsilon_1)_+ \in A], \quad y \in [0, M], w \in \mathbb{R}_+, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+).$$

Furthermore,

$$\bar{\gamma} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n} \left(K \prod_{k=1}^n \gamma(Y_k) \right) < 1.$$

Proof. Define $\lambda(\alpha) := \Gamma(\alpha) + \ln(\mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha\varepsilon_1}])$. The functions

$$\lambda_n(\alpha) := \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j)} \right], \quad \alpha \in (-\eta, \eta), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^+$$

are finite and differentiable. They are also clearly convex. Define

$$\psi_n(\alpha) := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j)} - 1}{\alpha} \right], \quad \alpha \in (0, \eta), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

By the Lagrange mean value theorem and measurable selection, there exists a random variable $\xi_n(\alpha) \in [0, \alpha]$ such that

$$\psi_n(\alpha) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j) \right) e^{\xi_n(\alpha) \sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j)} \right].$$

Here

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j) \right) e^{\xi_n(\alpha) \sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j)} \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n Y_{j-1} \right) e^{\eta \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{j-1}},$$

which is uniformly bounded in $\alpha \in (0, \eta)$ (for n fixed). Hence reverse Fatou's lemma shows that

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0+} \psi_n(\alpha) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^n (Y_{j-1} - \varepsilon_j) \right] = n \mathbb{E}[Y_0 - \varepsilon_1].$$

This implies that, for all $n \geq 1$, $\lambda'_n(0) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0+} \psi_n(\alpha) \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_0 - \varepsilon_1]$.

Since $\lambda_n(\alpha) \rightarrow \lambda(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (-\eta, \eta)$ by Assumption 4.2 it follows from Theorem 25.7 of [19] that also $\lambda'_n(0) \rightarrow \lambda'(0)$ hence $\lambda'(0) < 0$ by Assumption 4.1. By Corollary 25.5.1 of [19], differentiability of λ implies its *continuous* differentiability, too. Hence from $\lambda(0) = 0$ and $\lambda'(0) < 0$ we obtain that there exists $\bar{\alpha} > 0$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} e^{\bar{\alpha}(Y_0 + \dots + Y_{n-1}) - \bar{\alpha}(\varepsilon_1 + \dots + \varepsilon_n)} < 0. \quad (12)$$

Now using the Lyapunov function $V(w) = e^{\bar{\alpha}w} - 1$, $w \geq 0$ and $\gamma(y) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\bar{\alpha}(y - \varepsilon_1)}]$, $y \geq 0$ we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} [Q(y)V](w) &= \mathbb{E}[V([w + y - \varepsilon_1]_+)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[e^{\bar{\alpha}(w+y-\varepsilon_1)_+}] \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{\bar{\alpha}(w+y-\varepsilon_1)}] \\ &\leq \gamma(y)(e^{\bar{\alpha}w} - 1) + \gamma(y) \leq \gamma(y)V(w) + e^{\bar{\alpha}M}, \end{aligned}$$

so (11) holds with K as defined above. By (12), the long-time contractivity condition also holds:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n} [K \gamma(Y_1) \dots \gamma(Y_n)] < 1, \quad (13)$$

which completes the proof. \square

Now we present another assumption on the inter-arrival times which will be needed to show the minorization condition.

Assumption 4.5. One has $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 \geq \tau) > 0$ for

$$\tau := M + \frac{4}{\frac{1}{\bar{\gamma}^{1/2}} - 1}.$$

Notice that, for unbounded ε_1 , Assumption 4.5 automatically holds. Now let us turn to the verification of the minorization condition under the assumption above.

Lemma 4.6. Let Assumptions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5 be in force. Choose $\epsilon := (1/\bar{\gamma}^{1/2} - 1)/2$. Then there is $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $y \in [0, M]$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\inf_{w \in V^{-1}([0, R(y)])} Q(y, w, A) \geq (1 - \alpha) \delta_0(A), \text{ where } R(y) = \frac{2K(y)}{\epsilon \gamma(y)}$$

and δ_0 is the one-point mass concentrated on 0.

Proof. Note that $R(y) \equiv R := \frac{2}{\epsilon}$.

$$\begin{aligned} Q(y, w, A) &= \mathbb{P}([w + y - \varepsilon_1]_+ \in A) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}([w + y - \varepsilon_1]_+ = 0) \delta_0(A) \\ &= (1 - \mathbb{P}(w + y - \varepsilon_1 > 0)) \delta_0(A) \\ &\geq (1 - \mathbb{P}(R + M - \varepsilon_1 > 0)) \delta_0(A) \end{aligned}$$

so we may set $\alpha := \mathbb{P}(\varepsilon_1 < \tau) \} < 1$, see Assumption 4.5. \square

Theorem 2.8 allows us to deduce that the queuing system in consideration converges to a stationary state and an ergodic theorem is valid. Theorem 4.7 below opens the door for the statistical analysis of such systems.

Theorem 4.7. *Under Assumptions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5 there exists a probability μ_* on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$, independent of the initial length of the queue, such that*

$$d_{TV}(\text{Law}(W_n), \mu_*) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 n^{1/3}},$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$. Furthermore, if $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is ergodic, then for an arbitrary measurable and bounded $\Phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{\Phi(W_0) + \dots + \Phi(W_{n-1})}{n} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz), \quad (14)$$

in L^p , for all $1 \leq p < \infty$.

Proof. According to Lemma 4.4 and 4.6, Assumptions 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.6 are satisfied hence by Theorem 2.8 and Remark 2.9 the first statement follows. By Theorem 2.10, the second statement also holds true. \square

Remark 4.8. It is known that $\text{Law}(W_n)$ converges to a limiting distribution under rather mild conditions, see Example 14.1 on page 189 of [5]. Details of this approach seem to be available only in Russian, see [4]. To be more explicit, applying Theorem 4 on page 25 of [3] (also in Russian) to our settings gives the following upper bound

$$d_{TV}(\text{Law}(W_n), \mu_*) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{0 \leq k < n} S_k > \max(W_1, W'_0 + \xi_0)\right), \quad (15)$$

where $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= 0 \\ S_n &= \sum_{k=1}^n (Y_k - \varepsilon_k), \quad n \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

moreover $W'_0 = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}^+} (Y_{-k} - \varepsilon_{-k})$. However, the main drawback of this upper bound is that the expression standing on the right hand side of (15) is still too general and non-informative. Therefore, we think that, Theorem 4.7 above is the first result providing a tractable rate of convergence in this setting.

5 Stochastic gradient Langevin algorithm

We consider, for some $\lambda > 0$,

$$\theta_{n+1} = \theta_n - \lambda H(\theta_n, Y_n) + \sqrt{\lambda} \xi_{n+1},$$

where ξ_n , $n \geq 1$ is an independent sequence of standard d -dimensional Gaussian random variables, Y_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a \mathbb{R}^m -valued strict sense stationary process and $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ a measurable function. We assume that $(Y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}^+}$ are independent, $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a constant.

This algorithm is called “stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics” (SGLD). Suggested by [23], it has recently become widely used for sampling from high-dimensional probability distributions. More precisely, let $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be differentiable with derivative $h = \nabla U$ such that $h(\theta) = E[H(\theta, Y_0)]$. For λ small and n large, $\text{Law}(\theta_n)$ is expected to be close to the probability defined by

$$\pi(A) = \frac{\int_A e^{-U(\theta)} d\theta}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(\theta')} d\theta'}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d),$$

see e.g. [23, 1]. The literature on SGLD is abundant but practically all studies assume that Y_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ are i.i.d. For the case where the step size λ_n is decreasing, it has been shown in [24] that, under suitable assumptions, the averages

$$D_n := \frac{\Phi(\theta_0) + \dots + \Phi(\theta_{n-1})}{n}$$

converge almost surely to $D := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(z) \pi(dz)$. In the case of fixed λ , [20] estimated the L^2 distance between D_n and D .

In the present article we keep λ fixed and establish a novel result: the SGLD recursion converges to a limiting law $\mu(\lambda)$ (in total variation) and D_n tends to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(z) \mu(\lambda)(dz)$ in L^p , $1 \leq p < \infty$. As far as we know this ergodic property has not yet been pointed out, even in the case of i.i.d. Y_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We can now prove it for a broad class of stationary processes Y_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We think of Y_n as an observed data sequence. As these are rarely i.i.d. in practice, Theorem 5.6 below formulates strong theoretical support for the use of SGLD with possibly dependent data.

The following standard dissipativity condition is required, see e.g. [17].

Assumption 5.1. *There is a measurable $\Delta : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $b \geq 0$ such that, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$\langle H(\theta, y), \theta \rangle \geq \Delta(y) |\theta|^2 - b.$$

Furthermore, $E[\Delta(Y_0)] > 0$. We may and will assume that Δ is a bounded function.

Assumption 5.2. *There is $\eta > 0$ such that the limit*

$$\Gamma(\alpha) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} e^{\alpha(\Delta(Y_1) + \dots + \Delta(Y_n))}$$

exists for all $\alpha \in (-\eta, \eta)$ and Γ is continuously differentiable on $(-\eta, \eta)$.

Assumption 5.3. *There exist K_1, K_2, K_3 such that*

$$|H(\theta, y)| \leq K_1 |\theta| + K_2 |y| + K_3.$$

Note that Assumption 5.3 holds, in particular, if H is Lipschitz-continuous.

Assumption 5.4. Y_0 is bounded, say, $|Y_0| \leq M$ a.s.

Remark 5.5. Boundedness of Y_0 could be relaxed at the price of rather tedious technicalities hence we prefer not to treat this here.

It turns out that the law of θ_n tends to a limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and ergodic averages converge to the expectation under the limit law.

Theorem 5.6. Let $\lambda > 0$ be small enough. Under Assumptions 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, there exists a probability law $\mu(\lambda)$, independent of the initial value, such that

$$d_{TV}(\text{Law}(\theta_n), \mu(\lambda)) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 n^{1/3}},$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$ (which also depend on λ). Moreover, for arbitrary bounded measurable $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{\Phi(\theta_0) + \dots + \Phi(\theta_{n-1})}{n} \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Phi(z) \mu(\lambda)(dz),$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in L^p , for all $p \geq 1$.

Remark 5.7. The convergence rates given by the above theorem are not sharp enough for practical purposes. However, Theorem 5.6 provides a *universal ergodic property* for the stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics, irrespective of dependencies in the data stream (as long as they satisfy Assumption 5.2). No result of this calibre has heretofore been available in the related literature.

It is a natural question, how far $\mu(\lambda)$ is from the target probability π . It follows from [8] that, under suitable assumptions, the Wasserstein-1 distance of $\text{Law}(\theta_n)$ from π is of the order $\sqrt{\lambda}$, uniformly in n . Hence the same is true for $\mu(\lambda)$ and π .

Proof of Theorem 5.6. Choose $V(\theta) := |\theta|^2$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and define

$$Q(y, \theta, A) := \mathbb{P}(\theta - \lambda H(\theta, y) + \sqrt{\lambda} \xi_1 \in A),$$

for all $y \in \mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{R}^m$, $\theta \in \mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \in \mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Noting that ξ_1 has mean zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [Q(y)V](\theta) &= \mathbb{E}[V(\theta - \lambda H(\theta, y) + \sqrt{\lambda} \xi_1)] \\ &= \lambda \mathbb{E}|\xi_1|^2 + \lambda^2 |H(\theta, y)|^2 + |\theta|^2 - 2\lambda \langle \theta, H(\theta, y) \rangle \\ &\leq \lambda(d + 2b) + 3\lambda^2 [K_1^2 |\theta|^2 + K_2^2 |y|^2 + K_3^2] + (1 - 2\lambda \Delta(y)) |\theta|^2 \end{aligned}$$

so Assumption 2.2 holds with $K(y) := \lambda(d + 2b) + 3\lambda^2 K_3^2 + 3\lambda^2 K_2^2 |y|^2$, $\gamma(y) := 1 + 3\lambda^2 K_1^2 - 2\lambda \Delta(y)$. Note that, due to the boundedness of Δ , $\gamma(y) \geq 0$ for all y for λ small enough, in fact $\gamma(y) \geq \tilde{\gamma} > 0$ for some $\tilde{\gamma}$. By Assumption 5.1, for $\bar{\lambda}$ small enough, $\mathbb{E}[3\bar{\lambda} K_1^2 - 2\Delta(Y_0)] < 0$.

Arguments similar to those in the preceeding section show that, when $\lambda \leq \bar{\lambda}$ is small enough,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln E[e^{\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n [3\bar{\lambda} K_1^2 - 2\Delta(Y_j)]]] < 0,$$

but then also

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln E[e^{\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n [3\lambda K_1^2 - 2\Delta(Y_j)]]] < 0.$$

Noting $1 + x \leq e^x$ this implies

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma} &:= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{1/n} [K(Y_0) \gamma(Y_1) \dots \gamma(Y_n)] \leq \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{1/n} [\gamma(Y_1) \dots \gamma(Y_n)] &\sqrt[n]{\lambda(d+2b) + 3\lambda^2 K_3^2 + 3\lambda^2 K_2^2 M^2} = \\ \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E^{1/n} [\gamma(Y_1) \dots \gamma(Y_n)] &< 1 \end{aligned}$$

hence Assumption 2.3 also holds.

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/\tilde{\gamma}^{1/2} - 1$, $R(y) := \frac{2K(y)}{\varepsilon\gamma(y)}$, define $C(y) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d : |\theta|^2 \leq R(y)\}$ and set

$$\kappa(y, A) := \frac{\text{Leb}(C(y) \cap A)}{\text{Leb}(C(y))}, \quad A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Denoting $f(\theta) := \exp\{-|\theta|^2/2\}/(2\pi)^{d/2}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $|y| \leq M$, $\theta \in C(y)$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$

$$\begin{aligned} Q(y, \theta, A) &= \mathbb{P}(\theta - \lambda H(\theta, y) + \sqrt{\lambda} \xi_1 \in A) \geq \mathbb{P}(\theta - \lambda H(\theta, y) + \sqrt{\lambda} \xi_1 \in C(y) \cap A) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_{\theta - \lambda H(\theta, y) + w\sqrt{\lambda} \in C(y) \cap A} f(w) dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^{d/2}} \int_{C(y) \cap A} f\left(\frac{z - \theta + \lambda H(\theta, y)}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\right) dz \\ &\geq \frac{\text{Leb}(C(y))}{(2\pi\lambda)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\max_{z \in C(y)} \frac{|z - \theta + \lambda H(\theta, y)|^2}{2\lambda}\right) \kappa(y, A). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for $|y| \leq M$ and $\theta, z \in C(y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\lambda} |z - \theta + \lambda H(\theta, y)|^2 &\leq \frac{(2 + \lambda K_1)^2}{\lambda} \frac{2K(y)}{\varepsilon\gamma(y)} + \lambda(K_2 M + K_3)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2(2 + \lambda K_1)^2 [d + 2b + 3\lambda(K_3^2 + K_2^2 M^2)]}{\varepsilon \tilde{\gamma}} + \lambda(K_2 M + K_3)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we can choose λ small enough such that

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda} |z - \theta + \lambda H(\theta, y)|^2 \leq \frac{9(d+2b)}{\varepsilon \tilde{\gamma}} + 1.$$

According to our previous estimate for $Q(y, \theta, A)$, for λ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(y, \theta, A) &\geq \frac{\text{Leb}(C(y))}{(2\pi\lambda)^{d/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{9(d+2b)}{\varepsilon \tilde{\gamma}} - 1\right) \kappa(y, A) \\ &\geq \tilde{c} e^{-\hat{c}/\varepsilon} \kappa(y, A) \end{aligned}$$

for suitable $\tilde{c}, \hat{c} > 0$ depending on b, d, M and $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} |\Delta(y)|$, which proves that Assumption 2.4 and 2.6 hold with $\alpha := 1 - \tilde{c} e^{-\hat{c}/\varepsilon}$. We thus get that the claimed convergence rate holds by Theorem 2.8 and Remark 2.9. \square

6 Linear systems in a random environment

A popular class of examples where we can apply the results of Section 3 is that of linear systems. Fix integers $m, d \geq 1$ and let $A, B : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ be measurable functions. Operator norm of a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ will be denoted $|||M|||$. Let $Y_t \in \mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{R}^m$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a stationary process. We consider the process $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ obeying the linear dynamics

$$X_{t+1} := A(Y_t)X_t + B(Y_t)\varepsilon_{t+1}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (16)$$

where $\varepsilon_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $t \geq 1$ is an i.i.d. sequence, independent of $(Y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Let $X_0 = x_0$ with some constant $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

For simplicity we stay with the case of square matrices $A(\cdot)$, $B(\cdot)$. More general linear systems could be treated along similar lines under suitable controllability conditions but at the price of considerable complications.

Assumption 6.1. *The functions A, B are bounded; $B(y)$, $A(y)$ are invertible for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^m} (|||A(y)^{-1}||| + |||B(y)^{-1}|||) < \infty$; ε_0 has a density $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with respect to the d -dimensional Lebesgue measure which is a.s. bounded away from 0 on compact sets; $E|\varepsilon_0| < \infty$.*

Assumption 6.2. *There is an integer $p \geq 1$ such that*

$$E \left[\ln |||A(Y_p)A(Y_{p-1}) \dots A(Y_1)||| \right] < 0. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, there is $\eta > 0$ and a differentiable function $\Gamma : (-\eta, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln E \prod_{i=1}^n |||A(Y_{ip})A(Y_{ip-1}) \dots A(Y_{(i-1)p+1})|||^\alpha = \Gamma(\alpha), \quad \alpha \in (-\eta, \eta). \quad (18)$$

Note that when A is a constant matrix, (17) boils down to requiring $|||A^p||| < 1$ for some $p \geq 1$ which is equivalent to the spectral radius of A being smaller than 1. This shows that (17) is reasonable to assume. Condition (18) is again a Gärtner-Ellis type condition in the spirit of Assumption 4.2 above. For Markovian Y sufficient conditions for its fulfillment can be deduced from e.g. [15, 16].

Theorem 6.3. *Under Assumptions 6.1 and 6.2, Theorem 3.4 applies to the system (16).*

Proof. We first verify the drift condition. Choose $V(x) := |x|$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Define $\gamma(y_1, \dots, y_p) := |||A(y_p)A(y_{p-1}) \dots A(y_1)|||$, $y_1, \dots, y_p \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Note that, by Assumption 6.1, there is $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ such that $\gamma(y_1, \dots, y_p) \geq \tilde{\gamma}$.

Let $M \geq 1$ denote a bound for both $|||A(\cdot)|||$ and $|||B(\cdot)|||$. Now notice that

$$[Q(y_p) \dots Q(y_1)]V(x) \leq \gamma(y_1, \dots, y_p)V(x) + pM^p \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_0|.$$

Furthermore, clearly

$$Q(y)V(x) \leq MV(x) + M\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_0|,$$

so we have verified the drift conditions with $K := pM^p \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_0|$.

To check the contractivity condition, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} \prod_{i=1}^n |||A(Y_{ip})A(Y_{ip-1}) \dots A(Y_{(i-1)p+1})|||^\alpha \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \alpha \sum_{i=1}^n \ln |||A(Y_{ip})A(Y_{ip-1}) \dots A(Y_{(i-1)p+1})||| \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and the summands are bounded by Assumption 6.1. Now from (17) and (18) by an argument identical to that of Lemma 4.4 we can deduce that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{1/n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \gamma(Y_{(i-1)p+1}, \dots, Y_{ip}) \right) < 1. \quad (19)$$

Now let us turn to the minorization condition. Let U_r denote the closed ball of radius $r > 0$ around the origin in \mathbb{R}^d . Let $F > 0$ be fixed and let $x \in U_F$ be arbitrary. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(U_1)$ and $L > 0$ be arbitrary. Taking $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y_p, \dots, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(A(Y_p) \cdots A(Y_1)x + \sum_{i=1}^p A(Y_p) \cdots A(Y_{i+1})B(Y_i)\varepsilon_i \in A \right) \\ & \geq \mathbb{E} \left[1_{\{\sup |A(y_p) \cdots A(y_1)x + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A(y_p) \cdots A(y_{i+1})B(y_i)\varepsilon_i| \leq L\}} \right. \\ & \quad \times \left. \inf_{w \in U_L, y \in \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{P}(w + B(y)\varepsilon_p \in A | \sigma(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{p-1})) \right] \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left(\sup \left| A(y_p) \cdots A(y_1)x + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A(y_p) \cdots A(y_{i+1})B(y_i)\varepsilon_i \right| \leq L \right) \\ & \quad \times \min_{w \in U_L, y \in \mathbb{R}^m} \mathbb{P}(w + B(y)\varepsilon_p \in A) \end{aligned}$$

by independence of the ε_i . Here the sup is taken over all $y_p, \dots, y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Choose L so large that $P(\sup |A(y_p) \cdots A(y_1)x + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A(y_p) \cdots A(y_{i+1})B(y_i)\varepsilon_i| \leq L) \geq 1/2$. This is clearly possible since A, B are bounded and $x \in U_F$.

Now notice that by Assumption 6.1, in particular, by $\sup_y |||B(y)^{-1}||| < \infty$, the density functions (w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure) of the random variables $B(y)\varepsilon_p$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are bounded away from 0 on U_{L+1} . But this means that

$$\min_{w \in U_L, y \in \mathbb{R}^m} P(w + B(y)\varepsilon_p \in A) \geq \bar{\alpha} \text{Leb}(A)$$

for some $\bar{\alpha} > 0$, independent of A . Applying these observations in the particular case $F := \frac{2K}{\epsilon\gamma}$ we obtain the minorization condition and Theorem 3.4 indeed applies. \square

7 Proofs

Now we proceed to the proofs of Theorems 2.8 and 2.10. All the assumptions of those results are supposed to hold throughout this section. In order to make our explanation understandable for the largest possible audience, we present here the key steps of the proofs together with the fundamental ideas behind them. Lemmas crucial to proving our main theorems are mentioned here, whereas the role of the more technical ones are clarified in the text body.

First, we introduce a representation for the process X_t using random maps depending on the environment. Furthermore, we show that these maps are constant on “small sets” with positive probability, where these “small sets” and this probability in question are determined by the instantaneous value of Y (Lemma 7.1). Next, we freeze the environment and estimate the probability of the event that two copies of X_t , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ starting from two different random states and driven by the same fixed trajectory of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ become coupled after N^3 steps (Lemma 7.6). In order to

prove this, we show that with large probability, in N^3 steps, both of the representatives visits simultaneously the same small set at least N times and by Lemma 7.1, after each visit, they are mapped to the same state with positive probability.

Using the transportation cost characterization of d_{TV} , the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and our results on the coupling probability, we show that $\mu_n = \text{Law}(X_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete metric space (\mathcal{M}_1, d_{TV}) which proves Theorem 2.8.

Our approach to the ergodic theorem for X relies on Birkhoff's ergodic theorem and the L -mixing property of a certain auxiliary Markov chain. It turned out in [11] that L -mixing is particularly well-adapted to Markov chains, even when they are inhomogeneous (and for us this is the crucial point). The main ideas of arguments in Subsection 7.3 go back to [11]. Strong stationarity of Y together with our estimate for the coupling probability are extensively used at this point.

The majority of technical lemmas (e.g. Lemmas 7.2, 7.8 and 7.12) are created to identify finite dimensional subsets of $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that the probability of coupling on trajectories coming from these sets and the probability of finding paths of Y in these sets are large enough. These arguments strongly rely on the stationarity of Y as well as the long-time contractivity of the chain.

7.1 Preliminary lemmas and notations

For $R > 0$, we denote by $\mathbf{c}(R)$ the set of mappings from \mathcal{X} into \mathcal{X} whose restriction to $V^{-1}([0, R])$ is constant. $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R(y)$ will be as in Assumption 2.4.

Representing Markov chains on Polish spaces by iterated random maps is a standard construction, see e.g. [2]. A similar representation for Q is shown in Lemma 7.1 below which will play a crucial role in the proofs. It is a variant of Lemma 6.1 in [11] in a somewhat more general setting.

Lemma 7.1. *There exists a sequence of measurable functions $T_t : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid T_t(y, x, \cdot) \in A\}) = Q(y, x, A),$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and there are events $J_t(y) \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that

$$J_t(y) \subset \{\omega \in \Omega \mid T_t(y, \cdot, \omega) \in \mathbf{c}(R(y))\} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(J_t(y)) \geq 1 - \alpha(y) \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, the sigma-algebras $\sigma(T_t(y, x, \cdot), x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}), t \in \mathbb{Z}$ are independent.

Proof. We follow the proof of Lemma 6.1 in [11]. So, let U_n and ε_n , $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be sequences of i.i.d. uniform random variables on $[0, 1]$ independent of each other. Without loss of generality, we may assume that (U_t, ε_t) , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ independent of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. The case of countable \mathcal{X} is easy hence omitted. In the case of \mathcal{X} uncountable we can also assume (by the Borel isomorphism theorem) that $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is the standard Borel σ -algebra of \mathbb{R} .

Easily seen that, if for some $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ $\alpha(y) = 0$, then by Assumption 2.4, for $A \in \mathcal{B}$ and $x \in V^{-1}([0, R(y)])$, $Q(y, x, A) \geq \kappa(y, A)$ and $Q(y, x, \mathcal{X} \setminus A) \geq \kappa(y, \mathcal{X} \setminus A)$ hold at the same time and thus we have

$$Q(y, \cdot, A)|_{V^{-1}([0, R(y)])} = \kappa(y, A), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

For $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, let

$$q(y, x, A) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha(y)} [Q(y, x, A) - (1 - \alpha(y))\kappa(y, A)] \mathbb{1}_{V(x) \leq R(y)} \\ + Q(y, x, A) \mathbb{1}_{V(x) > R(y)} & \text{if } \alpha(y) \neq 0 \\ Q(y, x, A) \mathbb{1}_{V(x) > R(y)} & \text{if } \alpha(y) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and define

$$T_t(y, x, \omega) = \kappa^{-1}(y, \varepsilon_t) \mathbb{1}_{U_t \leq 1 - \alpha(y)} \mathbb{1}_{V(x) \leq R(y)} + q^{-1}(y, x, \varepsilon_t) (1 - \mathbb{1}_{U_t \leq 1 - \alpha(y)} \mathbb{1}_{V(x) \leq R(y)})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{-1}(y, z) &:= \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid \kappa(y, (-\infty, r]) \geq z\} \\ q^{-1}(y, x, z) &:= \inf\{r \in \mathbb{Q} \mid q(y, x, (-\infty, r]) \geq z\}, \end{aligned}$$

$z \in \mathbb{R}$ are the pseudoinverses of the corresponding cumulative distribution functions.

Obviously, $x \mapsto T_t(y, x, \omega)$ is constant on $V^{-1}([0, R(y)])$ whenever $U_t \leq 1 - \alpha(y)$, this implies (20) with $J_t(y) := \{\omega \mid U_t(\omega) \leq 1 - \alpha(y)\}$. Furthermore, for all $r \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for any fixed $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid T_t(y, x, \cdot) \leq r\}) &= \mathbb{1}_{V(x) > R(y)} \mathbb{P}(q^{-1}(y, x, \varepsilon_t) \leq r) \\ &+ \mathbb{1}_{V(x) \leq R(y)} [\alpha(y) \mathbb{P}(q^{-1}(y, x, \varepsilon_t) \leq r) + (1 - \alpha(y)) \mathbb{P}(\kappa^{-1}(y, \varepsilon_t) \leq r)]. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the pseudoinverse, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\kappa^{-1}(y, \varepsilon_t) \leq r) &= \mathbb{P}(\kappa(y, (-\infty, r']) \geq \varepsilon_t, r' \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (r, \infty)) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\kappa(y, (-\infty, r]) \geq \varepsilon_t) = \kappa(y, (-\infty, r]) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\mathbb{P}(q^{-1}(y, x, \varepsilon_t) \leq r) = q(y, x, (-\infty, r])$$

hence

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid T_t(y, x, \cdot) \leq r\}) = Q(y, x, (-\infty, r])$$

as we desired.

It remains only to show that T_t is measurable with respect to sigma algebras $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \sigma(\{U_t, \varepsilon_t \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}\})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. Indeed, T_t is a composition of measurable functions. The claimed independence of the sigma-algebras clearly holds too. \square

We drop the dependence of the mappings T_t on ω in the notation and will simply write $T_t(y)x := T_t(x, y, \cdot)$. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$, define the family of auxiliary processes

$$Z_{s,s}^{x,y} = x, \quad Z_{s,t+1}^{x,y} = T_{t+1}(y_t)Z_{s,t}^{x,y}, \quad t \geq s, \quad (21)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (\dots, y_{-1}, y_0, y_1, \dots) \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a fixed trajectory. Let $\mathcal{G}_t := \sigma(\varepsilon_i, U_i, i \leq t)$ and $\mathcal{G}_t^+ := \sigma(\varepsilon_i, U_i, i > t)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Clearly, \mathcal{G}_t is independent of \mathcal{G}_t^+ and $Z_{s,t}^{x,y}$ is adapted to \mathcal{G}_t moreover the process $Z_{s,t}^{x,y}$, $t \geq s$ heavily depends on the choice of \mathbf{y} . These processes follow the dynamics of X with the environment being “frozen”.

Recall that $S : \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ stands for the usual *left shift operation* i.e.

$$(S\mathbf{y})_j = \mathbf{y}_{j+1}, j \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (22)$$

In the, next lemma we introduce subsets of $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that for fixed $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, contractivity is established on every consecutive $N^{1/M}$ long pieces of $[1, N]$. Furthermore, we prove that \mathbf{Y} and its shifted versions fall into these sets with large probability.

Lemma 7.2. *For $M, N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, we define the sets*

$$B_{N,M}^{\lambda} := \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \left| \prod_{l=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \gamma(y_{k\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor + l}) < \bar{\gamma}^{\lambda \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor}, k = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^{M-1} - 1 \right. \right\}.$$

Then \mathbf{Y} and its shifted copies fall into $B_{N,M}^{\lambda}$ with large probability. More precisely, there exist $c, \nu > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}) \quad \mathbb{P}\left((S^k \mathbf{Y}) \in B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) &\geq 1 - cN^{1-1/M} e^{-\nu N^{1/M}} \\ \mathbb{P}\left((S^k \mathbf{Y}) \in B_{N,M}^{\lambda}, k = 0, \dots, n-1\right) &\geq 1 - cnN^{1-1/M} e^{-\nu N^{1/M}} \end{aligned}$$

holds.

Proof. The second inequality easily follows from the first one. By the union bound and the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can write

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} (S^k \mathbf{Y}) \notin B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}\left((S^k \mathbf{Y}) \notin B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) = n\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \notin B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) \leq cnN^{1-1/M} e^{-\nu N^{1/M}}.$$

In order to prove the first inequality, we use the union bound and the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ again.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \notin B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^{M-1} - 1} \mathbb{P}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \gamma(Y_{k\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor + l}) \geq \bar{\gamma}^{\lambda N^{1/M}}\right) \\ &\leq N^{1-1/M} \mathbb{P}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \gamma(Y_l) \geq \bar{\gamma}^{\lambda N^{1/M}}\right) \leq N^{1-1/M} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \gamma(Y_l)\right)}{\bar{\gamma}^{\lambda N^{1/M}}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.3, there exists $\tilde{c} > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}\left(K(Y_0) \prod_{t=1}^n \gamma(Y_t)\right) \leq \tilde{c} \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ moreover $K(\cdot) \geq 1$. With this, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \gamma(Y_l)\right) \leq \tilde{c} \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2} \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor} \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{\bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}}} \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2} N^{1/M}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \notin B_{N,M}^{\lambda}\right) \leq \frac{\tilde{c}}{\bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2}}} N^{1-1/M} \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1+\lambda}{2} N^{1/M}}$$

thus the first inequality holds with $c = \tilde{c} / \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}^{1+\lambda}}$ and $\nu = -\frac{1-\lambda}{2} \log \bar{\gamma}$. \square

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ be such that $S^t \mathbf{y} \in B_{[N^{1/6}]^6, 6}^\lambda$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}] - 1$. For $t \in \{t = 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}]^6 - [N^{1/6}]^3\}$, exists $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}]^5 - [N^{1/6}]^2\}$ and $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}] - 1\}$ for which $t = q[N^{1/6}] + r$ holds. So, for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}]^2 - 1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{l=1}^{[N^{1/6}]} \gamma((S^t \mathbf{y})_{k[N^{1/6}] + l}) &= \prod_{l=1}^{[N^{1/6}]} \gamma(\mathbf{y}_{t+k[N^{1/6}] + l}) = \prod_{l=1}^{[N^{1/6}]} \gamma(\mathbf{y}_{(k+q)[N^{1/6}] + l + r}) \\ &= \prod_{l=1}^{[N^{1/6}]} \gamma((S^r \mathbf{y})_{(k+q)[N^{1/6}] + l}) < \bar{\gamma}^{\lambda[N^{1/6}]} \end{aligned}$$

hence $S^t \mathbf{y} \in B_{[N^{1/6}]^3, 3}^\lambda$. Thus we arrive at the following important remark.

Remark 7.3. If for some $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, $S^t \mathbf{y} \in B_{[N^{1/6}]^6, 6}^\lambda$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}] - 1$, then $S^t \mathbf{y} \in B_{[N^{1/6}]^3, 3}^\lambda$, $t = 1, \dots, [N^{1/6}]^6 - [N^{1/6}]^3$ holds as well.

The next lemma tells us about the consequences of the drift condition satisfied by $Q(y_{k-1}) \dots Q(y_l)$, where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l < k$ are arbitrary and fixed.

Lemma 7.4. For $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l < k$, we have

$$[Q(y_{k-1}) \dots Q(y_l)V](x) \leq V(x) \prod_{r=l}^{k-1} \gamma(y_r) + \sum_{r=l}^{k-1} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k-1} \gamma(y_j).$$

Proof. We prove by induction. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ be arbitrary and fixed. For $k = l + 1$, we have

$$[Q(y_l)V](x) \leq \gamma(y_l)V(x) + K(y_l). \quad (23)$$

which holds by Assumption 2.2.

Induction step: Operators $V \mapsto [Q(y)V]$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ are linear, monotone and for $V \equiv 1$ $[Q(y)V] \equiv 1$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ hence by Assumption 2.2 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} [Q(y_k) \dots Q(y_l)V](x) &= [Q(y_k)(Q(y_{k-1}) \dots Q(y_l)V)](x) \leq \\ &[Q(y_k)V](x) \prod_{r=l}^{k-1} \gamma(y_r) + \sum_{r=l}^{k-1} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k-1} \gamma(y_j) \leq \\ &V(x) \prod_{r=l}^k \gamma(y_r) + \sum_{r=l}^k K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^k \gamma(y_j) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\lambda \in (1/2, 1)$ be fixed and $P_1, P_2 : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ arbitrary \mathcal{G}_0 -measurable random variables, which may depend on \mathbf{y} . Furthermore, in the remaining part of this subsection, we assume that $\mathbf{y} \in B_{N^3, 3}^\lambda$. Our purpose will be to prove that, with a large probability $Z_{0, N^3}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}} = Z_{0, N^3}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}$ for N large enough. In other words, a coupling between the processes $Z_{0, N^3}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}$ and $Z_{0, N^3}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}$ is realized.

First, we are going to prove that the process $\bar{Z}_t := (Z_{0, t}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}, Z_{0, t}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}})$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ visits the sets $\bar{D}(y_t)$ frequently enough, where

$$\bar{D}(y) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}^2 \mid V(x_1) + V(x_2) \leq R(y)\}, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}. \quad (24)$$

Let us define the successive visiting times

$$\sigma_0 := 0, \quad \sigma_{k+1} := \min\{i > \sigma_k \mid \bar{Z}_i \in \bar{D}(y_i)\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (25)$$

that are obviously $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ -stopping times.

Lemma 7.5. *For the tail distribution of σ_N , we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_N > N^3) < \bar{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})N^2} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}[V(Z_{0,kN^2+1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,kN^2+1}^{P_2,y})].$$

Proof. If $\sigma_N > N^3$, then exists $k \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ for which $\bar{Z}_{kN^2+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{kN^2+l})$, $l = 1, \dots, N^2$. Thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\sigma_N > N^3) &\leq \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=0}^{N-1} \bigcap_{l=1}^{N^2} \{\bar{Z}_{kN^2+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{kN^2+l})\}\right) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{l=1}^{N^2} \{\bar{Z}_{kN^2+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{kN^2+l})\}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

We estimate a general term of the latter sum. For typographical reasons, we will write $a := kN^2$ and $b := N^2$. By the tower rule, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{l=1}^b \{\bar{Z}_{a+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+l})\}\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{l=1}^b \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{Z}_{a+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+l})\}}\right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{Z}_{a+b} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+b})\}} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{a+b-1}\right] \prod_{l=1}^{b-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{Z}_{a+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+l})\}}\right] < \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{V(Z_{0,a+b}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b}^{P_2,y})}{R(y_{a+b})} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{a+b-1}\right] \prod_{l=1}^{b-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{Z}_{a+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+l})\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 2.2, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0,a+b}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b}^{P_2,y}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{a+b-1}\right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[V(T_{a+b}(y_{a+b-1})Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(T_{a+b}(y_{a+b-1})Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{a+b-1}\right] = \\ &= [Q(y_{a+b-1})V](Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + [Q(y_{a+b-1})V](Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y}) \leq \\ &= \gamma(y_{a+b-1})[V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y})] + 2K(y_{a+b-1}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if $\bar{Z}_{a+b-1} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+b-1})$, then

$$V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y}) > R(y_{a+b-1})$$

which immediately implies that

$$2K(y_{a+b-1}) < \varepsilon \gamma(y_{a+b-1}) (V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y})).$$

Recall that $0 < \varepsilon < 1/\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}$ thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_{a+b-1}\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{Z}_{a+b-1} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+b-1})\}} < \\ &= \frac{\gamma(y_{a+b-1})}{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}} [V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,a+b-1}^{P_2,y})]. \end{aligned}$$

This argument can clearly be iterated and leads to

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{l=1}^b \{\bar{Z}_{a+l} \notin \bar{D}(y_{a+l})\}\right) < \frac{\prod_{l=1}^{b-1} \gamma(y_{a+l})}{\sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^{b-1}} R(y_{a+b})} \times \mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0,a+1}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0,a+1}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}})\right].$$

Taking into account that $\mathbf{y} \in B_{N^3, 3}^\lambda$, $R(y_{a+b}) = \frac{2K(y_{a+b})}{\varepsilon \gamma(y_{a+b})}$ and $K(\cdot) \geq 1$, hence we can write

$$\prod_{l=1}^b \gamma(y_{a+l}) = \prod_{l=1}^{N^2} \gamma(y_{kN^2+l}) = \prod_{l=0}^{N-1} \prod_{j=1}^N \gamma(y_{(kN+l)N+j}) < \tilde{\gamma}^{\lambda N^2}$$

moreover

$$\frac{\prod_{l=1}^{b-1} \gamma(y_{a+l})}{\sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^{b-1}} R(y_{a+b})} \leq \frac{1 - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})N^2}.$$

Finally, we sum up for $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ and get

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma_N > N^3) < \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})N^2} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0, kN^2+1}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0, kN^2+1}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}})\right]$$

which completes the proof. \square

Now we are in the position to estimate the probability of coupling between $Z_{0, N^3}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}$ and $Z_{0, N^3}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}$.

Lemma 7.6. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{0, N^3}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}} \neq Z_{0, N^3}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}\right) &\leq \left(\max_{0 \leq k < N^3} \alpha(y_k)\right)^{N-1} \\ &\quad + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})N^2} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0, kN^2+1}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0, kN^2+1}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}})\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For typographical reasons, we will write $\sigma(N)$ instead of σ_N in this proof. Recall that, $T_t(y) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is constant on $V^{-1}([0, R(y)])$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha(y)$. By the definition of $\bar{D}(\cdot)$, $\bar{Z}_t \in \bar{D}(y_t)$ implies that $Z_{0, t}^{P_i, \mathbf{y}} \in V^{-1}([0, R(y_t)])$ for $i = 1, 2$, moreover $Z_{0, t}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}} = Z_{0, t}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}$ with probability at least $1 - \alpha(y_t)$.

Let us introduce the abbreviation $M_N = \max_{0 \leq k < N^3} \alpha(y_k)$ for a moment. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{0, N^3}^{P_1, \mathbf{y}} = Z_{0, N^3}^{P_2, \mathbf{y}}, \sigma_N \leq N^3\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(U_{\sigma(j)+1} > 1 - \alpha(y_{\sigma(j)}); j = 1, \dots, N-1\right) \leq \\ &\quad \mathbb{P}\left(U_{\sigma(j)+1} > 1 - M_N; j = 1, \dots, N-1\right) = \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}\left(U_{\sigma(N-1)+1} > 1 - M_N \mid \mathcal{G}_{\sigma(N-1)}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{N-2} \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{\sigma(j)+1} > 1 - M_N\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $U_{\sigma(N-1)+1}$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(N-1)}$ so

$$\mathbb{P}\left(U_{\sigma(N-1)+1} > 1 - M_N \mid \mathcal{G}_{\sigma(N-1)}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(U_{\sigma(N-1)+1} > 1 - M_N\right) = \max_{0 \leq k < N^3} \alpha(y_k).$$

Iteration of this argument leads to the following estimation.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{0,N^3}^{P_1,y} = Z_{0,N^3}^{P_2,y}, \sigma_N \leq N^3\right) \leq \left(\max_{0 \leq k < N^3} \alpha(y_k)\right)^{N-1}$$

By Lemma 7.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{0,N^3}^{P_1,y} = Z_{0,N^3}^{P_2,y}\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{0,N^3}^{P_1,y} = Z_{0,N^3}^{P_2,y}, \sigma_N \leq N^3\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_N > N^3\right) \\ &\leq \left(\max_{0 \leq k < N^3} \alpha(y_k)\right)^{N-1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda-\frac{1}{2})N^2} \frac{1-\sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0,kN^2+1}^{P_1,y}) + V(Z_{0,kN^2+1}^{P_2,y})\right] \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

According to the following lemma, conditions on the maximum process of $\alpha(Y_k)$ appearing in the statement of Theorem 2.10 can be translated to Assumption 2.6, which is somewhat more tractable.

Lemma 7.7. *Let Assumption 2.6 be in force. Then, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $1 \leq p < \infty$,*

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p < \infty.$$

More precisely, there exists $c, \nu, \beta > 0$ depending only on M, p and θ such that

$$\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p \leq c \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right]^{\frac{\nu}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^\theta}}, N \in \mathbb{N}^+.$$

Proof. Let $\beta = \frac{1}{M(1-\theta)}$. For sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\frac{1}{p} \frac{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} > 1$ hence by Jensen's inequality and the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p^{\frac{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1}} \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right] \leq N \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right]$$

hence we obtain

$$\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p \leq N^{\frac{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right]^{\frac{1}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^\theta}}\right)^{\frac{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^{1-\theta}}}$$

Taking into consideration that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor} = 0$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^{1-\theta}} = 1$, we conclude that there exists $c, \nu > 0$ depending on M, p and θ for which

$$\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p \leq c \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right]^{\frac{\nu}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^\theta}}, N \in \mathbb{N}^+$$

holds.

By Assumption 2.6, for some $0 < \theta' < 1$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^N\right]^{\frac{1}{N^{\theta'}}} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and trivially, the same holds for any $0 < \theta < \theta'$. Let us fix some $\theta \in (0, \theta')$. Then, by the previous point, we have the estimate

$$\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p \leq c \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha(Y_0)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor}\right]^{\frac{\nu}{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^{\theta'}}}\right)^{\lfloor N^\beta \rfloor^{\theta' - \theta}}, N \in \mathbb{N}^+,$$

where $c, \nu, \beta > 0$ depends only on M, p and θ thus for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$,

$$\sum_{N=n}^{\infty} \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p < c \sum_{N=n}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor N^{\beta} \rfloor^{\theta' - \theta}}} < \infty$$

which proves that

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor^M} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/M} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p < \infty.$$

□

7.2 Pointwise convergence of kernels

Let us introduce the sequence of probabilistic kernels $\mu_k(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(\mathbf{y}, \cdot) &= \delta_{x_0} \\ \mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot) &= \text{Law}(Z_{0,n}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In this point, for typical $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we give an estimation for $d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot))$, moreover we prove that under Assumptions 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4, for $\text{Law}(Y) - \text{a.s. } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, $\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ converges to a probability measure in total variation distance.

Lemma 7.8. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $1/2 < \lambda < 1$, we define the following sets.*

$$A_n^\lambda = \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \left| \frac{d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot))}{2} < \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3} \alpha(y_k) \right)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n^{1/3}} \right. \right\}$$

Then \mathbf{Y} falls into A_n^λ with large probability. More precisely, there exist $c, \nu > 0$ for which

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \in A_n^\lambda) \geq 1 - cn^{2/3} e^{-\nu n^{1/3}}.$$

Proof. According to the optimal transportation cost characterization of the total variation distance, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)) &= \inf_{\kappa \in \mathcal{C}(\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot))} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{1}_{x \neq y} \kappa(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_{0,n}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}} \neq Z_{0,n+1}^{x_0, S^{-n}\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbb{P}(Z_{0,n}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}} \neq Z_{0,n}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(Z_{0, \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}} \neq Z_{0, \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y} \in B_{n,3}^\lambda$, we can apply Lemma 7.6 since x_0 is deterministic and $T_0(y_{-n})x_0$ is \mathcal{G}_0 -measurable, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_{0, \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}} \neq Z_{0, \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}) &\leq \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3} \alpha(y_k) \right)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \\ &+ \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1}\mathbf{y}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.4, Assumption 2.2 and the tower rule, for $0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{x_0, S^{-n+1} \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1} \mathbf{y}}) \right] = \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(\left[Q(y_{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1}) \dots Q(y_{-n+1}) V \right] (x_0) \right) + \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(\left[Q(y_{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1}) \dots Q(y_{-n+1}) V \right] (T_0(y_{-n})x_0) \right) \leq \\
& (V(x_0) + \mathbb{E}(V(T_0(y_{-n})x_0))) \prod_{r=-n+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(y_r) + 2 \sum_{r=-n+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(y_j) \leq \\
& V(x_0)(1 + \gamma(y_{-n})) \prod_{r=-n+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(y_r) + 2 \sum_{r=-n}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(y_j)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have taken into account that $K(\cdot) \geq 1$.

By the Markov inequality and the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\mathbf{Y} \in \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{x_0, S^{-n+1} \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0, k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1}^{T_0(y_{-n})x_0, S^{-n+1} \mathbf{y}}) \right] \geq \frac{2\bar{\gamma}^{-n-1/3}}{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}} \right\} \right) \leq \\
& \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \left\{ V(x_0) \mathbb{E} \left[(1 + \gamma(Y_{-n})) \prod_{r=-n+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(Y_r) \right] + \right. \\
& \left. 2 \sum_{r=-n}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \mathbb{E} \left[K(Y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n + 1} \gamma(Y_j) \right] \right\} \leq \\
& c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \left[V(x_0) \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}) \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{2} k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2} + 2 \sum_{r=0}^{k \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 + 1} \bar{\gamma}^{r/2} \right] \leq \\
& c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \left[V(x_0) \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}} (1 + \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}})}{1 - \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{2} \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2}} + \frac{2 \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor}{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}} \right] \leq \\
& c_1 (V(x_0) + \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}},
\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 is chosen such that $\mathbb{E}(K(Y_0) \prod_{t=1}^n \gamma(Y_t)) \leq c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{n}{2}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ holds.

So, by Lemma 7.2 and by our previous considerations, there exist $c_1, c_2, \nu' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin A_n^\lambda) \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin A_n^\lambda, S^{-n+1} \mathbf{Y} \in B_{n,3}^\lambda) + \mathbb{P}(S^{-n+1} \mathbf{Y} \notin B_{n,3}^\lambda) \\
& \leq c_1 (V(x_0) + \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}} + c_2 n^{2/3} e^{-\nu' n^{1/3}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, there exists $c > 0$ such that, for $\nu = \min(-\log \bar{\gamma}, \nu')$,

$$c_1 (V(x_0) + \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{n^{1/3}} + c_2 n^{2/3} e^{-\nu' n^{1/3}} \leq c n^{2/3} e^{-\nu n^{1/3}}$$

holds, which completes the proof. \square

The next lemma is a crucial ingredient of the proofs of both Theorem 2.8 and 2.10.

Lemma 7.9. *Under Assumption 2.6, there exists $1 \leq p < \infty$, such that*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|d_{TV}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))\|_p < \infty.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 7.8, there exist $c, \nu > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \in A_n^\lambda) \geq 1 - cn^{2/3}e^{-\nu n^{1/3}}$. So, we obtain the following upper bound for the general term

$$\begin{aligned} \|d_{TV}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))\|_p &\leq \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{Y} \in A_n^\lambda} \right\|_p + 2\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin A_n^\lambda) \\ &\leq 2 \left[\left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n^{1/3}} + cn^{2/3}e^{-\nu n^{1/3}} \right], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

which, by Lemma 7.7, has a finite sum. \square

Corollary 7.10. *For $\text{Law}(Y)$ -a.s. \mathbf{y} , $\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is convergent in the metric space (\mathcal{M}_1, d_{TV}) . Let us denote this pointwise limit by $\mu_*(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$. μ_* is a probability kernel.*

Proof. We notice that the sequence of expected total variation distances has a finite sum, that is

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(d_{TV}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))) < \infty \quad (29)$$

which implies that $\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a Cauchy sequence (P -a.s.) hence it converges. It is not difficult to check that μ_* is indeed a probability kernel. \square

According to the next remark, the $\text{Law}(Y)$ -a.s. existing pointwise limit $\mu_*(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ is independent of x_0 which will lead later to the conclusion that the limit law μ_* in Theorem 2.8 is independent of the initial value, as well.

Remark 7.11. Signaling the dependence of $\mu_n(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ on x_0 , we write $\mu_n^{x_0}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$. Applying the arguments presented in this section mutadis mutandis, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_n^{x_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_n^{x'_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \right\|_p &\leq \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^3} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_p \\ &\quad + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n^{1/3}} + c(x_0, x'_0) n^{2/3} e^{-\nu n^{1/3}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \end{aligned}$$

and thus by the triangle inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_*^{x_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_*^{x'_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \right\|_p &\leq \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_n^{x_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_*^{x_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \right\|_p + \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_*^{x'_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_n^{x'_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \right\|_p \\ &\quad + \left\| d_{TV}(\mu_n^{x_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_n^{x'_0}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)) \right\|_p, \end{aligned}$$

where the right-hand side tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ showing that for $\text{Law}(Y)$ -a.s. $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, $\mu_*^{x_0}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot) = \mu_*^{x'_0}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ holds.

7.3 Ergodicity of $\Phi(Z_t^y)$

Let $N \geq 1$ be an arbitrary natural number and $y \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Let us define the truncated process

$$W_t(y) := \left[\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, y}) - \mathbb{E}(\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, y})) \right] \mathbb{1}_{t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (30)$$

We will use the results of Section 8. For $p \geq 1$, we introduce the quantities $M_p(W) = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \|W_t\|_p$ and

$$\Gamma_p(W) = \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \gamma_p(W, \tau),$$

where $\gamma_p(W, \tau) = \sup_{t \geq \tau} \|W_t - \mathbb{E}(W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-\tau}^+)\|_p$, $\tau \geq 1$. If $\tau > \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6$, then $\gamma_p(W, \tau) = 0$ thus $\Gamma_p(W)$ is finite which means that W_t , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ is L-mixing of order p with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_t, \mathcal{G}_t^+)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$. According to Lemma 8.2, for $p \geq 2$, we have the estimate

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t \right\|_p \leq C_p M_p^{1/2}(W) \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_p(W)}{N}}, \quad (31)$$

where C_p is a constant that depends neither on N or W .

Let us consider the estimate

$$\Gamma_p(W) = \sum_{\tau=1}^{\infty} \gamma_p(W, \tau) \leq 2\sqrt{N} \|\Phi\|_{\infty} + \sum_{\tau=\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3+1}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \gamma_p(W, \tau)$$

and for $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \geq s$ introduce the auxiliary process

$$\widetilde{W}_{s,t} := \left[\Phi(Z_{s,t}^{x_0, y}) - \mathbb{E}(\Phi(Z_{s,t}^{x_0, y})) \right] \mathbb{1}_{t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6}.$$

Note that, $W_{s,t}$ is measurable with respect to \mathcal{G}_s^+ moreover

$$W_t - \widetilde{W}_{s,t} = \Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, y}) - \Phi(Z_{s,t}^{x_0, y}) \quad (32)$$

which will be important later.

For $\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3 < \tau \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6$, there exists $q, r \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3\}$ such that $\tau = q\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3 + r$, where $q \geq 1$. By our previous observation, $\widetilde{W}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3, t}$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{G}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^+$ moreover $\mathcal{G}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{t-\tau}^+$ because $q \geq 1$ and thus $\widetilde{W}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3, t}$ is $\mathcal{G}_{t-\tau}^+$ -measurable.

By Lemma 8.1 and (32), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_p(W, \tau) &= \max_{\tau \leq t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \|W_t - \mathbb{E}(W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-\tau}^+)\|_p \leq \max_{\tau \leq t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} 2 \|W_t - \widetilde{W}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3, t}\|_p \\ &\leq \max_{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} 2 \|W_t - \widetilde{W}_{t-\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3, t}\|_p \\ &= \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} 2 \|W_{t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} - \widetilde{W}_{t, t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}\|_p \\ &= \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} 2 \left\| \Phi(Z_{0, t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y}) - \Phi(Z_{t, t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y}) \right\|_p \\ &\leq 4\|\Phi\|_{\infty} \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \mathbb{P}(Z_{0, t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \neq Z_{t, t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y}). \end{aligned}$$

We substitute this back into (31) and we obtain the following upper bound

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t \right\|_p \leq 2C_p \|\Phi\|_\infty \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + 2 \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \neq Z_{t,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \right) \right)^{1/2}. \quad (33)$$

The content of the next lemma is that there exist “large” sets of the environment for which good enough couplings occur.

Lemma 7.12. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $1/2 < \lambda < 1$ and $0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3$, let us define the following sets.*

$$C_{N,t}^\lambda = \left\{ y \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{Z_t'', S^t y} \neq Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, S^t y} \right) < \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \alpha(y_{k+t}) \right)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}} \right\}$$

Then there exist $c, \nu > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \in C_N^\lambda) \geq 1 - cN^{7/6} e^{-\nu N^{1/6}}, \text{ where } C_N^\lambda = \bigcap_{t=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} C_{N,t}^\lambda.$$

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3$ be arbitrary and fixed. We have the following identities

$$\mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \neq Z_{t,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{t,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{Z_t', y} \neq Z_{t,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, y} \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{Z_t'', S^t y} \neq Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, S^t y} \right),$$

where $Z' = Z_{0,t}^{x_0, y}$ and $Z'' = Z_{-t,0}^{x_0, S^t y}$.

If $y \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $S^t y \in B_{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6, 6}^\lambda$, $t = 0, 1, \dots, \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1$, then by Remark 7.3, $S^t y \in B_{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3, 3}^\lambda$, $0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3$, furthermore Z_t'' is \mathcal{G}_0 -measurable hence we can apply Lemma 7.6 thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{Z_t'', S^t y} \neq Z_{0,\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, S^t y} \right) &\leq \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \alpha(y_{k+t}) \right)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \\ &+ \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2} \frac{1 - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \mathbb{E} \left[V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{Z_t'', S^t y}) + V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{x_0, S^t y}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.4, Assumption 2.2 and the tower rule, for $0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{Z_t'', S^t y}) + V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{x_0, S^t y}) \right] = \\ &\mathbb{E} \left([Q(y_{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t}) \dots Q(y_t) V](Z_{-t,0}^{x_0, S^t y}) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left([Q(y_{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t}) \dots Q(y_t) V](x_0) \right) = \\ &\mathbb{E} \left([Q(y_{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t}) \dots Q(y_0) V](x_0) \right) + \mathbb{E} \left([Q(y_{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t}) \dots Q(y_t) V](x_0) \right) \leq \\ &V(x_0) \left[\prod_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_r) + \prod_{r=t}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_r) \right] + \\ &\sum_{r=t}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_j) + \sum_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_j) \leq \\ &V(x_0) \left[\prod_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_r) + \prod_{r=t}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_r) \right] + 2 \sum_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} K(y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(y_j). \end{aligned}$$

By the Markov inequality and the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \in \left\{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \mathbb{E}\left[V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{Z_t'', S^t \mathbf{y}}) + V(Z_{0,k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+1}^{x_0, S^t \mathbf{y}})\right] \geq \frac{2\bar{\gamma}^{-N^{1/6}}}{1-\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}} \right\} \right) &\leq \\
&\leq \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}} \frac{1-\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \left\{ V(x_0) \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(Y_r) + \prod_{r=t}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(Y_r) \right] + \right. \\
&\quad \left. 2 \sum_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \mathbb{E} \left[K(Y_r) \prod_{j=r+1}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \gamma(Y_j) \right] \right\} \leq \\
&\leq c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}} \frac{1-\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \left[V(x_0) \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}} (1 + \bar{\gamma}^{t/2}) \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{2}k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2} + 2 \sum_{r=0}^{k\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2+t} \bar{\gamma}^{r/2} \right] \leq \\
&\leq c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}} \frac{1-\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}}{2} \left[V(x_0) \frac{\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}(1 + \bar{\gamma}^{t/2})}{1 - \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{2}\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2}} + \frac{2\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor}{1 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}} \right] \leq \\
&\leq c_1 (V(x_0) + \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}},
\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 is chosen such that $\mathbb{E}(K(Y_0) \prod_{t=1}^n \gamma(Y_t)) \leq c_1 \bar{\gamma}^{\frac{n}{2}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ holds.

So, by Lemma 7.2 and our previous considerations, there exists $c_1, c_2, \nu' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{t=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \mathbf{Y} \notin C_{n,t}^\lambda\right) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{Y} \notin C_{n,t}^\lambda, \bigcap_{s=r}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} S^r \mathbf{y} \in B_{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6, 6}^\lambda\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{r=0}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} S^r \mathbf{y} \notin B_{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6, 6}^\lambda\right) \\
&\leq c_1 N (V(x_0) + \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}} + c_2 N e^{-\nu' N^{1/6}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, there exists $c > 0$ such that, for which $\nu = \min(-\log \bar{\gamma}, \nu')$,

$$c_1 N (V(x_0) + \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor) \bar{\gamma}^{N^{1/6}} + c_2 N e^{-\nu' N^{1/6}} \leq c N^{7/6} e^{-\nu N^{1/6}}$$

holds which completes the proof. \square

Finally, we arrive at the following important result which will play a central role in the proof of Theorem 2.10. Combining our estimates so far, we can bound the L_p -norm of the functional averages.

Lemma 7.13. *There exists $\tilde{c}(p, \bar{\gamma}, \lambda) > 0$ depending only on $p, \bar{\gamma}$ and λ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \right] \leq \tilde{c}(p, \bar{\gamma}, \lambda) \|\Phi\|_\infty \left(N^{-1/4} + \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right).$$

Proof. Without the loss of generality, we may assume that $p \geq 2$. Clearly on C_N^λ

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \mathbb{P} \left(Z_{0,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}} \neq Z_{t,t+\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}} \right) \leq \\ & \max_{0 < t \leq \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6 - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^3} \alpha(y_{k+t}) \right)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}} \leq \\ & \left(\max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(y_k) \right)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}} \end{aligned}$$

holds, hence by (33), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \right] \leq \\ & \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{Y} \in C_N^\lambda} \right] + \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{Y} \notin C_N^\lambda} \right] \leq \\ & 2 \|\Phi\|_\infty \left[C_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + 2\tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}} + 2 \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2} \right)^{1/2} + \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin C_N^\lambda)^{1/p} \right] \end{aligned}$$

The square root function is subadditive hence by Lemma 7.12, there exists $\tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda)$ depending only on $p, \tilde{\gamma}$ and λ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & C_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + 2\tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}} + 2 \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2} \right)^{1/2} + \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Y} \notin C_N^\lambda)^{1/p} \leq \\ & C_p \left(N^{-1/4} + \sqrt{2} \tilde{\gamma}^{\frac{1}{2} [(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^2 - N^{1/6}]} + \sqrt{2} \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right) + \\ & \quad c^{1/p} N^{\frac{7}{6p}} e^{-\frac{\lambda}{p} N^{1/6}} \leq \\ & \frac{\tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda)}{2} \left(N^{-1/4} + \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we obtain the desired upper bound

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \right] \leq \tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda) \|\Phi\|_\infty \left(N^{-1/4} + \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right)$$

which completes the proof. \square

7.4 Proof of Theorem 2.8

For $A \in \mathcal{B}$ arbitrary and any decomposition of A into disjoint and measurable sets $A = \cup_i A_i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i |\mathbb{E}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, A_i)) - \mathbb{E}(\mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, A_i))| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_i |\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, A_i) - \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, A_i)| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}(d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum of the left-hand side, we get

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{E}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot)), \mathbb{E}(\mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))) \leq \mathbb{E}(d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))).$$

As easily seen, $\mu_n(A) = \mathbb{E}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, A))$ holds for $A \in \mathcal{B}$, so we infer that

$$d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) \leq \mathbb{E}(d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))).$$

Then it follows from Corollary 7.10 that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) < \infty,$$

hence μ_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a Cauchy sequence in the complete metric space $(\mathcal{M}_1, d_{\text{TV}})$. Hence it converges to some probability μ_{**} as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The claimed convergence rate follows from (28) with $p = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_N, \mu_{**}) &\leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n, \mu_{n+1}) \leq \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}(d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\max_{0 \leq k \leq \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor - 1} \right) + \tilde{\gamma}^{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2}) \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor^2 - n^{1/3}} + cn^{2/3} e^{-m^{1/3}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove that μ_* and μ_{**} coincide. It is clear that for every $A \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\mu_{**}(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, A)) = \mathbb{E}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, A)) = \mathbb{E}(\mu_*(\mathbf{Y}, A)) = \mu_*(A),$$

hence $\mu_* = \mu_{**}$. By Remark 7.11, easily follows that the limit distribution μ_* is independent of the initial state x_0 . \square

7.5 Proof of Theorem 2.10

Let $N \geq 1$ arbitrary integer, $1 \leq p < \infty$ and consider the following estimate.

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}}) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz) \right\|_p \leq \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) [\mu_*(S^t \mathbf{Y}, dz) - \mu_*(dz)] \right\|_p \\ &+ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) (\mu_t - \mu_*)(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right\|_p \\ &+ \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \left(\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}}) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_t(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right) \right\|_p \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

As we already mentioned in Section 2, the stochastic process Y is strongly stationary and ergodic hence the left shift $S : \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is an ergodic endomorphism of the probability space $(\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{A}^{\otimes \mathbb{Z}}, \text{Law}(Y))$, moreover $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}} \ni \mathbf{y} \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(\mathbf{y}, dz)$ is obviously in L^1 hence Birkhoff's ergodic theorem implies that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(S^t \mathbf{Y}, dz) \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz), \quad N \rightarrow \infty,$$

almost surely and also in L^p due to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem.

By the strong stationary property of Y again, for the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) (\mu_t - \mu_*)(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right\|_p &\leq \frac{\|\Phi\|_{\infty}}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \|d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_t(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_*(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))\|_p \\ &\leq \frac{\|\Phi\|_{\infty}}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \sum_{n=t}^{\infty} \|d_{\text{TV}}(\mu_n(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot), \mu_{n+1}(\mathbf{Y}, \cdot))\|_p \end{aligned}$$

which is a Cèsaro sum and due to Lemma 7.9, the general term tends to zero thus we obtain

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) (\mu_t - \mu_*)(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right\|_p \rightarrow 0, \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Finally, due to the definition of $\mu_t(\cdot, \cdot)$, for any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the law of $Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}}$ equals to $\mu_t(S^{t-1} \mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ hence for the last term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \left(\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}}) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_t(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right) \right\|_p \leq 2 \frac{N - \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6}{N} \|\Phi\|_{\infty} + \\ &+ \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \left(\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}}) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_t(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right) \right|^p \middle| \sigma(\mathbf{Y}) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{12 \|\Phi\|_{\infty}}{N^{1/6}} + \mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 7.13, exists $\tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/p} \left[\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N W_t(\mathbf{Y}) \right\|_p^p \right] \leq \tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda) \|\Phi\|_{\infty} \left(N^{-1/4} + \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right)$$

hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \left(\Phi(Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{Y}}) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_t(S^{t-1} \mathbf{Y}, dz) \right) \right\|_p \leq \\ &\frac{12 \|\Phi\|_{\infty}}{N^{1/6}} + \tilde{c}(p, \tilde{\gamma}, \lambda) \|\Phi\|_{\infty} \left(N^{-1/4} + \left\| \max_{0 \leq k < \lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor^6} \alpha(Y_k)^{\lfloor N^{1/6} \rfloor - 1} \right\|_{p/2}^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where by Lemma 7.7, the upper bound tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

To sum up,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^N \Phi(X_t) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz) \right\|_p \rightarrow 0, N \rightarrow \infty$$

because the laws of X_t and $Z_{0,t}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}}$ coincides. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.10.

Remark 7.14. Birkhoff's ergodic theorem does not provide an upper bound for the difference between time and space averages hence, we have a convergence rate for every term in (34) except for the first one. However, in the ideal case this term is of the order $1/\sqrt{N}$ and this can be shown for Y with suitably favourable ergodic properties.

7.6 Proof of Theorem 3.4

In order to keep the explanation compact, we omit the details of the proof and just indicate how our lemmas should be modified to make them applicable in this setting.

Let $p \geq 1$ be as in Assumption 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 and we introduce the auxiliary processes

$$(\tilde{X}_t^j)_{t \in \mathbb{N}} = (Z_{0,pt}^{Z_j', \mathbf{y}})_{t \in \mathbb{N}}, j = 0, \dots, p-1,$$

where $Z_j' = Z_{-j,0}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}}$. Note that $\tilde{X}_t^j = Z_{-j,pt}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}} = Z_{0,pt+j}^{x_0, S^{-j}\mathbf{y}}$ and hence, by the strong stationarity of Y_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, the laws of \tilde{X}_t^j and X_{pt+j} coincide. Furthermore, the process \tilde{X}_t^j , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ also can be considered as Markov chain in a random environment driven by

$$\tilde{Y}_t^j = (Y_{p(t-1)+j}, \dots, Y_{pt+j-1}) \in \mathcal{Y}^p, t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We denote the parametric family of stochastic kernels corresponding to \tilde{X}_t^j by \tilde{Q} . It is easy to check that $\tilde{Q} : \mathcal{Y}^p \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is independent of j and arises as the p -times composition of $Q(y)$ s with itself, that is,

$$[\tilde{Q}((y_1, \dots, y_p))\phi](x) = [Q(y_p) \dots Q(y_1)\phi](x)$$

holds for arbitrary non-negative measurable $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $(y_1, \dots, y_p) \in \mathcal{Y}^p$ and $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Assumptions in Section 3 imply that Assumptions 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 hold for the processes $(\tilde{X}_t^j)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, where the corresponding α , κ and K are independent of the environment. In Assumption 3.1, the one-step bound i.e. inequality (7) gives the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}(V(Z_{-j,0}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}})) \leq K^j V(x_0) + \sum_{i=1}^j K^i \leq K^p (V(x_0) + p) \quad (35)$$

which is uniform in $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Clearly, for any \mathbf{y} fixed, $Z_{-j,0}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}}$ is \mathcal{G}_0 measurable and by inequality (7), Lemma 7.6 is applicable for proving that for $\text{Law}(Y)$ - \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the law of $Z_{-j,pt}^{x_0, \mathbf{y}}$ converges to a probability law as $t \rightarrow \infty$, and the limit is

independent of the choice of j . From this follows that Theorem 2.8 applies for $(\tilde{X}_t^j)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ moreover, the limiting laws, which are subsequences of $(\mu_n = \text{Law}(X_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, are equal. But then the whole sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to some μ_* in total variation.

The environment \tilde{Y}_t , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is also ergodic hence by Theorem 2.10, we have a law of large numbers in L^q for each $(\Phi(\tilde{X}_t^j))_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$. So, by the triangle inequality, we can write

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \Phi(X_k) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz) \right\|_q \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \left\| \frac{p}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{N}{p} \rfloor} \Phi(\tilde{X}_k^j) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \Phi(z) \mu_*(dz) \right\|_q + O(N^{-1})$$

showing that the law of large numbers holds true in L^q also for $\Phi(X_t)$. This completes the proof. \square

8 Appendix

For the reader's convenience, we recall a concept of mixing defined in [12] which was used in some of the estimations above. Let \mathcal{G}_t , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be an increasing sequence of sigma-algebras and let \mathcal{G}_t^+ , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be a decreasing sequence of sigma-algebras such that, for each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{G}_t is independent of \mathcal{G}_t^+ .

Let W_t , $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be a real-valued stochastic process. For each $p \geq 1$, introduce

$$M_p(W) := \sup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} E^{1/p}[|W_t|^p].$$

For each process W such that $M_1(W) < \infty$ define, for each $p \geq 1$,

$$\gamma_p(W, \tau) := \sup_{t \geq \tau} E^{1/p}[|W_t - E[W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-\tau}^+]|^p], \quad \tau \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \Gamma_p(W) := \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \gamma_p(W, \tau).$$

For some $p \geq 1$, the process W is called *L-mixing of order p* with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_t, \mathcal{G}_t^+)$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ if it is adapted to $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $M_p(W) < \infty$, $\Gamma_p(W) < \infty$. We say that W is *L-mixing* if it is *L-mixing of order p* for all $p \geq 1$.

We recall Lemma 2.1 of [12].

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a sigma-algebra, X, Y random variables with $E^{1/p}[|X|^p] < \infty$, $E^{1/p}[|Y|^p] < \infty$ with some $p \geq 1$. If Y is \mathcal{G} -measurable then*

$$E^{1/p}[|X - E[X | \mathcal{G}]|^p] \leq 2E^{1/p}[|X - Y|^p]$$

holds. \square

Finally, a trivial consequence of Theorem 1.1 of [12] is formulated.

Lemma 8.2. *For an L-mixing process W of order $p \geq 2$ satisfying $E[W_t] = 0$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$E^{1/p} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^N W_i \right|^p \right] \leq C_p N^{1/2} M_p^{1/2}(W) \Gamma_p^{1/2}(W),$$

holds for each $N \geq 1$ with a constant C_p that does not depend either on N or on W . \square

References

- [1] M. Barkhagen, N. H. Chau, E. Moulines, M. Rásonyi, S. Sabanis, and Y. Zhang. On stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics with dependent data streams in the logconcave case. *To appear in Bernoulli*, *arXiv:1812.02709*, 2020.
- [2] R. N. Bhattacharya and E. C. Waymire. *Stochastic Processes with Applications*. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1990.
- [3] A. A. Borovkov. *Stochastic Processes in Queuing Theory*. Nauka, 1972. In Russian.
- [4] A. A. Borovkov. *Asymptotic Methods in Queuing Theory*. Nauka, 1980. In Russian.
- [5] A. A. Borovkov. *Ergodicity and Stability of Stochastic Processes*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- [6] R. Burton and H. Dehling. Large deviations for some weakly dependent random processes. *Statistics Probab. Letters*, 9:397–401, 1990.
- [7] A. Caré, B. Cs. Csáji, B. Gerencsér, L. Gerencsér, and M. Rásonyi. On the poisson equation of parameter-dependent markov chains. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Control and Decision, Nice, France*, page *arXiv:1906.09464*, 2019.
- [8] H. N. Chau, E. Moulines, M. Rásonyi, S. Sabanis, and Y. Zhang. On stochastic gradient langevin dynamics with dependent data streams: the fully non-convex case. *Preprint*, *arXiv:1905.13142*, pages –, 2020.
- [9] F. Comte and É. Renault. Long memory in continuous-time stochastic volatility models. *Math. Finance*, 8:291–323, 1998.
- [10] J. Gatheral, T. Jaisson, and M. Rosenbaum. Volatility is rough. *Quantitative Finance*, 18:933–949, 2018.
- [11] B. Gerencsér and M. Rásonyi. On the ergodicity of certain Markov chains in random environments. *Preprint*, *arXiv:1807.03568v3*, 2019.
- [12] L. Gerencsér. On a class of mixing processes. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 26(3):165–191, 1989.
- [13] Y. Kifer. Perron-Frobenius theorem, large deviations, and random perturbations in random environments. *Math. Zeitschrift*, 222:677–698, 1996.
- [14] Y. Kifer. Limit theorems for random transformations and processes in random environments. *Trans. American Math. Soc.*, 350:1481–1518, 1998.
- [15] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Meyn. Spectral theory and limit theorems for geometrically ergodic Markov processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 13:304–362, 2003.
- [16] I. Kontoyiannis and S. Meyn. Large deviations asymptotics and the spectral theory of multiplicative regular processes. *Electronic J. Probab.*, 10:61–123, 2005.

- [17] M. Raginsky, A. Rakhlin, and M. Telgarsky. Non-convex learning via stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics: a nonasymptotic analysis. In Satyen Kale and Ohad Shamir, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 65 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1674–1703, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 07–10 Jul 2017.
- [18] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [19] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton University Press, 1972.
- [20] Vollmer S. J., Zygalakis K. C., and Teh Y. W. Exploration of the (non-)asymptotic bias and variance of stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. *J. Machine Learning Research*, 17:5504–5548, 2016.
- [21] T. Seppäläinen. Large deviations for Markov chains with random transitions. *Ann. Probab.*, 22:713–748, 1994.
- [22] Ö. Stenflo. Markov chains in random environments and random iterated function systems. *Trans. American Math. Soc.*, 353:3547–3562, 2001.
- [23] M. Welling and Y. W. Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-11)*, pages 681–688, 2011.
- [24] Teh Y. W., Thiery A. H., and Vollmer S. J. Consistency and fluctuations for stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics. *J. Machine Learning Research*, 17:193–225, 2016.