

---

# STOCHASTIC APPROXIMATION CUT ALGORITHM FOR INFERENCE IN MODULARIZED BAYESIAN MODELS

---

**Yang Liu\***

MRC Biostatistics Unit  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, UK  
yang.liu@mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk

**Robert J.B. Goudie**

MRC Biostatistics Unit  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, UK  
robert.goudie@mrc-bsu.cam.ac.uk

April 5, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Bayesian modelling enables us to accommodate complex forms of data and make a comprehensive inference, but the effect of partial misspecification of the model is a concern. One approach in this setting is to modularize the model, and prevent feedback from suspect modules, using a cut model. After observing data, this leads to the cut distribution which normally does not have a closed-form. Previous studies have proposed algorithms to sample from this distribution, but these algorithms have unclear theoretical convergence properties. To address this, we propose a new algorithm called the Stochastic Approximation Cut algorithm (SACut) as an alternative. The algorithm is divided into two parallel chains. The main chain targets an approximation to the cut distribution; the auxiliary chain is used to form an adaptive proposal distribution for the main chain. We prove convergence of the samples drawn by the proposed algorithm and present the exact limit. Although SACut is biased, since the main chain does not target the exact cut distribution, we prove this bias can be reduced geometrically by increasing a user-chosen tuning parameter. In addition, parallel computing can be easily adopted for SACut, which greatly reduces computation time.

**Keywords** Cutting feedback · Stochastic approximation Monte Carlo · Intractable normalizing functions · Discretization

## 1 Introduction

Bayesian models mathematically formulate our beliefs about the data and parameter. Such models are often highly structured models that represent strong assumptions. Many of the desirable properties of Bayesian inference require the model to be correctly specified. We say a set of models  $f(x|\theta)$ , where  $\theta \in \Theta$ , are misspecified if there is no  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  such that data  $X$  is independently and identically generated from  $f(x|\theta_0)$  (Walker, 2013). In practice, models will inevitably fall short of covering every nuance of the truth. One popular approach when a model is misspecified is fractional (or power) likelihood. This can be used in both classical (e.g., Nakaya et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2018) and Bayesian (e.g., Miller

---

\*Correspondence: Yang Liu, MRC Biostatistics Unit, University of Cambridge, Robinson Way, CB2 0SR




Figure 1: DAG representation of a generic two module model. The two modules are separated by a dashed line.

and Dunson, 2019; Bhattacharya et al., 2019) frameworks. However, this method treats all of the model as equally misspecified.

We consider the situation when the assumptions of the model are thought to partially hold: specifically, we assume that one distinct component (or module in the terminology of Liu et al., 2009) is thought to be incorrectly specified, whereas the other component is correctly specified. In standard Bayesian inference, these distinct modules are linked by Bayes’ theorem. Unfortunately, this means the reliability of the whole model may be affected even if only one component is incorrectly specified. To address this, in this paper we adopt the idea of “cutting feedback” (Lunn et al., 2009b; Liu et al., 2009; Plummer, 2015; Jacob et al., 2017; Jacob et al., 2020) which modifies the links between modules so that estimation of non-suspect modules is unaffected by information from suspect modules. This idea has been used in a broad range of applications including the study of population pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) models (Lunn et al., 2009a), analysis of computer models (Liu et al., 2009), Bayesian estimation of causal effects with propensity scores (McCandless et al., 2010; Zigler, 2016) and Bayesian analysis of health effect of air pollution (Blangiardo et al., 2011).

Consider the generic two module model with observable quantities (data)  $Y$  and  $Z$  and parameters  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$ , shown in the directed acyclic graph (DAG) in Figure 1. The joint distribution is

$$p(Y, Z, \theta, \varphi) = p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(Z|\varphi)p(\theta)p(\varphi),$$

and the standard Bayesian posterior, given observations of  $Y$  and  $Z$ , is

$$p(\theta, \varphi|Y, Z) = p(\theta|Y, \varphi)p(\varphi|Y, Z) = \frac{p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(\theta)}{p(Y|\varphi)} \frac{p(Y|\varphi)p(Z|\varphi)p(\varphi)}{p(Y, Z)}.$$

Suppose we are confident that the relationship between  $\varphi$  and  $Z$  is correctly specified but not confident about the relationship between  $\varphi$  and  $Y$ . To prevent this possible misspecification affecting estimation of  $\varphi$ , we can “cut” feedback by replacing  $p(\varphi|Y, Z)$  in the standard posterior with  $p(\varphi|Z)$ , making the assumption that  $\varphi$  should be solely estimated by  $Z$ ,

$$p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi) := p(\theta|Y, \varphi)p(\varphi|Z) = \frac{p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(\theta)}{p(Y|\varphi)} \frac{p(Z|\varphi)p(\varphi)}{p(Z)}. \quad (1)$$

We call (1) the “cut distribution”. The basic idea of cutting feedback is to allow information to “flow” in the direction of the directed edge, but not in the reverse direction (i.e. a “valve” is added to the directed edge).

Sampling directly from  $p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$  is difficult because the marginal likelihood  $p(Y|\varphi) = \int p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(\theta)d\theta$  depends on a parameter of interest  $\varphi$  and is not usually analytically tractable, except in the simple case when  $p(\theta)$  is conditionally conjugate to  $p(Y|\theta, \varphi)$ , which we do not wish to assume. This intractable marginal likelihood is a conditional posterior normalizing constant: it is the normalizing function for the posterior distribution  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , conditional on  $\varphi$ , of a parameter  $\theta$  of interest:

$$p(\theta|Y, \varphi) = \frac{p(Y, \theta|\varphi)}{p(Y|\varphi)}. \quad (2)$$

This differs importantly to intractable likelihood normalizing constants, as discussed in the doubly intractable literature (e.g., Park and Haran, 2018), in which the normalizing function  $H(\varphi) = \int h(Y|\varphi)dY$  for the likelihood is intractable.

$$p(Y|\varphi) = \frac{h(Y|\varphi)}{H(\varphi)}.$$

The normalizing function  $H(\varphi)$  is obtained by marginalizing the likelihood, with respect to the observable quantity  $Y$ , in contrast to the normalizing function  $p(Y|\varphi)$ , which is obtained by marginalizing the likelihood  $p(Y, \theta|\varphi)$  with respect to a parameter  $\theta$  of interest. This difference means that standard methods for doubly intractable problems (e.g., Møller et al., 2006; Murray et al., 2006; Liang, 2010; Liang et al., 2016), which introduce an auxiliary variable, with the same distribution (or proposal distribution) as the distribution of the *a posteriori* observed and fixed  $Y$  to cancel the intractable normalizing function shared by them, do not directly apply to (2).

A simple algorithm that aims to sample from  $p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$  is implemented in WinBUGS (Lunn et al., 2009b). It is a Gibbs-style sampler that involves updating  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$  with a pair of transition kernels  $q(\theta'|\theta, \varphi')$  and  $q(\varphi'|\varphi)$  that satisfy detailed balance with  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi')$  and  $p(\varphi|Z)$  respectively. However, the chain constructed by the WinBUGS algorithm may not have the cut distribution as its stationary distribution (Plummer, 2015) since

$$\int p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)q(\theta'|\theta, \varphi')q(\varphi'|\varphi)d\theta d\varphi = w(\theta', \varphi')p_{cut}(\theta', \varphi'),$$

where the weight function  $w$  is

$$w(\theta', \varphi') = \int \frac{p(\theta|Y, \varphi)}{p(\theta|Y, \varphi')}q(\varphi|\varphi')q(\theta|\theta', \varphi')d\theta d\varphi.$$

The WinBUGS algorithm is inexact since  $w(\theta', \varphi') \neq 1$ , except in the simple case (conditionally-conjugate) when it is possible to draw exact Gibbs updates from  $p(\theta'|Y, \varphi')$ . Plummer (2015) proposed two algorithms that address this problem by satisfying  $w(\theta', \varphi') = 1$  approximately. One is a nested MCMC algorithm, which updates  $\theta$  from  $p(\theta'|Y, \varphi')$  by running a separate internal Markov chain with transition kernel  $q^*(\theta'|\theta, \varphi')$  satisfying detailed balance with the target distribution  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi')$ . The other is a linear path algorithm, which decomposes the complete MCMC move from  $(\theta, \varphi)$  to  $(\theta', \varphi')$  into a series of substeps along a linear path from  $\varphi$  to  $\varphi'$  and drawing a new  $\theta$  at each substep. However, these methods require either the length of the internal chain or the number of substeps to go to infinity, meaning that in practice, these algorithms will not necessarily converge to  $p_{cut}$ .

In this article, we propose a new sampling algorithm for  $p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$ , called the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm (SACut). Our algorithm is divided into two chains that are run in parallel: the main chain that approximately targets  $p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$ ; and an auxiliary chain that is used to form a proposal distribution for  $\theta|\varphi$  in the main chain. The auxiliary chain uses Stochastic Approximation Monte Carlo (SAMC) (Liang et al., 2007) to approximate the intractable marginal likelihood  $p(Y|\varphi)$  for each  $\varphi \in \Phi_0 = \{\varphi_0^{(1)}, \dots, \varphi_0^{(m)}\}$ , a set of pre-selected auxiliary parameters.

The basic “naive” form of our algorithm has convergence in distribution, but stronger convergence properties can be obtained by targeting an approximation  $p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\theta, \varphi)$  instead of the true density  $p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$ . We prove a weak law of large numbers for the samples  $\{(\theta_n, \varphi_n)\}_{n=1}^N$  drawn from the main chain. We also prove that the bias due to targeting  $p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\theta, \varphi)$  can be controlled by the precision parameter  $\kappa$ , and that the bias decreases geometrically as  $\kappa$  increases. Our algorithm is inspired by the adaptive exchange algorithm (Liang et al., 2016), but replaces the exchange step with a direct proposal distribution for  $\theta$  given  $\varphi$  in the main chain.

## 2 Main Result

Let the product space  $\Theta \times \Phi$  be the supports of  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$  under  $p_{cut}$ . We assume the following throughout for simplicity.

**Assumption 1.** (a)  $\Theta$  and  $\Phi$  are compact, (b)  $p_{cut}$  is continuous with respect to  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$  over  $\Theta \times \Phi$ .

Assumption 1(a) is restrictive, but is commonly assumed in the study of adaptive Markov chains (Haario et al., 2001). Note that Assumption 1 implies that  $p_{cut}$  is bounded over  $\Theta \times \Phi$ . From now on, define a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Denote Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $\Theta$  and  $\Phi$  and let  $P_{cut}$  be the measure on  $\Theta \times \Phi$  defined by its density  $p_{cut}$ .

## 2.1 Naive Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm

To introduce ideas that we will use in Section 2.3, we first describe a naive version of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm. The overall naive algorithm (Algorithm 1) is divided into two chains that are run in parallel.

The auxiliary chain  $h_n = (\tilde{\theta}_n, \tilde{\varphi}_n, \tilde{w}_n)$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , uses Stochastic Approximation Monte Carlo (Liang et al., 2007) to estimate  $p(Y|\varphi)$  at a set of  $m$  pre-selected auxiliary parameter values  $\Phi_0 = \{\varphi_0^{(1)}, \dots, \varphi_0^{(m)}\}$ . These values  $\Phi_0$  are chosen using the Max-Min procedure introduced in Liang et al. (2016) so that they cover the major part of the support of  $p(\varphi|Z)$ . The target density for  $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\varphi})$ , which is proportional to  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  in (1) at the values  $\Phi_0$ , is

$$p(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\varphi}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}, \varphi_0^{(i)})p(\tilde{\theta})}{p(Y|\varphi_0^{(i)})} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\varphi}=\varphi_0^{(i)}\}}, \quad \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \quad \tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_0. \quad (3)$$

Given proposal distributions  $q_1(\tilde{\theta}'|\tilde{\theta})$  and  $q_2(\tilde{\varphi}'|\tilde{\varphi})$  for  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}$  individually (e.g., symmetric random walk proposal), at each iteration  $n$ , proposals  $\tilde{\theta}'$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}'$  are drawn from a mixture proposal distribution, with a fixed mixing probability  $p_{mix}$ ,

$$q(\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}'|\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}, \tilde{\varphi}_{n-1}) = \begin{cases} p_{mix}q_1(\tilde{\theta}'|\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}), & \text{for } \tilde{\theta}' \neq \tilde{\theta}_{n-1} \\ (1 - p_{mix})q_2(\tilde{\varphi}'|\tilde{\varphi}_{n-1}), & \text{for } \tilde{\varphi}' \neq \tilde{\varphi}_{n-1} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and accepted according to the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability with an iteration-specific target

$$p_n(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\varphi}) \propto \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}, \varphi_0^{(i)})p(\tilde{\theta})}{\tilde{w}_{n-1}^{(i)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\varphi}=\varphi_0^{(i)}\}}, \quad \tilde{\theta} \in \Theta, \quad \tilde{\varphi} \in \Phi_0.$$

Here  $\tilde{w}_n^{(i)}$  is the estimate of  $p(Y|\varphi_0^{(i)})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , up to a constant, and  $\tilde{w}_n = (\tilde{w}_n^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{w}_n^{(m)})$  is a vector of these estimates at each of the pre-selected auxiliary parameter values  $\Phi_0$ . We set  $\tilde{w}_0^{(i)} = 1$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$  at the start. As described in Liang et al. (2007) and Liang et al. (2016), the estimates are updated by

$$\log(\tilde{w}_n^{(i)}) = \log(\tilde{w}_{n-1}^{(i)}) + \xi_n(e_{n,i} - m^{-1}), \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad (4)$$

where  $e_{n,i} = 1$  if  $\tilde{\varphi}_n = \varphi_0^{(i)}$  and  $e_{n,i} = 0$  otherwise, and  $\xi_n = n_0 / \max(n_0, n)$  decreases to 0 when  $n$  goes to infinity (the shrink magnitude  $n_0$  is a user-chosen fixed constant). Note that in this auxiliary chain, when the number of iterations is sufficiently large, we are drawing  $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\varphi})$  from (3). Hence, by checking if the empirical sampling frequency of each  $\varphi_0^{(i)} \in \Phi_0$  equals  $m^{-1}$ , we can determine whether the auxiliary chain has converged.

In the main Markov chain  $(\theta_n, \varphi_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  we draw  $\varphi'$  from a proposal distribution  $q(\varphi'|\varphi)$ , and then draw  $\theta'$  according to a random measure

$$P_n^*(\theta \in \mathcal{B}|Y, \varphi') = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{w}_j^{(i)} \frac{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi')}{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi_0^{(i)})} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\theta}_j \in \mathcal{B}, \varphi_0^{(i)} = \tilde{\varphi}_j\}}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{w}_j^{(i)} \frac{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi')}{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi_0^{(i)})} \mathbb{1}_{\{\varphi_0^{(i)} = \tilde{\varphi}_j\}}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta$  is any Borel set. The measure  $P_n^*(\theta \in \mathcal{B}|Y, \varphi')$  is adapted to the filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(\cup_{j=1}^n (\tilde{\theta}_j, \tilde{\varphi}_j, \tilde{w}_j))$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , and has a Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to a mixture of Dirac

measures determined by  $\tilde{\Theta}_n = \cup_{j=1}^n \{\tilde{\theta}_j\}$  (Gottardo and Raftery, 2008), because it is the law of a discrete random variable defined on  $\tilde{\Theta}_n$ .

Given a  $\varphi$ , the random measure (5) is formed via a dynamic importance sampling procedure proposed in Liang (2002) with intention to approximate the unknown distribution  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ . For any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{w}_j^{(i)} \frac{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi)p(\tilde{\theta}_j)}{p(Y|\tilde{\theta}_j, \varphi_0^{(i)})p(\tilde{\theta}_j)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\theta}_j \in \mathcal{B}, \varphi_0^{(i)} = \tilde{\varphi}_j\}} \\ & \rightarrow n \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{B}} mp(Y|\varphi_0^{(i)}) \frac{p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(\theta)}{p(Y|\theta, \varphi_0^{(i)})p(\theta)} \frac{1}{m} \frac{p(Y|\theta, \varphi_0^{(i)})p(\theta)}{p(Y|\varphi_0^{(i)})} d\theta \\ & = nm \int_{\mathcal{B}} p(Y|\theta, \varphi)p(\theta) d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, the denominator of (5) converges to  $nm p(Y|\varphi)$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.1 of Liang et al. (2016), since  $\Theta \times \Phi$  is compact, for any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta$  and on any outcome  $\omega$  of probability space  $\Omega$ , we have:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi} \left| P_n^*(\theta \in \mathcal{B}|Y, \varphi) - \int_{\mathcal{B}} p(\theta|Y, \varphi) d\theta \right| = 0. \quad (6)$$

This implies that the distribution of  $\{\theta_n\}$ , drawn from (5), converges in distribution to  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , and this convergence occurs uniformly over  $\Phi$ . Note that convergence in distribution is not sufficiently strong to infer a law of large numbers or ergodicity of the drawn samples. To obtain these properties, we will adopt a density function approximation technique.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Naive Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm

---

Initialize at starting points  $h_0 = (\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_0, \tilde{w}_0)$  and  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0)$ ;

For  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ;

(a) Auxiliary chain:

- (1) Draw a proposal  $(\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}')$  according to  $q(\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}'|\tilde{\theta}_{n-1}, \tilde{\varphi}_{n-1})$ .
- (2) Accept the proposal, and set  $(\tilde{\theta}_n, \tilde{\varphi}_n) = (\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}')$  according to the iteration-specific acceptance probability.
- (3) Calculate  $\tilde{w}_n^{(i)}$  according to (4),  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

(b) Main chain:

- (1) Draw a proposal  $\varphi'$  according to  $q(\varphi'|\varphi_n)$ .
- (2) Set  $\varphi_n = \varphi'$  with probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\varphi'|\varphi_{n-1}) &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(\theta'|Y, \varphi')p(\varphi'|Z)q(\varphi_{n-1}|\varphi')p(\theta_{n-1}|Y, \varphi_{n-1})}{p(\theta_{n-1}|Y, \varphi_{n-1})p(\varphi_{n-1}|Z)q(\varphi'|\varphi_{n-1})p(\theta'|Y, \varphi')} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(\varphi'|Z)q(\varphi_{n-1}|\varphi')}{p(\varphi_{n-1}|Z)q(\varphi'|\varphi_{n-1})} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (3) If  $\varphi'$  is accepted, draw  $\theta'$  according to  $P_n^*(\theta'|Y, \varphi')$  defined in (5) and set  $\theta_n = \theta'$ .
- (4) Otherwise if  $\varphi'$  is rejected, set  $(\theta_n, \varphi_n) = (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})$ .

End For;

---

## 2.2 Density Function Approximation by Simple Function

In this section, we show how a density function  $f$  can be approximated by a simple function that is constant on a hypercube. We show that the degree of approximation can be easily controlled, and is dependent on the

gradient of  $f$ . The use of a simple function to approximate a density function has been discussed previously (Fu and Wang, 2002; Malefaki and Iliopoulos, 2009), but here we use a different partition of the support of the function, determined by rounding to a user-specified number of decimal places. We first consider the general case, then the particular case of the cut distribution.

### 2.2.1 General case

For a compact set  $\Psi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with dimension  $d$ , define a map  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa : \Psi \rightarrow \Psi$  that rounds every element of  $\psi \in \Psi$  to  $\kappa$  decimal places, where  $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}$ , as  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa(\psi) = \lfloor 10^\kappa \psi + 0.5 \rfloor / 10^\kappa$ . Since  $\Psi$  is compact,  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa(\Psi)$  is a finite set and we let  $R_\kappa$  denote its cardinality. We partition  $\Psi$  in terms of (partial) hypercubes  $\Psi_r$  whose centres  $\psi_r \in \mathcal{R}_\kappa(\Psi)$  are the rounded elements of  $\Psi$ ,

$$\Psi_r = \Psi \cap \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_r\|_\infty \leq 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}\}, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa, \quad (7)$$

and the boundary set  $\bar{\Psi}_\kappa$ ,

$$\bar{\Psi}_\kappa = \Psi \cap \left( \bigcup_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_r\|_\infty = 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}\} \right). \quad (8)$$

It is clear that  $\bigcup_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \Psi_r = \Psi$ . Hence  $\{\Psi_r \setminus \bar{\Psi}_\kappa\}_{r=1}^{R_\kappa}$  and  $\bar{\Psi}_\kappa$  form a partition of  $\Psi$ .

Using this partition, we are able to construct a simple function density that approximates a density function. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of all continuous and integrable probability density functions  $f : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of all simple functions  $f : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Define a map  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}$  as

$$\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) = \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Psi_r)} \int_{\Psi_r} f(\psi') d\psi' \mathbb{1}_{\{\psi \in \Psi_r\}}, \quad \forall \psi \in \Psi.$$

The sets  $\Psi_r$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ , are the level sets of the simple function approximation, and the value  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi)$ ,  $\psi \in \Psi \setminus \bar{\Psi}_\kappa$ , is the (normalized) probability of a random variable with density  $f$  taking a value in  $\Psi_r$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . Note that, when  $\Psi_r$  is a full hypercube,  $\mu(\Psi_r) = 10^{-d\kappa}$ ; and if the set  $\Psi$  is known, then  $\mu(\Psi_r)$  is obtainable for partial hypercubes. Figure 2 illustrates how this simple function approximates the truncated standard normal density function  $f_{\text{norm}} : [-4, 4] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , when  $\kappa = 0$  and  $\kappa = 1$ . Note that this is the optimal simple function for the approximation in terms of Kullback-Leibler divergence (Malefaki and Iliopoulos, 2009).

Since  $\mu(\bar{\Psi}_\kappa) = 0$ , it is clear that

$$\int_{\Psi} \mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) d\psi = \int_{\Psi} f(\psi) d\psi = 1.$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)$  is a well-defined density function. We have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Given any continuous density function  $f$ ,*

$$\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f) \xrightarrow{a.s.} f, \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* See supplementary material. □

When the density function  $f$  is also continuously differentiable, we can obtain the following result about the rate of convergence.

**Corollary 1.** *Given a density function  $f$  that is continuously differentiable, there exists a set  $\mathcal{E} \subset \Psi$  with  $\mu(\mathcal{E}) = \mu(\Psi)$  such that the local convergence holds:*

$$|\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq (\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) + \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2) \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}, \quad \forall \psi \in \mathcal{E},$$

where  $\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ .




Figure 2: Simple function approximation of a truncated normal distribution. When  $\kappa = 0$  the sets  $\Psi_1 = [-4, -3.5]$ ,  $\Psi_2 = [-3.5, -2.5]$ , ...,  $\Psi_8 = [2.5, 3.5]$ ,  $\Psi_9 = [3.5, 4]$  are the intervals partitioning  $[-4, 4]$  and  $\Psi_0 = \{-3.5, -2.5, \dots, 2.5, 3.5\}$ .

In addition, the global convergence holds:

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}} |\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}.$$

*Proof.* See supplementary material.  $\square$

Corollary 1 shows that the rate of convergence of  $\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)$  to  $f$  is geometric. It states that, (a) for any  $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , the rate of convergence is locally controlled by its gradient  $\|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2$ ; and (b) the rate of convergence is uniformly controlled by the upper bound of the gradient. Hence, as is intuitively expected, convergence is faster if the target function  $f$  has a smaller total variation on the set  $\mathcal{E}$ .

**Remark 1.** When the scale of each component of  $\psi \in \Psi$  is not same, a more complex partition can be formed by choosing component-specific precision parameters  $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d)$ . Denote  $\circ$  as the Hadamard product and  $10^{\pm\kappa} := (10^{\pm\kappa_1}, \dots, 10^{\pm\kappa_d})$ , we redefine

$$\mathcal{R}_\kappa(\Psi) = \lfloor 10^\kappa \circ \psi + 0.5 \rfloor \circ 10^{-\kappa}.$$

We build a (partial)  $d$ -orthotope around  $\psi_r \in \mathcal{R}_\kappa(\Psi)$

$$\Psi_r = \Psi \cap \{\psi : |\psi - \psi_r| \leq 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}\}, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa.$$

We do not discuss this more complex partition but all results in this paper that are based on the basic partition in (7) and (8) can be easily extended to this more complex partition.

### 2.2.2 Simple function approximation cut distribution

Let  $\{\Theta_r \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa\}_{r=1}^{R_\kappa}$  and  $\bar{\Theta}_\kappa$  be the partition of  $\Theta$  formed according to (7) and (8), where  $\mu(\bar{\Theta}_\kappa) = 0$ . Since the density function  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is continuous on the compact set  $\Theta$ , we can apply the simple function approximation technique to obtain an approximation with support  $\Theta$

$$p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) = \mathcal{S}_\kappa(p(\cdot|Y, \varphi))(\theta),$$

and let  $P^{(\kappa)}$  be the corresponding probability measure on  $\Theta$ . The **simple function approximation cut distribution** is then formed by replacing the exact conditional distribution with this approximation

$$p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\theta, \varphi) = p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)p(\varphi|Z).$$

Let  $P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}$  be the corresponding probability measure on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ .

### 2.3 Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm

We now refine the naive Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm by replacing in the main chain the proposal distribution  $P_n^*$ , which concentrates on the discrete set  $\bar{\Theta}_n$ , by a distribution, with support on the compact set  $\Theta$ , that we will show converges almost surely to  $P^{(\kappa)}$ .

Define a random weight process  $\mathcal{W}_n(\varphi) = (W_n(\Theta_1|Y, \varphi), \dots, W_n(\Theta_{R_\kappa}|Y, \varphi))$  based on the probability of the original proposal distribution  $P_n^*$  taking a value in each partition component  $\Theta_r$  as

$$W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) = \frac{P_n^*(\theta \in \Theta_r|Y, \varphi) + (nR_\kappa)^{-1}}{1 + n^{-1}}, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa. \quad (9)$$

Note that  $W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi)$  is adapted to the auxiliary filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$ . By adding a  $(nR_\kappa)^{-1}$ , each  $W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi)$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ , is strictly positive and yet this modification does not affect the limit since  $(nR_\kappa)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ . That is, on any outcome  $\omega$  of probability space  $\Omega$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi; 1 \leq r \leq R_\kappa} \left| W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta|Y, \varphi) d\theta \right| = 0. \quad (10)$$

We now define the random measure process  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  that replaces  $P_n^*$  used in the naive Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm. For any Borel set  $\mathcal{B}$ ,

$$P_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta \in \mathcal{B}|Y, \varphi) = \int_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \in \Theta_r\}} d\theta. \quad (11)$$

Clearly  $P_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta \in \Theta|Y, \varphi) = 1$  so  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  is a valid probability measure on  $\Theta$ . Additionally, since  $\mathcal{W}_n(\varphi)$  is adapted to filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$ ,  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  is adapted to filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$ . The Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  with respect to Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $\Theta$  is

$$p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) = \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \in \Theta_r\}}. \quad (12)$$

This density is not continuous, but it is bounded on  $\Theta$ . In addition, since  $\Theta$  is the support of  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  and  $\mathcal{W}_n(\varphi)$  is strictly positive, the support of  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  is  $\Theta$  for all  $\varphi \in \Phi$  as well.

Using  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  as the proposal distribution has the advantage that  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  converges almost surely to  $p^{(\kappa)}$ , in contrast to the convergence in distribution for the naive algorithm in (6).

**Lemma 1.** *Given Assumption 1, on any outcome  $\omega$  of probability space  $\Omega$ , we have:*

$$p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \xrightarrow{a.s.} p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi),$$

and this convergence is uniform over  $(\Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa) \times \Phi$ .

Note that the convergence is to  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  rather than  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , but we will show in Corollary 2 that this bias reduces geometrically as the precision parameter  $\kappa$  increases.

The complete Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm (SACut) is shown in Algorithm 2. The key idea is that we propose samples for  $\theta$  from a density  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , which approximates  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  and from which






Figure 3: Relationship between  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi_0^{(i)})$ ,  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ ,  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  and  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ . Samples of the auxiliary variable  $\tilde{\theta}$  are drawn from a mixture of discretized densities  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi_0^{(i)})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , shown in the violin plot in (a), with the green dots showing the median of each component. Then  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , shown in (b), is formed by using these auxiliary variables. Lemma 1 shows that  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  converges to  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , which is shown in (d). Theorem 1 shows that  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  converges to the original density  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , shown in (c).

we can draw samples, but we accept these proposals according to  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ , which then cancels. This results in the acceptance probability being determined only by the proposal distribution for  $\varphi$ ; the proposal distribution for  $\theta$  is not involved. Indeed, the acceptance probability is the same as the partial Gibbs sampler that we will discuss in Section 3.1.1.

Figure 3 illustrates the key quantities involved for a toy example when the conditional distribution of  $\theta$ , given  $Y = 1$  and  $\varphi$ , is  $N(\varphi, Y^2)$ .

## 2.4 Parallelization and Simplification of Computation

The main computational bottleneck of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm is the updating and storage of the cumulative set of auxiliary variable values  $\tilde{\Theta}_n = \cup_{j=1}^n \{\tilde{\theta}_j\}$ . Since we draw a new  $\varphi'$  at each iteration, in order to calculate all possible probabilities defined by (5) and (9), the density  $p(Y|\tilde{\theta}, \varphi')$  must be calculated  $|\tilde{\Theta}_n|$  times. This is equivalent to running  $|\tilde{\Theta}_n|$  internal iterations at each step of external iteration for the existing approximate approaches proposed in Plummer (2015). Note that  $\tilde{\Theta}_n$  is solely generated from the auxiliary chain so  $|\tilde{\Theta}_n|$  is not affected by the precision parameter  $\kappa$ . If the calculation of this density is computationally expensive, the time to perform each update of the chain will become prohibitive when  $|\tilde{\Theta}_n|$  is large. However, the calculation of  $p(Y|\tilde{\theta}, \varphi')$  for different values of  $\tilde{\theta}$  is embarrassingly parallel so can be evaluated in parallel whenever multiple computer cores are available, enabling a considerable speed up.

**Algorithm 2:** Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm (SACut)

---

Initialize at starting points  $h_0 = (\tilde{\theta}_0, \tilde{\varphi}_0, \tilde{w}_0)$  and  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0)$ ;

For  $n = 1, \dots, N$ ;

(a) Auxiliary chain:

- (1) Draw a proposal  $(\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}')$  according to  $q(\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}' | \tilde{\theta}_{n-1}, \tilde{\varphi}_{n-1})$ .
- (2) Accept the proposal, and set  $(\tilde{\theta}_n, \tilde{\varphi}_n) = (\tilde{\theta}', \tilde{\varphi}')$  according to the iteration-specific acceptance probability.
- (3) Calculate  $\tilde{w}_n^{(i)}$  according to (4),  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

(b) Main chain:

- (1) Draw a proposal  $\varphi'$  according to  $q(\varphi' | \varphi_n)$ .
- (2) Set  $\varphi_n = \varphi'$  with probability:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi_{n-1}) &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') p(\varphi' | Z) q(\varphi_{n-1} | \varphi') p^{(\kappa)}(\theta_{n-1} | Y, \varphi_{n-1})}{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta_{n-1} | Y, \varphi_{n-1}) p(\varphi_{n-1} | Z) q(\varphi' | \varphi_{n-1}) p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi')} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(\varphi' | Z) q(\varphi_{n-1} | \varphi')}{p(\varphi_{n-1} | Z) q(\varphi' | \varphi_{n-1})} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (3) If  $\varphi'$  is accepted, calculate  $W_n(\Theta_r | Y, \varphi')$  defined in (9),  $r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . Draw a proposal  $\theta'$  according to  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi')$  defined in (11) and set  $\theta_n = \theta'$ .
- (4) Otherwise if  $\varphi'$  is rejected, set  $(\theta_n, \varphi_n) = (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})$ .

End For;

---

The speed of the computation can be further improved by reducing the size of  $\tilde{\Theta}_n$ . Given the precision parameter  $\kappa$ , we let  $\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)} = \mathcal{R}_\kappa(\tilde{\Theta}_n)$ . This can be easily achieved by rounding every newly sampled  $\tilde{\theta}_j$  to  $\kappa$  decimal places. At each iteration, the number of calculations of density  $p(Y | \tilde{\theta}, \varphi')$  is equal to the number of  $d$ -orthotopes that auxiliary chain  $\{\tilde{\theta}_j\}_{j=1}^n$  has visited up to iteration  $n$  and by (6) we know that the distribution of auxiliary samples of  $\tilde{\theta}$  converges to the true distribution  $p(\theta | Y, \varphi)$ . Hence, the computational speed is mainly determined by the precision parameter  $\kappa$  and the target distribution  $p(\theta | Y, \varphi)$ . In particular, for any fixed  $\kappa$  and a sufficiently long auxiliary chain the computational cost is upper bounded by the case of uniform distribution since it equally distributes over the space  $\Theta$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Given an arbitrary  $d$  dimensional compact parameter space  $\Theta$  and a precision parameter  $\kappa$  and suppose that the auxiliary chain has converged before we start collecting auxiliary variable  $\tilde{\theta}$ , for any fixed number of iteration  $n$ . Then the expected number of  $d$ -orthotopes visited  $\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)}|)$  is maximized when the target distribution is uniform distribution.*

*Proof.* See supplementary material. □

For example, given a  $d$  dimensional parameter space  $\Theta = [0 - 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}, 1 + 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}]^d$  and its partition  $\Theta_r$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, 11^{d\kappa}$ , we consider the uniform distribution as the target distribution. Assume the auxiliary chain has converged, the expectation of  $|\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)}|$  is

$$\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)}|) = 11^{d\kappa} - \frac{(11^{d\kappa} - 1)^n}{11^{d\kappa(n-1)}}.$$

In the case of  $d = 1$ , Figure 4 compares the number of orthotopes visited between the uniform distribution and truncated normal distribution when the standard deviation is 0.1 and 0.05. It shows that larger precision parameter  $\kappa$  means more evaluations of  $p(Y | \tilde{\theta}, \varphi')$  are required. Hence, a wise choice of a small  $\kappa$  can significantly reduce computation time.




Figure 4: Relationship between the number of orthotopes visited and the number of iterations when precision parameter  $\kappa = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ . Separate Monte Carlo simulations were conducted for uniform distribution and truncated normal distribution with standard deviation 0.1 and 0.05.

While small  $\kappa$  means a loss of precision since local variations of original target distribution are smoothed by rounding the value of its samples, in most applied settings only a small number of significant figures are meaningful, and so the ability to trade-off the precision and computational speed is appealing. Comparing short preliminary run of chains for different candidates of  $\kappa$  may be useful when a suitable choice of  $\kappa$  is unclear. We will discuss this in Section 4.1.

### 3 Convergence Properties

In this section, we study the convergence properties of samples drawn by the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm. We establish a weak law of large numbers with respect to the simple function approximation cut distribution  $P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}$ , under some regularity conditions, by proving that the conditions required by Theorem 3.2 in Liang et al. (2016) are satisfied. We then prove that the bias with respect to  $P_{cut}$  can be reduced geometrically by increasing the precision parameter  $\kappa$ . To aid exposition of the convergence properties, it is necessary to first introduce two simpler but infeasible alternative algorithms.

#### 3.1 Infeasible Alternative Algorithms

**Definition 1.** Given a signed measure  $\mathcal{M}$  defined on a set  $E$ , and a Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset E$ , define the total variation norm of  $\mathcal{M}$  as

$$\|\mathcal{M}(\cdot)\|_{TV} = \sup_{\mathcal{B} \subset E} |\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B})|.$$

### 3.1.1 A Partial Gibbs Sampler

The most straightforward algorithm that draws samples from  $p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\theta, \varphi)$  is a standard partial Gibbs sampler, which draws proposals  $\theta'$  from  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta'|Y, \varphi')$ , given a  $\varphi'$  drawn from a proposal distribution  $q(\varphi'|\varphi_{n-1})$ . The transition kernel is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}^{(1)}((\theta_n, \varphi_n)|(\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})) &= \alpha(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1})p^{(\kappa)}(\theta_n|Y, \varphi_n)q(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1}) \\ &+ \left(1 - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} \alpha(\varphi|\varphi_{n-1})p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)q(\varphi|\varphi_{n-1})d\theta d\varphi\right) \delta((\theta_n, \varphi_n) - (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})) \\ &= \alpha(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1})p^{(\kappa)}(\theta_n|Y, \varphi_n)q(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1}) \\ &+ \left(1 - \int_{\Phi} \alpha(\varphi|\varphi_{n-1})q(\varphi|\varphi_{n-1})d\varphi\right) \delta((\theta_n, \varphi_n) - (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta$  is the multivariate Dirac delta function and

$$\alpha(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1}) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(\varphi_n|Z)q(\varphi_{n-1}|\varphi_n)}{p(\varphi_{n-1}|Z)q(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1})} \right\}.$$

This transition kernel is Markovian and admits  $p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}$  as its stationary distribution, provided a proper proposal distribution  $q(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1})$  is used. We write  $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$  for the corresponding probability measure.

Let  $\mathbf{u}^{(s)}$  denote the  $s$ -step transition kernel and write  $\mathbf{U}^{(s)}$  for the corresponding probability measure. By Meyn et al. (2009), we have ergodicity on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ ,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{U}^{(s)}(\cdot) - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} = 0,$$

and for any bounded function  $f$  defined on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ , we have a strong law of large numbers

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(d\theta, d\varphi).$$

Note, however, that this algorithm is infeasible because  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is intractable, since  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is intractable, and so we cannot directly draw proposals for  $\theta$ .

### 3.1.2 An Adaptive Metropolis-Hastings Sampler

An adaptive Metropolis-Hastings sampler can be built by replacing  $p^{(\kappa)}$  in the calculation of acceptance probability of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm by its approximation  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$ , which is the exact proposal distribution for  $\theta$  at the  $n^{th}$  step. The acceptance probability is determined by both  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$ ,

$$\alpha_n((\theta', \varphi')|(\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta'|Y, \varphi')p(\varphi'|Z)q(\varphi_{n-1}|\varphi')p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta_{n-1}|Y, \varphi_{n-1})}{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta_{n-1}|Y, \varphi_{n-1})p(\varphi_{n-1}|Z)q(\varphi'| \varphi_{n-1})p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta'|Y, \varphi')} \right\}.$$

and we can write the transition kernel,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_n^{(1)}((\theta_n, \varphi_n)|(\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1}), \mathcal{G}_n) &= \alpha_n((\theta_n, \varphi_n)|(\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1}))p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta_n|Y, \varphi_n)q(\varphi_n|\varphi_{n-1}) \\ &+ \left(1 - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} \alpha_n((\theta, \varphi)|(\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1}))p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)q(\varphi|\varphi_{n-1})d\theta d\varphi\right) \delta((\theta_n, \varphi_n) - (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta$  is the multivariate Dirac delta function. Conditional on the filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_n^{(1)}$  is Markovian. We write  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}$  for the corresponding probability measure. Note that this sampler is not a standard Metropolis-Hastings

algorithm since the transition kernel is not constant. Instead, it is an *external* adaptive MCMC algorithm (Atchadé et al., 2011).

Given information up to  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , if we stop updating auxiliary process then  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  is fixed and not random, and this sampler reduces to a standard Metropolis-Hastings sampler. The transition kernel  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}$  admits  $p_{cut}^{(\kappa)}$  as its stationary distribution provided a proper proposal distribution is used. That is, define

$$\mathbf{v}_n^{(s)} = \int_{\Theta^{s-1} \times \Phi^{s-1}} \prod_{k=1}^s \mathbf{v}_n^{(1)}((\theta_k, \varphi_k) | (\theta_{k-1}, \varphi_{k-1}), \mathcal{G}_n) d\theta_{1:s-1} d\varphi_{1:s-1},$$

and  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s)}$  as the corresponding probability measure. Then on  $\Theta \times \Phi$  we have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{V}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} = 0.$$

Note, however, that this algorithm is also infeasible because, while we can draw proposals for  $\theta$ , since  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  is known up to  $\mathcal{G}_n$ ,  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  remains intractable so we cannot calculate the acceptance probability.

### 3.2 Convergence of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm

The infeasibility of the partial Gibbs sampler and the adaptive Metropolis-Hastings sampler motivate the development of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm, which replaces the proposal distribution  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  by its target  $p^{(\kappa)}$  in the accept-reject step of the adaptive Metropolis-Hastings sampler. This leads to the same acceptance probability as is used by the partial Gibbs sampler so the proposed algorithm can be viewed as combining the advantages of both the partial Gibbs sampler and the adaptive Metropolis-Hastings sampler. The transition kernel of the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm is

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{t}_n^{(1)}((\theta_n, \varphi_n) | (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1}), \mathcal{G}_n) \\ &= \alpha(\varphi_n | \varphi_{n-1}) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta_n | Y, \varphi_n) q(\varphi_n | \varphi_{n-1}) \\ &+ \left( 1 - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} \alpha(\varphi | \varphi_{n-1}) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi) q(\varphi | \varphi_{n-1}) d\theta d\varphi \right) \delta((\theta_n, \varphi_n) - (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})) \\ &= \alpha(\varphi_n | \varphi_{n-1}) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta_n | Y, \varphi_n) q(\varphi_n | \varphi_{n-1}) \\ &+ \left( 1 - \int_{\Phi} \alpha(\varphi | \varphi_{n-1}) q(\varphi | \varphi_{n-1}) d\varphi \right) \delta((\theta_n, \varphi_n) - (\theta_{n-1}, \varphi_{n-1})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta$  is the multivariate Dirac delta function. Conditionally to  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , the transition kernel  $\mathbf{t}_n^{(1)}$  is Markovian. We write  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}$  for the corresponding probability measure. Given information up to  $\mathcal{G}_n$  and stopping updating the auxiliary process,  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  is fixed and not random, and we define the  $s$ -step transition kernel as

$$\mathbf{t}_n^{(s)} = \int_{\Theta^{s-1} \times \Phi^{s-1}} \prod_{k=1}^s \mathbf{t}_n^{(1)}((\theta_k, \varphi_k) | (\theta_{k-1}, \varphi_{k-1}), \mathcal{G}_n) d\theta_{1:s-1} d\varphi_{1:s-1},$$

and write  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}$  for the corresponding probability measure.

We now present several lemmas required to prove a weak law of large numbers for this algorithm (proofs in supplementary material), appropriately modifying the reasoning of Meyn and Tweedie (1994), Roberts and Tweedie (1996) and Liang et al. (2016) for this setting.

**Assumption 2.** *The posterior density  $p(\varphi|Z)$  is continuous on  $\Phi$  and the proposal distribution  $q(\varphi'|\varphi)$  is continuous with respect to  $(\varphi', \varphi)$  on  $\Phi \times \Phi$ .*

**Lemma 2 (Diminishing Adaptation).** *Given Assumptions 1 and 2, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \left\| \mathbf{T}_{n+1}^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_{n+1}) - \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \right\|_{TV} = 0.$$

Before presenting the next lemma, we introduce the concept of *local positivity*.

**Definition 2.** A proposal distribution  $q(\psi'|\psi)$  satisfies local positivity if there exists  $\delta > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for every  $\psi \in \Psi$ ,  $|\psi' - \psi| \leq \delta$  implies that  $q(\psi'|\psi) > \varepsilon$ .

**Lemma 3.** Given Assumption 1, the proposal distributions with densities  $p_n^{(\kappa)} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $p^{(\kappa)} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are both uniformly lower bounded away from 0 and satisfy local positivity uniformly for all values  $\varphi \in \Phi$ .

**Lemma 4 (Stationarity).** Given Assumptions 1 and 2, and the filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$  (i.e.  $P_n^{(\kappa)}$  is not random), then if the transition kernel measures  $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}$  both admit an irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain, then the transition kernel measure  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}$  admits an irreducible and aperiodic chain. Moreover, if the proposal distribution  $q(\varphi'|\varphi)$  satisfies local positivity, then there exists a probability measure  $\Pi_n$  on  $\Theta \times \Phi$  such that for any  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ ,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - \Pi_n(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} = 0,$$

and this convergence is uniform over  $\Theta \times \Phi$ .

**Lemma 5 (Asymptotic Simultaneous Uniform Ergodicity).** Given Assumptions 1 and 2 and the assumptions in Lemma 4, for any initial value  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $e > 0$ , there exist constants  $S(\varepsilon) > 0$  and  $N(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\{ P_n^{(\kappa)} : \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \right) > 1 - e,$$

for all  $s > S(\varepsilon)$  and  $n > N(\varepsilon)$ .

Lemma 2 leads to condition (c) (Diminishing Adaptation), Lemma 4 leads to condition (a) (Stationarity) and Lemma 5 leads to condition (b) (Asymptotic Simultaneous Uniform Ergodicity) in Theorem 3.2 of Liang et al. (2016). Hence, we have the following weak law of large numbers.

**Theorem 3 (WLLN).** Suppose that the conditions of Lemma 5 hold. Let  $f$  be any measurable bounded function on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ . Then for samples  $(\theta_n, \varphi_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  drawn using the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm, we have that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) \rightarrow \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(d\theta, d\varphi), \quad \text{in probability.}$$

*Proof.* This follows by Theorem 3.2 in Liang et al. (2016)  $\square$

Given further conditions and combining Corollary 1 with Theorem 3 we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** Given the conditions in Corollary 1 hold for the cut distribution  $p_{cut}$  and conditions in Theorem 3 hold. Then given a measurable and bounded function  $f : \Theta \times \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $e > 0$ , a precision parameter  $\kappa$  and iteration number  $N$ , such that for samples  $(\theta_n, \varphi_n)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  drawn using the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \leq \varepsilon \right) > 1 - e.$$

More specifically, the bias

$$\left| \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right|$$

can be controlled by

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \left\| \nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10\kappa} \left( \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \right).$$

Corollary 2 shows that, although the convergence established by Theorem 3 is biased with respect to the true cut distribution  $P_{cut}$ , the bias can be geometrically reduced by selecting a large precision parameter  $\kappa$ .

## 4 Illustrative Examples

We demonstrate the proposed algorithm in this section. First, we use a simulation example to introduce a simple method for choosing the precision parameter  $\kappa$ , and demonstrate that the proposed algorithm can eliminate the feedback from a suspect module. We then examine a simulated case designed to highlight when existing algorithms will perform poorly. We finally apply our algorithm to an epidemiological example. The R package *SACut* and code to replicate these examples can be downloaded from <https://github.com/MathBilibili/Stochastic-approximation-cut-algorithm>.

### 4.1 Simulated Random Effects Example

In this example, we discuss a simple method for selecting the precision parameter  $\kappa$  and show that the proposed algorithm can effectively cut the feedback from a suspect module.

We consider a simple normal-normal random effect example previously discussed by Liu et al. (2009), with groups  $i = 1, \dots, 100 = N$ , observations  $Y_{ij} \sim N(\beta_i, \varphi_i^2)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 20$  in each group, and random effects distribution  $\beta_i \sim N(0, \theta^2)$ . Our aim is to estimate the random effects standard deviation  $\theta$  and the residual standard deviation  $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N)$ . By sufficiency, the likelihood can be equivalently represented in terms of the group-specific means  $\bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{20} \sum_{j=1}^{20} Y_{ij}$  and the sum of squared deviations  $s_i^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{20} (Y_{ij} - \bar{Y}_i)^2$  as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Y}_i &\sim N(\beta_i, \frac{\varphi_i^2}{20}), \\ s_i^2 &\sim \text{Gamma}\left(\frac{20-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2\varphi_i^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Given the sufficient statistics  $\bar{Y} = (\bar{Y}_1, \dots, \bar{Y}_N)$  and  $s^2 = (s_1^2, \dots, s_N^2)$ , the model consists of two modules: module 1 involving  $(s^2, \varphi)$  and module 2 involving  $(\bar{Y}, \beta, \varphi)$ , where  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)$ .

We consider the situation when an outlier group is observed, meaning that module 2 is misspecified, and compare the standard Bayesian posterior distribution with the cut distribution. Specifically, we simulate data from the model with  $\theta^2 = 2$ , and  $\varphi_i^2$  drawn from a  $\text{Unif}(0.5, 1.5)$  distribution ( $\varphi_1^2 = 1.60$ ), but we artificially set  $\beta_1 = 10$ , making the first group an outlier and thus our normal assumption for the random effects misspecified. Given priors  $p(\varphi_i^2) \propto (\varphi_i^2)^{-1}$  and  $p(\theta^2|\varphi^2) \propto (\theta^2 + \bar{\varphi}^2/20)^{-1}$ , Liu et al. (2009) showed the standard Bayesian marginal posterior distribution for the parameters of interest is:

$$\begin{aligned}p(\theta, \varphi|\bar{Y}, s^2) &= p(\theta|\bar{Y}, \varphi)p(\varphi|\bar{Y}, s^2) \\ &\propto \frac{1}{\theta^2 + \bar{\varphi}^2/20} \prod_{i=1}^{100} (\varphi_i^2)^{-\frac{21}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{s_i^2}{2\varphi_i^2}\right) \frac{1}{(\theta^2 + \varphi_i^2/20)^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\bar{Y}_i^2}{2(\theta^2 + \varphi_i^2/20)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since we are confident about our assumption of normality of  $Y_{ij}$  but not confident about our distributional assumption for the random effects  $\beta_i$ , following Liu et al. (2009), we consider the cut distribution in which we remove the influence of  $\bar{Y}$  on  $\varphi$ , so that possible misspecification of the first module does not affect  $\varphi$ :

$$p_{\text{cut}}(\theta, \varphi) := p(\theta|\bar{Y}, \varphi)p(\varphi|s^2),$$

where

$$p(\varphi|s^2) \propto \prod_{i=1}^{100} \varphi_i^{-21} \exp\left(-\frac{s_i^2}{2\varphi_i^2}\right).$$

To apply the proposed algorithm we first construct the auxiliary parameter set for the parameter  $\varphi$  by selecting 70 samples selected from posterior samples of  $p(\varphi|s^2)$  by the Max-Min procedure (Liang et al., 2016). We set the shrink magnitude  $n_0 = 1000$  and run only the auxiliary chain for  $10^4$  iterations before starting to store the auxiliary variable  $h_n$ , as suggested by Liang et al. (2016).

The precision parameter  $\kappa$  should be chosen large enough to obtain accurate results, whilst being small enough that computation is not prohibitively slow. To illustrate this, we compare results with  $\kappa = 10$ , which




Figure 5: Quantile-quantile plot for  $\theta$  drawn from (13) with precision parameter  $\kappa = 1, 2, 3, 4, 10$ . The x-axis of the quantile-quantile plot is the quantile of samples under different  $\kappa$ , the y-axis is the quantile of samples under the gold standard  $\kappa = 10$ .

we regard as the gold standard, to results with  $\kappa = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . Different values of  $\kappa$  affect the sampling of  $\theta$  only via (11), so we compare samples drawn from  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|\bar{Y}, \varphi)$ , averaged over the marginal cut distribution of  $\varphi$ :

$$p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|\bar{Y}, s^2) := \int p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|\bar{Y}, \varphi) p_{cut}(\varphi) d\varphi, \quad (13)$$

where the marginal cut distribution  $p_{cut}(\varphi)$  is

$$p_{cut}(\varphi) := \int p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi) d\theta = p(\varphi|s^2) \propto p(s^2|\varphi)p(\varphi).$$

We draw  $10^5$  samples from (13) for each value of  $\kappa$ , after running the proposed algorithm with few iterations ( $10^4$ ) as a preliminary trial. Figure 5 shows the quantile-quantile plot for 5 choices for  $\kappa$ . The fit appears good for all choices of  $\kappa$ , except in the tails, where  $\kappa = 3$  and  $\kappa = 4$  provide a closer match to the gold standard. Thus, we choose  $\kappa = 3$  as it gives a sufficiently accurate approximation.

We apply both the standard Bayesian approach and the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm ( $\kappa = 3$ ), each with 10 independent chains. All chains were run for  $10^5$  iterations and we retain only every  $100^{th}$  value, after discarding the first 10% of the samples. Pooling the 10 chains for the cut distribution gave estimates of  $\theta^2 = 2.54$  (95% Credible Interval 1.93 - 3.44) and  $\varphi_1^2 = 1.58$  (95% Credible Interval 0.88 - 3.18), whereas the standard Bayesian approach gave estimates of  $\theta^2 = 2.53$  (95% Credible Interval 1.93 - 3.44) and  $\varphi_1^2 = 1.69$  (95% Credible Interval 0.91 - 3.76). Figure 6 presents the medians for the parameter of interest  $\varphi_1^2$  under each of the 10 independent runs for the cut distribution and the standard Bayesian posterior. Recalling the true value for  $\varphi_1^2 = 1.60$ , it is clear that when using the Stochastic Approximation Cut algorithm the medians locate around its true value rather than deviating systematically towards one side. This indicates the proposed algorithm has successfully prevented the outlying observation from influencing the estimation of  $\varphi_1^2$ .

## 4.2 Simulated Strong Dependence Between $\theta$ and $\varphi$

In this section, we apply our algorithm in a simulated setting that illustrates when nested MCMC (Plummer, 2015) can perform poorly. Consider the case when the distribution of  $\theta$  is highly dependent on  $\varphi$ . In this case, if the distance between successive values  $\varphi'$  and  $\varphi$  is large in the external MCMC chain, the weight function may not be close to 1 and so the internal chain will typically require more iterations to reach convergence. This will be particularly problematic if the mixing time for the proposal distribution is large.






Figure 6: Box plot of median estimates for  $\varphi_1^2$  from each of 10 independent runs, under the cut distribution and the standard Bayesian posterior. The dashed line indicates the true value of  $\varphi_1^2$ .

To simulate this scenario, we consider a linear regression for outcomes  $Y_i, i = 1, \dots, 50$ , in which the 20 dimensional coefficient vector  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{20})$  is closely related to the coefficient  $\varphi$  for the covariate  $X_i = (X_{\theta,i}, X_{\varphi,i})$ . As well as observations of the outcome  $Y_i$  and the covariate  $X_i$ , we assume we have separate observations  $Z_j, j = 1, \dots, 100$  related to the coefficient  $\varphi$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i &\sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X_{\theta,i} + \varphi X_{\varphi,i}, 3), \quad i = 1, \dots, 50; \\ Z_j &\sim \mathcal{N}(\varphi, 1), \quad j = 1, \dots, 100; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Suppose that we wish to estimate  $\varphi$  solely on the basis of  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{100})$ , and so we cut the feedback from  $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{50})$  to  $\varphi$ .

We generate  $Y$  and  $Z$  according to (14), with  $\varphi = 1$  and  $\theta_p = \sin(p)$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, 20$ , and compare the results of Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm (SACut) and nested MCMC with internal chain length  $n_{int} = 1, 10, 200, 500, 1000, 1500$  and 2000. Notably, nested MCMC with  $n_{int} = 1$  is the WinBUGS algorithm. The proposal distribution for each element of  $\varphi$  is a normal distribution, centred at the previous value and with standard deviation 0.25; and the proposal distribution for  $\theta$  used in the nested MCMC is a normal distribution, centred at the previous value and with standard deviation  $10^{-5}$ . The prior for both parameters are not informative. We set the shrink magnitude  $n_0 = 2000$  and precision parameter  $\kappa_p = 4$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, 20$ . The SACut is processed in parallel on ten cores of Intel Xeon E7-8860 v3 CPU (2.2 GHz) and the (inherently serial) nested MCMC algorithm is processed on a single core. Both algorithms were independently run 10 times and the results are the averages across runs. Each run consists of  $5 \times 10^4$  iterations. We retain only every  $10^{th}$  value after discarding the first 40% samples as burn-in.

To assess the performance of these algorithms, we compare their estimation of  $\mathbb{E}(\theta)$ , the corresponding Gelman-Rubin diagnostic statistic  $\hat{R}$  (Gelman and Rubin, 1992) and the average time needed for the whole run. The precision of the estimation of  $\theta$  is measured by the mean square error (MSE) across its 20 components. The convergence is evaluated by averaging the Gelman-Rubin diagnostic statistic of 20 components. As shown in Table 1, the time required to run the nested MCMC algorithm increases as the length of the internal chain increases. The time needed to run SACut is more than the time needed to run the WinBUGS algorithm and nested MCMC algorithm when the length of internal chain is less than 1500, but both the bias and the Gelman-Rubin statistic are lower when using the SACut algorithm. In particular, the bias of the WinBUGS algorithm is large. While the difference between SACut and nested MCMC with

Algorithm	$n_{int}$	$MSE \times 10^3$	$\hat{R}$	Time (min)
SACut	-	1.44	1.01	1215
WinBUGS	1	16388.52	232.60	2
Nested MCMC	10	12479.49	24.90	11
	200	252.20	2.64	203
	500	11.25	1.32	494
	1000	1.81	1.25	961
	1500	1.75	1.23	1417
	2000	1.80	1.13	1905
Unbiased Coupling	-	1.41	-	1794

Table 1: Bias, Gelman-Rubin statistic  $\hat{R}$ , and clock time for the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm (SACut), WinBUGS algorithm, the nested MCMC algorithm and unbiased coupling algorithm, with varying internal chain length  $n_{int}$ . All values are means across 10 independent runs.

$n_{int} = 1000$  is small, the Gelman-Rubin statistic of the nested MCMC is still larger than the threshold 1.2 suggested by Brooks and Gelman (1998). When  $n_{int} = 1500$ , the MCMC chains produced by the nested MCMC converge even better and the bias is even smaller, but the SACut algorithm still outperforms it according to both metrics, and takes less time. When  $n_{int} = 2000$ , the chains converge well with a much smaller Gelman-Rubin statistic, but the nested MCMC takes significantly more time.

Jacob et al. (2020) recently proposed an unbiased coupling algorithm which can sample from the cut distribution. This algorithm requires running coupled Markov chains where samples from each chain marginally target the same true distribution. The estimator is completely unbiased when two chains meet. Drawing samples from the cut distribution using the unbiased coupling algorithm typically involves two stages. In general the first stage involves running coupled chains for  $\varphi$  until they meet. For each sampled  $\varphi$ , the second stage involves running another set of coupled chains for  $\theta$  until they meet. Although the algorithm is unbiased, as illustrated in Section 4.2, 4.3 and the discussion of Jacob et al. (2020), the number of iterations for coupled chains is determined by meeting times, which can be very large especially when the dimension of the parameter is high. As a comparison, we apply the unbiased coupled algorithm on this example by using the R package “unbiasedmcmc” provided by Jacob et al. (2020). To simplify the implementation and computation of the unbiased coupling algorithm, we consider a simplified scenario with an informative conjugate prior for  $\varphi$ , meaning we can omit the first stage and instead directly draw  $5 \times 10^4$  samples from  $p(\varphi|Z)$ . This prior is normal with mean equal to the true value of  $\varphi$ . We then ran preliminary coupled chains for  $\theta$  that target  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  given these samples of  $\varphi$  so as to sample the meeting times. Over the  $5 \times 10^4$  independent runs, although the majority of meeting times are relatively small, their 95% and 99% quantile were 3448 and 5434 respectively. To ensure that the total number of iterations covers the majority of meeting times, following Jacob et al. (2020), we set the minimum number of iterations for each coupled chain to 10 times the 95% quantile of meeting times. The algorithm was processed in parallel on the same ten cores as SACut and final result is shown in Table 1. The unbiased coupling algorithm achieves similar MSE to the SACut algorithm, but it takes considerably more computation time than SACut, even though it has been conducted under a simplified setting (i.e., no coupled chain for  $\varphi$ ).

### 4.3 Epidemiological Example

We now consider an epidemiological study of the relation between high risk human papillomaviru (HPV) prevalence and cervical cancer incidence (Maucourt-Boulch et al., 2008), which was previously discussed by Plummer (2015). In this study, age-stratified HPV prevalence data and cancer incidence data were collected from 13 cities. The model is divided into two modules. The first module concerns the number of people with HPV infection in city  $i$ , denoted as  $Z_i$ , out of a sample of  $N_i$  women:

$$Z_i \sim \text{Bin}(N_i, \varphi_i).$$




Figure 7: Comparison of the distribution of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  drawn from the cut distribution (red) and standard Bayesian posterior (blue).

The second module describes the relation between the number of cancer cases  $Y_i$  from  $T_i$  person-years and incidence which is assumed to be linked with  $\varphi_i$  by a log linear relationship:

$$Y_i \sim \text{Poisson}(T_i (\exp(\theta_1 + \theta_2 \varphi_i))).$$

The log-linear dose-response relationship is speculative, so we apply the cut algorithm to prevent the feedback from the second module to the estimation of  $\varphi_i$  (Plummer, 2015).

We apply the Stochastic Approximation Cut Algorithm and compare results with the standard Bayesian approach (i.e. without a cut). Both algorithms were run 10 times independently, each with  $1.4 \times 10^5$  iterations. We set the shrink magnitude  $n_0 = 20000$  and precision parameter  $\kappa_1 = 3$  for  $\theta_1$  and  $\kappa_2 = 2$  for  $\theta_2$ . We retain only every 100<sup>th</sup> value after discarding the first  $4 \times 10^4$  samples as burn-in. The pooled results of  $\theta$  are shown in Figure 7, highlighting the considerable effect of cutting feedback in this example.

## 5 Conclusion

We have proposed a new algorithm for approximating the cut distribution that improves on the WinBUGS algorithm and approximate approaches in Plummer (2015). Our approach approximates the intractable marginal likelihood  $p(Y|\varphi)$  using Stochastic Approximation Monte Carlo (Liang et al., 2007). The algorithm avoids the weakness of approximate approaches that insert an “internal limit” into each iteration of the main Markov chain. Obviously, one can argue that approximate approaches can be revised by setting the length of the internal chain to the number of iterations, i.e.  $n_{int} = n$  so that the internal length diverges with  $n$ . However, since the sampling at each iteration is still not perfect and bias is inevitably introduced, the convergence of the main Markov chain remains unclear and the potential limit is not known. We proved convergence of the samples drawn by our algorithm and present the exact limit. Although the bias is not completely removed by our algorithm, the degree of the bias is explicit in the sense that the shape of

$p^\kappa(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is known since the shape of  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is normally obtainable given a fixed  $\varphi$ . Corollary 2 shows that the bias in our approach can be reduced by increasing the precision parameter  $\kappa$ . We proposed that  $\kappa$  be selected by comparing results across a range of choices; quantitative selection of this precision parameter still needs further study.

Existing approximate approaches (Plummer, 2015) which need an infinitely long internal chain may be computationally slow, because the internal chain requires sequential calculation so parallelization is not possible. In contrast, thanks to the embarrassingly parallel calculation of (5), our algorithm can be more computationally efficient when multiple computer cores are available, although the per-iteration time of our algorithm decays as the Markov chain runs due to the increasing size of collection of auxiliary variables.

Lastly, while the adaptive exchange algorithm (Liang et al., 2016) is used for intractable normalizing problems when the normalizing function is an integral with respect to the observed data, it would be interesting to investigate the use of our algorithm for other problems involving a normalizing function that is an integral with respect to the unknown parameter. For example, our algorithm can be directly extended to sample from the recently developed Semi-Modular Inference distribution (Carmona and Nicholls, 2020) which generalizes the cut distribution.

## Supplementary Materials

The supplementary appendix contains all technical proofs of results stated in the paper.

## Acknowledgement

The authors thank Daniela De Angelis and Simon R. White for helpful discussions and suggestions. Yang Liu was supported by a Cambridge International Scholarship from the Cambridge Commonwealth, European and International Trust. Robert J.B. Goudie was funded by the UK Medical Research Council [programme code MC\_UU\_00002/2] and was supported by the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-20014). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

## References

- Atchadé, Y., Fort, G., Moulines, E., and Priouret, P. (2011). Adaptive Markov Chain Monte Carlo: Theory and Methods. In Barber, D., Cemgil, A. T., and Chiappa, S., editors, *Bayesian Time Series Models*, pages 32–51. Cambridge University Press.
- Bhattacharya, A., Pati, D., Yang, Y., et al. (2019). Bayesian Fractional Posteriors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(1):39–66.
- Blangiardo, M., Hansell, A., and Richardson, S. (2011). A Bayesian Model of Time Activity Data to Investigate Health Effect of Air Pollution in Time Series Studies. *Atmospheric Environment*, 45(2):379 – 386.
- Brooks, S. P. and Gelman, A. (1998). General Methods for Monitoring Convergence of Iterative Simulations. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 7(4):434–455.
- Carmona, C. U. and Nicholls, G. K. (2020). Semi-Modular Inference: Enhanced Learning in Multi-Modular Models by Tempering the Influence of Components. *arXiv e-prints*.
- Fu, J. C. and Wang, L. (2002). A Random-Discretization Based Monte Carlo Sampling Method and its Applications. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 4(1):5–25.
- Gelman, A. and Rubin, D. B. (1992). Inference from Iterative Simulation Using Multiple Sequences. *Statistical Science*, 7(4):457–472.
- Gottardo, R. and Raftery, A. E. (2008). Markov Chain Monte Carlo with Mixtures of Mutually Singular Distributions. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 17(4):949–975.

- Haario, H., Saksman, E., and Tamminen, J. (2001). An Adaptive Metropolis Algorithm. *Bernoulli*, 7(2):223–242.
- Huang, B., Wu, B., and Barry, M. (2010). Geographically and Temporally Weighted Regression for Modeling Spatio-Temporal Variation in House Prices. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 24(3):383–401.
- Jacob, P. E., Murray, L. M., Holmes, C. C., and Robert, C. P. (2017). Better Together? Statistical Learning in Models Made of Modules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.08719*.
- Jacob, P. E., O’Leary, J., and Atchadé, Y. F. (2020). Unbiased Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods with Couplings. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*.
- Liang, F. (2002). Dynamically Weighted Importance Sampling in Monte Carlo Computation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97(459):807–821.
- Liang, F. (2010). A Double Metropolis–Hastings Sampler for Spatial Models with Intractable Normalizing Constants. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 80(9):1007–1022.
- Liang, F., Jin, I. H., Song, Q., and Liu, J. S. (2016). An Adaptive Exchange Algorithm for Sampling from Distributions with Intractable Normalizing Constants. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(513):377–393.
- Liang, F., Liu, C., and Carroll, R. J. (2007). Stochastic Approximation in Monte Carlo Computation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):305–320.
- Liu, F., Bayarri, M., Berger, J., et al. (2009). Modularization in Bayesian Analysis, with Emphasis on Analysis of Computer Models. *Bayesian Analysis*, 4(1):119–150.
- Liu, Y., Lam, K.-F., Wu, J. T., and Lam, T. T.-Y. (2018). Geographically Weighted Temporally Correlated Logistic Regression Model. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1):1417.
- Lunn, D., Best, N., Spiegelhalter, D., Graham, G., and Neuenschwander, B. (2009a). Combining MCMC with ‘Sequential’ PKPD Modelling. *Journal of Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics*, 36(1):19.
- Lunn, D., Spiegelhalter, D., Thomas, A., and Best, N. (2009b). The BUGS Project: Evolution, Critique and Future Directions. *Statistics in Medicine*, 28(25):3049–3067.
- Malefaki, S. and Iliopoulos, G. (2009). Simulation from a Target Distribution Based on Discretization and Weighting. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 38(4):829–845.
- Maucort-Boulch, D., Franceschi, S., and Plummer, M. (2008). International Correlation between Human Papillomavirus Prevalence and Cervical Cancer Incidence. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention*, 17(3):717–720.
- McCandless, L. C., Douglas, I. J., Evans, S. J., and Smeeth, L. (2010). Cutting Feedback in Bayesian Regression Adjustment for the Propensity Score. *The International Journal of Biostatistics*, 6(2):16.
- Meyn, S., Tweedie, R. L., and Glynn, P. W. (2009). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.
- Meyn, S. P. and Tweedie, R. L. (1994). Computable Bounds for Geometric Convergence Rates of Markov Chains. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 4(4):981–1011.
- Miller, J. W. and Dunson, D. B. (2019). Robust Bayesian Inference via Coarsening. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114(527):1113–1125.
- Møller, J., Pettitt, A. N., Reeves, R., and Berthelsen, K. K. (2006). An Efficient Markov Chain Monte Carlo Method for Distributions with Intractable Normalising Constants. *Biometrika*, 93(2):451–458.
- Murray, I., Ghahramani, Z., and MacKay, D. J. C. (2006). MCMC for Doubly-Intractable Distributions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, UAI’06, pages 359–366, Arlington, Virginia, United States. AUAI Press.
- Nakaya, T., Fotheringham, A. S., Brunsdon, C., and Charlton, M. (2005). Geographically Weighted Poisson Regression for Disease Association Mapping. *Statistics in Medicine*, 24(17):2695–2717.
- Park, J. and Haran, M. (2018). Bayesian Inference in the Presence of Intractable Normalizing Functions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1372–1390.

- Plummer, M. (2015). Cuts in Bayesian Graphical Models. *Statistics and Computing*, 25(1):37–43.
- Roberts, G. O. and Tweedie, R. L. (1996). Geometric Convergence and Central Limit Theorems for Multidimensional Hastings and Metropolis Algorithms. *Biometrika*, 83(1):95–110.
- Walker, S. G. (2013). Bayesian Inference with Misspecified Models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143(10):1621 – 1633.
- Zigler, C. M. (2016). The Central Role of Bayes’ Theorem for Joint Estimation of Causal Effects and Propensity Scores. *The American Statistician*, 70(1):47–54.

# Appendices

## A Proofs of the Main Text

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be the set of all rational numbers in  $\mathbb{R}$  and hence  $\mathbb{Q}^c$  is the set of all irrational numbers in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{Q}^{cd} \cap \Psi$  and it is easy to see that  $\mu(\mathcal{E}) = \mu(\Psi)$  since  $\mu(\mathbb{Q}) = 0$ . We first show that,  $\forall \kappa < \infty$  and  $\forall \psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , we have  $\psi \notin \bar{\Psi}_\kappa$ .

Given a  $\kappa < \infty$ , every element of set  $\mathcal{R}_\kappa(\Psi)$  is a  $d$ -dimensional rational vector. We also have that  $5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}$  is a rational number. Therefore, at least one element of  $d$ -dimensional vector  $\psi$  is a rational number if  $\psi \in \bigcup_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_r\|_\infty = 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}\}$ . Now  $\forall \psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , because  $\psi$  is a  $d$ -dimensional irrational vector,  $\psi \notin \bigcup_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_r\|_\infty = 5 \times 10^{-\kappa-1}\}$ , and hence  $\psi \notin \bar{\Psi}_\kappa$ .

Now given a fixed  $\kappa < \infty$ ,  $\forall \psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , since  $\psi \notin \bar{\Psi}_\kappa$ ,  $\psi$  is always in the inner set of one of  $\Psi_r$ ,  $r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . Re-write this  $\Psi_r$  as  $\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}$ . Since the set  $\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}$  is compact and function  $f$  is continuous, we have  $f_{\psi, \min} = \min_{y \in \Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}} f(y)$  and  $f_{\psi, \max} = \max_{y \in \Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}} f(y)$ . By the first mean value theorem, there is a  $\psi^* \in \Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}$  with  $f_{\psi, \min} \leq f(\psi^*) \leq f_{\psi, \max}$ , such that

$$\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) = \frac{1}{\mu(\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)})} \int_{\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}} f(y) dy = f(\psi^*) \frac{1}{\mu(\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)})} \int_{\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}} dy = f(\psi^*).$$

It is clear that, when  $\kappa$  increases,  $\mu(\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)})$  monotonically decreases since  $\Psi_\psi^{(\kappa+1)} \subset \Psi_\psi^{(\kappa)}$  (i.e. a much smaller hypercube is formed). This leads to the fact that  $(f_{\psi, \max} - f_{\psi, \min})$  monotonically decreases to 0. Hence, there is a  $N$  such that  $\forall \kappa > N$ ,  $(f_{\psi, \max} - f_{\psi, \min}) \leq \varepsilon$ . Then we have  $\forall \kappa > N$ ,

$$|\mathcal{R}_\kappa^*(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| = |f(\psi^*) - f(\psi)| \leq (f_{\psi, \max} - f_{\psi, \min}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} f, \quad \text{as } \kappa \rightarrow \infty.$$

### A.2 Proof of Corollary 1

Following the result of Theorem 1, for a given  $\psi \in \mathcal{E}$ , we have

$$|\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq (f_{\psi, \max} - f_{\psi, \min}).$$

Since  $f$  has a continuous gradient on a compact set, then by the mean value theorem we have:

$$(f_{\psi, \max} - f_{\psi, \min}) = |\langle \nabla f(y), (\psi_{\max} - \psi_{\min}) \rangle|.$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  means inner product,  $f(\psi_{max}) = f_{\psi, max}$ ,  $f(\psi_{min}) = f_{\psi, min}$ ,  $y \in \Psi_{\psi}^{(\kappa)}$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$|\langle \nabla f(y), (\psi_{max} - \psi_{min}) \rangle| \leq \|\nabla f(y)\|_2 \times \|\psi_{max} - \psi_{min}\|_2$$

Now we prove the local convergence result. Since  $\nabla f$  is continuous on the  $d$ -dimensional compact set  $\Psi$ , we can write

$$\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) = \sup_{a, b \in \Psi_{\psi}^{(\kappa)}} \|\nabla f(a) - \nabla f(b)\|_2.$$

Since  $\mu(\Psi_{\psi}^{(\kappa)}) \rightarrow 0$ , it is easy to check that  $\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, we have both  $\psi_{max}$  and  $\psi_{min}$  are in set  $\Psi_{\psi}^{(\kappa)}$ , and we have

$$\sup_{a, b \in \Psi_{\psi}^{(\kappa)}} \|a - b\|_2 = \sqrt{d10^{-2\kappa}}.$$

Then by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(y)\|_2 \times \|\psi_{max} - \psi_{min}\|_2 &\leq (\|\nabla f(y) - \nabla f(\psi)\|_2 + \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2) \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa} \\ &\leq (\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) + \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2) \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$|\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq (\varepsilon(\psi, \kappa) + \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2) \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}.$$

Now we prove the global convergence result. Since  $\nabla f$  is continuous on compact set  $\Psi$ , then  $\|\nabla f\|_2$  is bounded. We have

$$\|\nabla f(y)\|_2 \times \|\psi_{max} - \psi_{min}\|_2 \leq \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}.$$

Note that, this means that  $|\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)|$  is uniformly bounded. Hence, it implies

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{E}} |\mathcal{S}_\kappa(f)(\psi) - f(\psi)| \leq \sup_{\psi \in \Psi} \|\nabla f(\psi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^\kappa}.$$

### A.3 Proof of Lemma 1

We write the explicit form of  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ :

$$p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) = \mathcal{S}_\kappa(p(\cdot|Y, \varphi))(\theta) = \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta^*|Y, \varphi) d\theta^* \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \in \Theta_r\}},$$

then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} \left( W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta^*|Y, \varphi) d\theta^* \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \in \Theta_r\}} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi \in \Phi} \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} \left| W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta^*|Y, \varphi) d\theta^* \right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta \in \Theta_r\}} \\ &= \sup_{\varphi \in \Phi; 1 \leq r \leq R_\kappa} \frac{1}{\mu(\Theta_r)} \left| W_n(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta^*|Y, \varphi) d\theta^* \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (10) from the main text, it is clear that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| = 0.$$

Since  $\mu(\bar{\Theta}_\kappa) = 0$ , we are done.

#### A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

The theorem naturally holds when  $n = 1$ , we consider the case when  $n \geq 2$ . Since the dimension  $d$  and precision parameter  $\kappa$  are known and fixed, we suppose that the parameter space  $\Theta$  is equally partitioned and the total number of  $d$ -orthotopes is  $R_\kappa$  and each orthotope is indexed as  $\Theta_r, r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . Since we suppose that the auxiliary chain has converged before we start collecting auxiliary variable  $\tilde{\theta}$ , by (6) in the main text, we could write the probability of the original proposal distribution  $P_n^*$  taking a value in each partition component  $\Theta_r$  as the integral with respect to the target distribution  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$ :

$$W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) = \int_{\Theta_r} p(\theta|Y, \varphi) d\theta, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa.$$

Now we define binary random variables  $I_r, r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$  as:

$$I_r = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if orthotope } r \text{ is never visited by auxiliary variables } \tilde{\theta}_i, i = 1, \dots, n; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

We then have the expected number of orthotope visited is

$$\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)}|) = \mathbb{E}\left(R_\kappa - \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} I_r\right) = R_\kappa - \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} (1 - W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi))^n.$$

By the method of the Lagrange multipliers, we write the Lagrange function as:

$$\mathcal{L}(W_\infty(\Theta_1|Y, \varphi), \dots, W_\infty(\Theta_{R_\kappa}|Y, \varphi), \lambda) = R_\kappa - \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} (1 - W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi))^n + \lambda \left( \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - 1 \right).$$

Conduct first order partial derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi)} &= -n(1 - W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi))^{n-1} + \lambda = 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa; \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} &= \sum_{r=1}^{R_\kappa} W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) - 1 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

These equations hold when  $W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) = 1/R_\kappa, r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . We now consider the second order derivatives, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial^2 W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi)} &= -n(n-1)(1 - W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi))^{n-2}, \quad r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa; \\ \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) \partial W_\infty(\Theta_t|Y, \varphi)} &= 0, \quad r \neq t. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the Hessian matrix is negative definite,  $\mathbb{E}(|\tilde{\Theta}_n^{(\kappa)}|)$  achieves its maxima when  $W_\infty(\Theta_r|Y, \varphi) = 1/R_\kappa, r = 1, \dots, R_\kappa$ . If we additionally require this to be held for any precision parameter  $\kappa$ , the target distribution  $p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  has to be uniform distribution.



### A.5 Proof of Lemma 2

Given a  $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , for any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_\Theta \times \mathcal{B}_\Phi \subset \Theta \times \Phi$ , define a signed measure  $D_n$  on  $\Theta \times \Phi$  as

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) &= \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) - \mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi} \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Theta} \left( \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') q(\varphi' | \varphi) - \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') q(\varphi' | \varphi) \right) d\theta' d\varphi' \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi} \left( \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Theta} \left( p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') \right) d\theta' \right) \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi) q(\varphi' | \varphi) d\varphi'. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $p(\varphi | Z)$  and  $q(\varphi' | \varphi)$  are continuous on a compact set, then  $\alpha(\varphi' | \varphi)$  and  $q(\varphi' | \varphi)$  are bounded. Let  $C = \sup_{\varphi' \in \Phi, \varphi \in \Phi} \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi) q(\varphi' | \varphi)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D_n(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi))| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi} \left( \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa} \left( p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') \right) d\theta' \right) \alpha(\varphi' | \varphi) q(\varphi' | \varphi) d\varphi' \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Phi} \sup_{\varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa} \left( p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi^*) \right) d\theta' \right| C d\varphi' \\ &\leq \mu(\Phi) C \int_{\mathcal{B}_\Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa} \sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right| d\theta' \\ &\leq \mu(\Phi) \mu(\Theta) C \sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The important fact here is that  $|D_n(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi))|$  can be uniformly (with respect to  $\theta, \varphi$  and Borel set  $\mathcal{B}$ ) bounded by

$$\sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right|$$

up to a constant.

Given Lemma 1, we have that the density  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  converges almost surely to  $p^{(\kappa)}$  and this convergence is uniformly on  $\Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa \times \Phi$ , and so we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_n(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV} = 0.$$

Now by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \left\| \mathbf{T}_{n+1}^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_{n+1}) - \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \right\|_{TV} \\ &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_{n+1}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_n(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \left\| \mathbf{T}_{n+1}^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_{n+1}) - \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \right\|_{TV} = 0.$$

### A.6 Proof of Lemma 3

Define a function  $g : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$g(\varphi) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi).$$

Since the support of  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  is  $\Theta$ , we have  $g(\varphi) > 0$ , for all  $\varphi \in \Phi$ . In addition, since each element of  $\mathcal{W}_n(\varphi)$  is a continuous function on the compact set  $\Phi$  (see (5) and (9) in the main text), then  $g(\varphi)$  is also a continuous function on  $\Phi$ . Since  $\Phi$  is compact,  $g(\varphi)$  reaches its minima

$$\varepsilon = \min_{\varphi \in \Phi} g(\varphi).$$

Thus  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) > \varepsilon$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  and  $\varphi \in \Phi$ , and local positivity holds.

By the same reasoning, it is also true for the proposal distribution with density  $p^{(\kappa)}$ .

## A.7 Necessary definitions

**Definition 3.** Given any function  $V : \Psi \rightarrow [1, \infty)$  and any signed measure  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $\Psi$ , define the  $V$ -norm as

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_V = \sup_{|g| \leq V} \left| \int_{\Psi} g(\psi) \mathcal{M}(d\psi) \right|.$$

**Definition 4.** For simplicity, for any function  $f : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any measure  $\mathcal{M}$  on  $\Psi$ , write

$$\mathcal{M}f := \int_{\Psi} f(\psi) \mathcal{M}(d\psi).$$

**Definition 5.** Given any two measures  $\mathbf{M}_{(x)}(dz) := \mathbf{M}(dz|x)$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ , and  $\mathbf{N}_{(y)}(dx) := \mathbf{N}(dx|y)$  which concentrates on  $\mathbb{X}$ , for any Borel set  $\mathcal{B}$ , we write

$$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{N}_{(y)}(\mathcal{B}) := \int_{\mathcal{B}} \int_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbf{M}_{(x)}(dz) \mathbf{N}_{(y)}(dx).$$

The definition can be extended to cases with more than two measures in a natural way.

## A.8 Proof of Lemma 4

Given the filtration  $\mathcal{G}_n$ , the transition kernel  $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}$  both admit an irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain by assumption. Therefore, to prove that transition kernel  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}$  also holds same property, it suffices to prove that for any  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , and Borel set  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_{\Theta} \times \mathcal{B}_{\Phi} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$  such that  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ , we have  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ . We prove this by mathematical induction.

Consider first when  $s = 1$ . We write  $\alpha(\varphi'|\varphi) = \min(1, \beta(\varphi'|\varphi))$  where

$$\beta(\varphi'|\varphi) = \frac{p(\varphi'|Z)q(\varphi|\varphi')}{p(\varphi|Z)q(\varphi'|\varphi)},$$

and  $\alpha_n((\theta', \varphi')|(\theta, \varphi)) = \min(1, \beta_n((\theta', \varphi')|(\theta, \varphi)))$ , where

$$\beta_n((\theta', \varphi')|(\theta, \varphi)) = \frac{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta'|Y, \varphi')p(\varphi|Z)q(\varphi|\varphi')p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)}{p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi)p(\varphi|Z)q(\varphi'|\varphi)p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta'|Y, \varphi')},$$

and

$$r((\theta', \varphi'), (\theta, \varphi)) = \frac{\beta(\varphi'|\varphi)}{\beta_n((\theta', \varphi')|(\theta, \varphi))},$$

noting that both  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  and  $p^{(k)}$  are bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$ . Now we denote

$$r^* = \min_{(\theta', \varphi'), (\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi} r((\theta', \varphi'), (\theta, \varphi)),$$

and it is easy to see that  $r^* > 0$ .

Now given any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_\Theta \times \mathcal{B}_\Phi \subset \Theta \times \Phi$  and initial value  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta_0, \varphi_0), \mathcal{G}_n) \\
&= \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} \setminus \{(\theta_0, \varphi_0)\} | (\theta_0, \varphi_0), \mathcal{G}_n) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{B}} \alpha(\varphi | \varphi_0) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi) q(\varphi | \varphi_0) d\theta d\varphi \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{B}} \min\{1, r((\theta, \varphi), (\theta_0, \varphi_0)) \beta_n((\theta, \varphi) | (\theta_0, \varphi_0))\} p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi) q(\varphi | \varphi_0) d\theta d\varphi \\
&\geq \int_{\mathcal{B}} \min\{1, r((\theta, \varphi), (\theta_0, \varphi_0))\} \min\{1, \beta_n((\theta, \varphi) | (\theta_0, \varphi_0))\} p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi) q(\varphi | \varphi_0) d\theta d\varphi \\
&\geq \min\{1, r^*\} \int_{\mathcal{B}} \alpha_n((\theta, \varphi) | (\theta_0, \varphi_0)) p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi) q(\varphi | \varphi_0) d\theta d\varphi
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\min\{1, r^*\} > 0$ , we have

$$\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta_0, \varphi_0), \mathcal{G}_n) > 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta_0, \varphi_0), \mathcal{G}_n) > 0.$$

Thus, the induction assumption holds when  $s = 1$ .

Now assume that the induction assumption holds up to step  $s = s^*$ , i.e.

$$\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{T}_n^{(s^*)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0.$$

We need to show that it also holds at step  $s = s^* + 1$ . For an initial value  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0)$ , consider a Borel set  $\mathcal{B}$  such that  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*+1)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ . We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{(s^*+1)}(\mathcal{B}) = \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \mathbf{T}_n^{(s^*)}(d\theta, d\varphi) = 0.$$

This implies that the function  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | \cdot, \mathcal{G}_n) = 0$  almost surely with respect to the measure  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(s^*)}$ . Because the induction assumption holds at step  $s^*$ , which means that any  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*)}$ -measurable set of positive measure is a subset of a  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(s^*)}$ -measurable set of positive measure, we have that the function  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | \cdot, \mathcal{G}_n) = 0$  almost surely with respect to the measure  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*)}$ . This further implies that the function  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | \cdot, \mathcal{G}_n) = 0$  almost surely with respect to the measure  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*)}$ . It is clear that this contradicts the fact that  $\mathbf{V}_n^{(s^*+1)}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ . Hence, we are done.

Given that  $q(\varphi' | \varphi)$  and  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi')$  satisfy the local positivity by Lemma 3, it is easy to check that

$$q((\theta', \varphi') | (\theta, \varphi)) = p^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') q(\varphi' | \varphi)$$

also satisfies local positivity. Hence, by Theorem 2.2 of Roberts and Tweedie (1996), since the target distribution is bounded away from 0 and  $\infty$  on a compact set and the proposal distribution satisfies local positivity, the Partial Gibbs chain is irreducible and aperiodic, and every nonempty compact set is small. Moreover,  $\Theta \times \Phi$  is a small set for the transition kernel  $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))$ , since it is compact. Hence, it is straightforward to verify that, for any  $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi$  and Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) \geq \delta \mu(\mathcal{B}).$$

Since

$$q_n((\theta', \varphi') | (\theta, \varphi)) = p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta' | Y, \varphi') q(\varphi' | \varphi)$$

also satisfies local positivity, following the proof of Theorem 2.2 in Roberts and Tweedie (1996)<sup>2</sup>, one can show that,  $\Theta \times \Phi$  is also a small set for the transition kernel  $\mathbf{t}_n^{(1)}$ . Let the “geometric drift function”

<sup>2</sup>The difference is that there is an additional term, the ratio of  $p_n^{(\kappa)}$  to  $p^{(\kappa)}$ , in our case. Since they are positive and bounded functions defined on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ , this ratio has a positive minimum on  $\Theta \times \Phi$ . Hence, the inequality in the original proof still holds.

$V(\theta, \varphi) \equiv 1$ , there exists  $\lambda < 1$  and  $b < \infty$  such that

$$1 = \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} V(\theta^*, \varphi^*) \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}((d\theta^*, d\varphi^*) | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \leq \lambda V(\theta, \varphi) + b \mathbb{1}_{\{(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi\}}$$

then by Theorem 3.1 of Roberts and Tweedie (1996), for all  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , there exists a probability measure  $\Pi_n$  on  $\Theta \times \Phi$  and constant  $\rho < 1$  and  $R < \infty$  such that for all  $s = 1, 2, \dots$  and all  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ ,

$$\left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} - \Pi_n \right\|_V \leq R V(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \rho^s.$$

Since  $V = 1$ , we have uniformly geometric convergence:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi} \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} - \Pi_n \right\|_V = 0$$

In addition, for any  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ ,

$$0 \leq \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - \Pi_n(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} \leq \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} - \Pi_n \right\|_V,$$

by the squeeze theorem, we have:

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi} \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - \Pi_n(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} = 0.$$

**Remark 2.** Following the fact that, for any  $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi$  and Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) \geq \delta \mu(\mathcal{B}).$$

following the proof of Lemma 2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) &= \mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) - \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) + \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| \mathbf{U}^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi)) - \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \right| + \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \\ &\leq C \mu(\mathcal{B}) \sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right| + \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n). \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a constant. Therefore, for any  $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi$  and Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$ , we have

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \geq \left( \delta - C \sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right| \right) \mu(\mathcal{B}).$$

Note that, by Lemma 1, for any outcome  $\omega$  in probability space  $\Omega$ , we have

$$\sup_{\theta^* \in \Theta \setminus \bar{\Theta}_\kappa, \varphi^* \in \Phi} \left| p^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) - p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta^* | Y, \varphi^*) \right| \rightarrow 0, \text{ when } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This is important. Since for any positive constant  $a < \delta$ , there exists a  $N$  such that for all  $n > N$ , we have

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \geq (\delta - a) \mu(\mathcal{B}).$$

Hence, a common and same lower bound is well defined on this outcome  $\omega$ .

## A.9 Proof of Lemma 5

For any initial value  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0)$  and  $s > 1$  and function  $f : \Theta \times \Phi \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ , write

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)} f = \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)} f + \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f.$$

We first concentrate on the second term  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f$ , for any  $1 \leq s_0 < s$ , denote  $\mathbf{U}^{(0)} = 1$  and  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(0)} = 1$ , we have, by a telescoping argument,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f \right| \\ & \leq \left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0)} f \right| + \left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s_0)} f \right| + \left| \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s_0)} f \right| \\ & = \left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0)} f \right| + \left| \sum_{k=0}^{s_0-1} \left( \mathbf{U}^{(k)} \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0-k)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(k+1)} \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0-k-1)} f \right) \right| + \left| \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s_0)} f \right| \\ & = \left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0)} f \right| + \left| \sum_{k=0}^{s_0-1} \mathbf{U}^{(k)} \left( \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)} - \mathbf{U}^{(1)} \right) \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0-k-1)} f \right| + \left| \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s_0)} f \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that,  $\left( \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)} - \mathbf{U}^{(1)} \right)$  is the signed measure  $D_n$  defined in the proof of Lemma 2. By the result of Lemma 2, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_n(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0,$$

on the probability space  $\Omega$ . Then by Egorov's theorem, for any  $e > 0$ , there exists a set  $E_1 \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(E_1) > 1 - \frac{e}{2}$  such that  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_n(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV}$  uniformly converges to 0 on  $E_1$ . Hence, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $N_1(\epsilon)$ , such that for all  $n > N_1(\epsilon)$ ,  $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, \varphi \in \Phi} \|D_n(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi))\|_{TV} \leq \epsilon$  on  $E_1$ . Then, since the remaining terms are bounded by 1, there exist a constant  $C$  such that

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^{s_0-1} \mathbf{U}^{(k)} \left( \mathbf{T}_n^{(1)} - \mathbf{U}^{(1)} \right) \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0-k-1)} f \right| \leq C s_0 \epsilon.$$

Now, following the same reasoning as Lemma 4 and Theorem 3.1 of Roberts and Tweedie (1996),  $\mathbf{U}^{(s)}$  uniformly converges to  $P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}$  in the sense of  $V$ -norm ( $V \equiv 1$ ). Hence, for the same  $\epsilon$ , there exists a  $S_1(\epsilon)$  such that for any  $s > s_0 > S_1(\epsilon)$ ,

$$\left| \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - \mathbf{U}^{(s_0)} f \right| \leq \epsilon, \quad \left| \mathbf{U}^{(s)} f - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)} f \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

By Lemma 1, we have that  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi)$  converges to  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi)$  almost surely on probability space  $\Omega$ . Then by Egorov's theorem, for same  $e$ , there exists a set  $E_2 \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(E_2) > 1 - \frac{e}{2}$  such that  $p_n^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi)$  uniformly converges to  $p^{(\kappa)}(\theta | Y, \varphi)$  on  $E_2$ . Hence on  $E_2$ , by the Remark of the proof of Lemma 4, for any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$  and  $(\theta, \varphi) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , there exists a  $N_2$  such that for all  $n > N_2$ ,

$$\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\mathcal{B} | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \mu(\mathcal{B}).$$

By Theorem 2.3 of Meyn and Tweedie (1994), we have all  $\mathbf{T}_n^{(1)}(\cdot | (\theta, \varphi), \mathcal{G}_n)$ , when  $n > N_2$ , are uniformly ergodic in  $V$ -norm and have the same geometric convergence rate. Hence on  $E_2$ , there exists a  $S_2(\epsilon)$ , such that for all  $s > s_0 > S_2(\epsilon)$  and  $n > N_2$ ,

$$\left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - \mathbf{T}_n^{(s_0)} f \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Let  $N(\epsilon) = \max(N_1(\epsilon), N_2)$  and  $S(\epsilon) = \max(S_1(\epsilon), S_2(\epsilon))$ . On set  $E_2$ , all convergences which involve  $S_1(\epsilon)$  and  $S_2(\epsilon)$  have geometric convergence rate. Thus, one can select a  $S(\epsilon)$  such that  $\epsilon S(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Let  $\varepsilon = (CS(\epsilon) + 3)\epsilon$  and set  $E = E_1 \cap E_2$  with  $\mathbb{P}(E) > 1 - e$ . It is clear that  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . We can conclude that, on set  $E$ , there exists  $N(\epsilon)$  and  $S(\epsilon)$  such that for any  $n > N(\epsilon)$  and  $s > S(\epsilon)$ ,

$$\left| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)} f - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)} f \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Note that, for any Borel set  $\mathcal{B} \subset \Theta \times \Phi$ , we can let function  $f$  be an indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{\{x \in \mathcal{B}\}}$ . Hence, for any initial value  $(\theta_0, \varphi_0) \in \Theta \times \Phi$ , and any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $e > 0$ , there exists constants  $S(\varepsilon) > 0$  and  $N(\varepsilon) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\{ P_n^{(\kappa)} : \left\| \mathbf{T}_n^{(s)}(\cdot) - P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(\cdot) \right\|_{TV} \leq \varepsilon \right\} \right) > 1 - e.$$

for all  $s > S(\varepsilon)$  and  $n > N(\varepsilon)$ .

## A.10 Proof of Corollary 2

Given the result of global convergence in Corollary 1, and given a  $\varphi$ , there is a subset  $\Theta^* \subset \Theta$  such that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*} \left| p(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*} \|\nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^{\kappa}},$$

where  $d$  is the dimension of  $\theta$ . Following the proof of Lemma 1, we know that the construction of the set  $\Theta^*$  is only related to the geometric shape of  $\Theta$ , and it is not related to the function and thus not related to  $\varphi$ . Since  $p_{cut}$  is continuously differentiable, then  $\nabla_{\theta, \varphi} p_{cut}(\theta, \varphi)$  is continuous. This further implies  $\nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi)$  is continuous with respect to  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$ . Because  $\Phi$  is compact, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| p(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*, \varphi \in \Phi} \|\nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^{\kappa}} < \infty.$$

Now since  $\mu(\Theta^*) = \mu(\Theta)$ , we have the following bias term

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\Theta^* \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) \left( p(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right) p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\Theta^* \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) \left| p(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*, \varphi \in \Phi} \left| p(\theta|Y, \varphi) - p^{(\kappa)}(\theta|Y, \varphi) \right| \int_{\Theta^* \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*, \varphi \in \Phi} \|\nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^{\kappa}} \left( \int_{\Theta^* \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \right). \end{aligned}$$

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta^*, \varphi \in \Phi} \|\nabla_{\theta} p(\theta|Y, \varphi)\|_2 \frac{\sqrt{d}}{10^{\kappa}} \left( \int_{\Theta^* \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) p(\varphi|Z) d\theta d\varphi \right) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

let the solution of this equation be  $\kappa^*$ . We have the following bias term

$$\left| \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa^*)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2},$$

and this is always true in probability space  $\Omega$ . Now by Theorem 2, for the same  $\varepsilon$  and  $\kappa^*$ , there exists a  $N(\kappa^*, \varepsilon)$  such that for any  $N > N(\kappa^*, \varepsilon)$ , there is a set  $E \subset \Omega$  with  $\mathbb{P}(E) > 1 - e$  and on this set the error term satisfies

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa^*)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Hence, combining the error term and bias term, on the set  $E$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(\theta_n, \varphi_n) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa^*)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| + \left| \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}(d\theta, d\varphi) - \int_{\Theta \times \Phi} f(\theta, \varphi) P_{cut}^{(\kappa^*)}(d\theta, d\varphi) \right| \leq \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we are done.