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Abstract

We study the following learning problem with dependent data: Observing a trajectory of length $n$ from a stationary Markov chain with $k$ states, the goal is to predict the next state. For $3 \leq k \leq O(\sqrt{n})$, using techniques from universal compression, the optimal prediction risk in Kullback-Leibler divergence is shown to be $\Theta\left(\frac{k^2}{n} \log \frac{n}{k^2}\right)$, in contrast to the optimal rate of $\Theta\left(\frac{\log \log n}{n}\right)$ for $k = 2$ previously shown in [FOPS16]. These rates, slower than the parametric rate of $O\left(\frac{k^2}{n}\right)$, can be attributed to the memory in the data, as the spectral gap of the Markov chain can be arbitrarily small. To quantify the memory effect, we study irreducible reversible chains with a prescribed spectral gap. In addition to characterizing the optimal prediction risk for two states, we show that, as long as the spectral gap is not excessively small, the prediction risk in the Markov model is $O\left(\frac{k^2}{n}\right)$, which coincides with that of an iid model with the same number of parameters.
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1 Introduction

Learning distributions from samples is a central question in statistics and machine learning. While significant progress has been achieved in property testing and estimation based on independent and identically distributed (iid) data, for many applications, most notably natural language processing, two new challenges arise: (a) Modeling data as independent observations fails to capture their temporal dependency; (b) Distributions are commonly supported on a large domain whose cardinality is comparable to or even exceeds the sample size. Continuing the progress made in [FOPS16, HOP18], in this paper we study the following prediction problem with dependent data modeled as Markov chains.

Suppose $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is a stationary first-order Markov chain on state space $[k] \triangleq \{1, \ldots, k\}$ with unknown statistics. Observing a trajectory $X^n \triangleq (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$, the goal is to predict the next state $X_{n+1}$ by estimating its distribution conditioned on the present data. We use the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence as the loss function: For distributions $P, Q$ on $[k]$, $D(P \parallel Q) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i \log \frac{p_i}{q_i}$ if $p_i = 0$ whenever $q_i = 0$ and $D(P \parallel Q) = \infty$ otherwise. The minimax prediction risk is given by

$$\text{Risk}_{k,n} \triangleq \inf_{\hat{M}} \sup_{\pi, M} \mathbb{E}[D(\hat{M}(\cdot|X^n) \parallel \hat{M}(\cdot|X^n))] = \inf_{\hat{M}} \sup_{\pi, M} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E}[D(\hat{M}(\cdot|i) \parallel \hat{M}(\cdot|i))1_{\{X_n=i\}}]$$

where the supremum is taken over all stationary distributions $\pi$ and transition matrices $M$ (row-stochastic) such that $\pi M = \pi$, the infimum is taken over all estimators $\hat{M} = \hat{M}(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$, and $M(\cdot|i)$ denotes the $i$th row of $M$. Our main objective is to characterize this minimax risk within universal constant factors as a function of $n$ and $k$.

The prediction problem (1) is distinct from the parameter estimation problem such as estimating the transition matrix [Bar51, AG57, Bil61, WK19] or its properties [CS00, KV16, HJL+18, HKL+19], in that the quantity to be estimated (conditional distribution of the next state) depends on the sample path itself. This is precisely what renders the prediction problem closely relevant to natural applications such as autocomplete and text generation. In addition, this formulation allows more flexibility with far less assumptions compared to the estimation framework. For example, if certain state has very small probability under the stationary distribution, consistent estimation of the transition matrix may not be possible, whereas the prediction problem is unencumbered by such rare states.

In the special case of iid data, the prediction problem reduces to estimating the distribution in KL divergence. In this setting the optimal risk is well understood, which is known to be $\frac{k-1}{2n}(1+o(1))$
when \( k \) is fixed and \( n \to \infty \) \([\text{BFSS02}]\) and \( \Theta(\frac{k}{n}) \) for \( k = O(n) \) \([\text{Pan04,KOPS15}]\).\(^1\) Typical in parametric models, this rate \( \frac{k}{n} \) is commonly referred to the “parametric rate”, which leads to a sample complexity that scales proportionally to the number of parameters and inverse proportionally to the desired accuracy.

In the setting of Markov chains, however, the prediction problem is much less understood especially for large state space. Recently the seminal work \([\text{FOPS16}]\) showed the surprising result that for stationary Markov chains on two states, the optimal prediction risk satisfies

\[
\text{Risk}_{2,n} = \Theta\left(\frac{\log \log n}{n}\right),
\]

which has a nonparametric rate even when the problem has only two parameters. The follow-up work \([\text{HOP18}]\) studied general \( k \)-state chains and showed a lower bound of \( \Omega\left(\frac{k^2 \log \log n}{n}\right) \) for uniform (not necessarily stationary) initial distribution; however, the upper bound \( O\left(\frac{k^2 \log \log n}{n}\right) \) in \([\text{HOP18}]\) relies on implicit assumptions on mixing time such as spectral gap conditions. The following theorem resolves the optimal risk for \( k \)-state Markov chains:

**Theorem 1** (Optimal rates without spectral gap). There exists a universal constant \( C > 0 \) such that for all \( 3 \leq k \leq \sqrt{n}/C \),

\[
\frac{k^2}{Cn} \log \left(\frac{n}{k^2}\right) \leq \text{Risk}_{k,n} \leq \frac{Ck^2}{n} \log \left(\frac{n}{k^2}\right).
\]

Furthermore, the lower bound continues to hold even if the Markov chain is restricted to be irreducible and reversible.

**Remark 1.** The optimal prediction risk of \( O\left(\frac{k^2 \log \log n}{n}\right) \) can be achieved by an average version of the add-one estimator (i.e. Laplace’s rule of succession). Given a trajectory \( x^n = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) of length \( n \), denote the transition counts (with the convention \( N_i \equiv N_{ij} \equiv 0 \) if \( n = 0, 1 \))

\[
N_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} 1\{x_\ell = i\}, \quad N_{ij} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} 1\{x_\ell = i, x_{\ell+1} = j\}.
\]

The add-one estimator for the transition probability \( M(j|i) \) is given by

\[
\hat{M}_{x^n}^{+1}(j|i) \triangleq \frac{N_{ij} + 1}{N_i + k}.
\]

which is an additively smoothed version of the empirical frequency. Finally, the optimal rate in (3) can be achieved by the following estimator \( \hat{M} \) defined as an average of add-one estimators over different sample sizes:

\[
\hat{M}_{x^n}(x_{n+1}|x_n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \hat{M}_{x_{n-t+1}^n}^{+1}(x_{n+1}|x_n).
\]

In other words, we apply the add-one estimator to the most recent \( t \) observations \((X_{n-t+1}, \ldots, X_n)\) to predict the next \( X_{n+1} \), then average over \( t = 1, \ldots, n \). Such Cesàro-mean-type estimators have been introduced before in the density estimation literature (see, e.g., \([\text{YB99}]\)). It remains open whether the usual add-one estimator (namely, the last term in (6) which uses all the data) or any add-c estimator for constant \( c \) achieves the optimal rate. In contrast, for two-state chains the optimal risk (2) is attained by a hybrid strategy \([\text{FOPS16}]\), applying add-c estimator for \( c = \frac{1}{\log n} \) for trajectories with at most one transition and \( c = 1 \) otherwise.

\(^1\)Here and below \( \simeq, \lesssim, \gtrsim \) or \( \Theta(\cdot), O(\cdot), \Omega(\cdot) \) denote equality and inequalities up to universal multiplicative constants.
Theorem 1 shows that the departure from the parametric rate of $\frac{k^2}{n}$, first discovered in [FOPS16, HOP18] for binary chains, is even more pronounced for larger state space. As will become clear in the proof, there is some fundamental difference between two-state and three-state chains, resulting in $\text{Risk}_{3,n} = \Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right) \gg \text{Risk}_{2,n} = \Theta\left(\frac{\log \log n}{n}\right)$. It is instructive to compare the sample complexity for prediction in the iid and Markov model. Denote by $d$ the number of parameters, which is $k-1$ for the iid case and $k(k-1)$ for Markov chains. Define the sample complexity $n^*(d, \epsilon)$ as the smallest sample size $n$ in order to achieve a prescribed prediction risk $\epsilon$. For $\epsilon = O(1)$, we have

\[ n^*(d, \epsilon) \asymp \begin{cases} 
\frac{d}{\epsilon} & \text{iid} \\
\frac{d}{\epsilon} \log \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} & \text{Markov with 2 states} \\
\frac{d}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} & \text{Markov with } k \geq 3 \text{ states}.
\end{cases} \]

(7)

At a high level, the nonparametric rates in the Markov model can be attributed to the memory in the data. On the one hand, Theorem 1 as well as (2) affirm that one can obtain meaningful prediction without imposing any mixing conditions;\(^2\) such decoupling between learning and mixing has also been observed in other problems such as learning linear dynamics [SMT+18, DMM+19]. On the other hand, the dependency in the data does lead to a strictly higher sample complexity than that of the iid case; in fact, the lower bound in Theorem 1 is proved by constructing chains with spectral gap as small as $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ (see Section 3). Thus, it is conceivable that with sufficiently favorable mixing conditions, the prediction risk improves over that of the worst case and, at some point, reaches the parametric rate. To make this precise, we focus on Markov chains with a prescribed spectral gap.

It is well-known that for an irreducible and reversible chain, the transition matrix $M$ has $k$ real eigenvalues satisfying $1 = \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots \lambda_k \geq -1$. The absolute spectral gap of $M$, defined as

\[ \gamma_* \triangleq 1 - \max \{|\lambda_i| : i \neq 1\}, \]

quantifies the memory of the Markov chain. For example, the mixing time is determined by $1/\gamma^*$ (relaxation time) up to logarithmic factors. As extreme cases, the chain which does not move ($M$ is identity) and which is iid ($M$ is rank-one) have spectral gap equal to 0 and 1, respectively. We refer the reader to [LP17] for more background. Given $\gamma_0 \in (0,1)$, define $\mathcal{M}_k(\gamma_0)$ as the set of transition matrices corresponding to irreducible and reversible chains whose absolute spectral gap exceeds $\gamma_0$. Restricting (1) to this subcollection and noticing the stationary distribution here is uniquely determined by $M$, we define the corresponding minimax risk:

\[ \text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \triangleq \inf_M \sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}_k(\gamma_0)} \mathbb{E}\left[ D(M(\cdot|X_n)||\tilde{M}(\cdot|X_n)) \right] \]

(9)

Extending the result (2) of [FOPS16], the following theorem characterizes the optimal prediction risk for two-state chains with prescribed spectral gaps:

**Theorem 2** (Spectral gap dependent rates for binary chain). For any $\gamma_0 \in (0,1)$

\[ \text{Risk}_{2,n}(\gamma_0) \asymp \frac{1}{n} \max \left\{ 1, \log \log \left( \min \left\{ n, \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \right\} \right) \right\}. \]

Theorem 2 shows that for binary chains, parametric rate $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ is achievable if and only if the spectral gap is nonvanishing. While this holds for bounded state space (see Corollary 4 below),

\(^2\)To see this, it is helpful to consider the extreme case where the chain does not move at all or is periodic, in which case predicting the next state is in fact easy.
for large state space, it turns out that much weaker conditions on the absolute spectral gap suffice to guarantee the parametric rate $O(k^2 n)$, achieved by the add-one estimator applied to the entire trajectory. In other words, as long as the spectral gap is not excessively small, the prediction risk in the Markov model behaves in the same way as that of an iid model with equal number of parameters. Similar conclusion has been established previously for the sample complexity of estimating the entropy rate of Markov chains in [HJL+18, Theorem 1].

**Theorem 3.** The add-one estimator in (5) achieves the following risk bound.

(i) For any $k \geq 2$, $\text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n}$ provided that $\gamma_0 \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log k}{k}\right)^{1/4}$.

(ii) In addition, for $k \gtrsim (\log n)^6$, $\text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n}$ provided that $\gamma_0 \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log(n+k)}{k}\right)^2$.

**Corollary 4.** For any fixed $k \geq 2$, $\text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) = O(\frac{1}{n})$ if and only if $\gamma_0 = \Omega(1)$.

### 1.1 Proof techniques

The proof of Theorem 1 deviates from existing approaches based on concentration inequalities for Markov chains. For instance, the standard program for analyzing the add-one estimator (5) involves proving concentration of the empirical counts on their population version, namely, $N_i \approx n\pi_i$ and $N_{ij} \approx n\pi_i M(j|i)$, and bounding the risk in the atypical case by concentration inequalities, such as the Chernoff-type bounds in [Lez98, Pau15], which have been widely used in recent work on statistical inference with Markov chains [KV16, HJL+18, HOP18, HKL+19, WK19]. However, these concentration inequalities inevitably depend on the spectral gap of the Markov chain, leading to results which deteriorate as the spectral gap becomes smaller. For two-state chains, results free of the spectral gap are obtained in [FOPS16] using explicit joint distribution of the transition counts; this refined analysis, however, is difficult to extend to large state space as the probability mass function of $(N_{ij})$ is given by Whittle’s formula [Whi55] which takes an unwieldy determinantal form.

Eschewing concentration-based arguments, the crux of our proof of Theorem 1, for both the upper and lower bound, revolves around the following quantity known as **redundancy**:

$$\text{Red}_{k,n} \triangleq \inf_{Q_{X^n}} \sup_{P_{X^n}} D(P_{X^n} \| Q_{X^n}) = \inf_{Q_{X^n}} \sup_{P_{X^n}} \sum_{x^n} P_{X^n}(x^n) \log \frac{P_{X^n}(x^n)}{Q_{X^n}(x^n)}. \quad (10)$$

Here the supremum is taken over all joint distributions of stationary Markov chains $X^n$ on $k$ states, and the infimum is over all joint distributions $Q_{X^n}$. A central quantity which measures the minimax regret in universal compression, the redundancy (10) corresponds to minimax cumulative risk (namely, the total prediction risk when the sample size ranges from 1 to $n$), while (1) is the individual minimax risk at sample size $n$ – see Section 2 for a detailed discussion. We prove the following reduction between prediction risk and redundancy:

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Red}_{k-1,n}^\text{sym} - \frac{\log k}{n} \lesssim \text{Risk}_{k,n} \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \text{Red}_{k,n} \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Red}_{k,n}^\text{sym}$ denotes the redundancy for symmetric Markov chains. The upper bound is standard: thanks to the convexity of the loss function and stationarity of the Markov chain, the risk of the Cesàro-mean estimator (6) can be upper bounded using the cumulative risk and, in turn, the redundancy. The proof of the lower bound is more involved. Given a $(k-1)$-state chain, we embed it into a larger state space by introducing a new state, such that with constant probability, the
chain starts from and gets stuck at this state for a period time that is approximately uniform in $[n]$, then enters the original chain. Effectively, this scenario is equivalent to a prediction problem on $k-1$ states with a random (approximately uniform) sample size, whose prediction risk can then be related to the cumulative risk and redundancy. This intuition can be made precise by considering a Bayesian setting, in which the $(k-1)$-state chain is randomized according to the least favorable prior for (10), and representing the Bayes risk as conditional mutual information and applying the chain rule.

Given the above reduction, it suffices to show both redundancies in (10) are on the order of $\frac{k^2}{n} \log \frac{n}{k^2}$. The redundancy is upper bounded by pointwise redundancy, which replaces the average in (10) by the maximum over all trajectories. Following [DMPW81, CS04], we consider an explicit probability assignment defined by add-one smoothing and using combinatorial arguments to bound the pointwise redundancy, shown optimal by information-theoretic arguments.

The optimal spectral gap-dependent rate in Theorem 2 relies on the key observation in [FOPS16] that, for binary chains, the dominating contribution to the prediction risk comes from trajectories with a single transition, for which we may apply an add-$c$ estimator with $c$ depending appropriately on the spectral gap. The lower bound is shown using a Bayesian argument similar to that of [HOP18, Theorem 1]. The proof of Theorem 3 relies on more delicate concentration arguments as the spectral gap is allowed to be vanishingly small. Notably, for small $k$, direct application of existing Bernstein inequalities for Markov chains in [Lez98, Pau15] falls short of establishing the parametric rate of $O(\frac{k^2}{n})$ (see Remark 4 in Section 4.2 for details); instead, we use a fourth moment bound which turns out to be well suited for analyzing concentration of empirical counts conditional on the terminal state.

For large $k$, we further improve the spectral gap condition using a simulation argument for Markov chains using independent samples [Bil61, HJL+18]. A key step is a new concentration inequality for $D(P \parallel \hat{P}_{n,k}^{+1})$, where $\hat{P}_{n,k}^{+1}$ is the add-one estimator based on $n$ iid observations of $P$ supported on $[k]$:

$$
P\left(D(P \parallel \hat{P}_{n,k}^{+1}) \geq c \cdot \frac{k}{n} + \frac{\text{polylog}(n) \cdot \sqrt{k}}{n} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)},$$

for some absolute constant $c > 0$. Note that an application of the classical concentration inequality of McDiarmid would result in the second term being $\frac{\text{polylog}(n)}{\sqrt{n}}$, and (12) crucially improves this to $\frac{\text{polylog}(n) \cdot \sqrt{k}}{n}$. Such an improvement has been recently observed by [MJT+20, Agr20, GR20] in studying the similar quantity $D(\hat{P}_n \parallel P)$ for the (unsmoothed) empirical distribution $\hat{P}_n$; however, these results, based on either the method of types or an explicit upper bound of the moment generating function, are not directly applicable to (12) in which the true distribution $P$ appears as the first argument in the KL divergence.

### 1.2 Related work

While the exact prediction problem studied in this paper has recently been in focus since [FOPS16, HOP18], there exists a large body of literature on relate works. As mentioned before some of our proof strategies draws inspiration and results from the study of redundancy in universal compression, its connection to mutual information, as well as the perspective of sequential probability assignment as prediction, dating back to [Dav73, DMPW81, Ris84, Sht87, Rya88]. Asymptotic characterization of the minimax redundancy for Markov sources, both average and pointwise, were obtained in [Dav83, Att99, JS02], in the regime of fixed alphabet size $k$ and large sample size $n$. Non-asymptotic characterization was obtained in [Dav83] for $n \gg k \log^2 k$ and recently extended to
$n \asymp k^2$ in [TJW18], which further showed that the behavior of the redundancy remains unchanged even if the Markov chain is very close to being iid in terms of spectral gap $\gamma^* = 1 - o(1)$.

The current paper adds to a growing body of literature devoted to statistical learning with dependent data, in particular those dealing with Markov chains. Estimation of the transition matrix [Bar51, AG57, Bil61, Sin64] and testing the order of Markov chains [CS00] have been well studied in the large-sample regime. More recently attention has been shifted towards large state space and nonasymptotics. For example, [WK19] studied the estimation of transition matrix in $\ell_\infty \to \ell_\infty$ induced norm for Markov chains with prescribed pseudo spectral gap and minimum probability mass of the stationary distribution, and determined sample complexity bounds up to logarithmic factors. Similar results have been obtained for estimating properties of Markov chains, including mixing time and spectral gap [HKL+19], entropy rate [KV16, HJL+18, OS20], graph statistics based on random walk [BHOP18], as well as identity testing [DDG18, CB19, WK20, FW21]. Most of these results rely on assumptions on the Markov chains such as lower bounds on the spectral gap and the stationary distribution, which afford concentration for sample statistics of Markov chains. In contrast, one of the main contributions in this paper, in particular Theorem 1, is that optimal prediction can be achieved without these assumptions, thereby providing a novel way of tackling these seemingly unavoidable issues. This is ultimately accomplished by information-theoretic and combinatorial techniques from universal compression.

1.3 Notations and preliminaries

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n] \triangleq \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Denote $x^n = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $x^n_t = (x_t, \ldots, x_n)$. The distribution of a random variable $X$ is denoted by $P_X$. In a Bayesian setting, the distribution of a parameter $\theta$ is referred to as a prior, denoted by $P_\theta$. We recall the following definitions from information theory [CK82, CT06]. The conditional KL divergence is defined as an average of KL divergence between conditional distributions:

$$D(P_{A|B}\|Q_{A|B}|P_B) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{B \sim P_B} [D(P_{A|B}\|Q_{A|B})] = \int P_B(db)D(P_{A|B=b}\|Q_{A|B=b}).$$

(13)

The mutual information between random variables $A$ and $B$ with joint distribution $P_{AB}$ is $I(A; B) \triangleq D(P_{B|A}\|P_B|P_A)$; similarly, the conditional mutual information is defined as

$$I(A; B|C) \triangleq D(P_{B|A,C}\|P_{B|C}|P_{A,C}).$$

The following variational representation of (conditional) mutual information is well-known

$$I(A; B) = \min_{Q_B} D(P_{B|A}\|Q_B|P_A), \quad I(A; B|C) = \min_{Q_{B|C}} D(P_{B|A,C}\|Q_{B|C}|P_{A,C}).$$

(14)

The entropy of a discrete random variables $X$ is $H(X) \triangleq \sum_x P_X(x) \log \frac{1}{P_X(x)}$.

1.4 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the general paradigm of minimax redundancy and prediction risk and their dual representation in terms of mutual information. We give a general redundancy-based bound on the prediction risk, which, combined with redundancy bounds for Markov chains, leads to the upper bound in Theorem 1. Section 3 presents the lower bound construction, starting from three states and then extending to $k$ states. Spectral-gap dependent risk bounds in Theorems 2 and 3 are given in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the assumptions and implications of our results and related open problems.
2 Two general paradigms

2.1 Redundancy, prediction risk, and mutual information representation

For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \mathcal{P} = \{P_{X_{n+1}|\theta} : \theta \in \Theta\} \) be a collection of joint distributions parameterized by \( \theta \).

“Compression”. Consider a sample \( X^n \triangleq (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) of size \( n \) drawn from \( P_{X^n|\theta} \) for some unknown \( \theta \in \Theta \). The redundancy of a probability assignment (joint distribution) \( Q_{X^n} \) is defined as the worst-case KL risk of fitting the joint distribution of \( X^n \), namely

\[
\text{Red}(Q_{X^n}) \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} D(P_{X^n|\theta} \parallel Q_{X^n}). \tag{15}
\]

Optimizing over \( Q_{X^n} \), the minimax redundancy is defined as

\[
\text{Red}_n \triangleq \inf_{Q_{X^n}} \text{Red}(Q_{X^n}), \tag{16}
\]

where the infimum is over all joint distribution \( Q_{X^n} \). This quantity can be operationalized as the redundancy (i.e. regret) in the setting of universal data compression, that is, the excess number of bits compared to the optimal compressor of \( X^n \) that knows \( \theta \) [CT06, Chapter 13].

The capacity-redundancy theorem (see [Kem74] for a very general result) provides the following mutual information characterization of (16):

\[
\text{Red}_n = \sup_{P_{\theta}} I(\theta; X^n), \tag{17}
\]

where the supremum is over all distributions (priors) \( P_{\theta} \) on \( \Theta \). In view of the variational representation (14), this result can be interpreted as a minimax theorem:

\[
\text{Red}_n = \inf_{Q_{X^n}} \sup_{P_{\theta}} D(P_{X^n|\theta} \parallel Q_{X^n}|P_{\theta}) = \sup_{P_{\theta}} \inf_{Q_{X^n}} D(P_{X^n|\theta} \parallel Q_{X^n}|P_{\theta}).
\]

Typically, for fixed model size and \( n \to \infty \), one expects that \( \text{Red}_n = \frac{d}{2} \log n(1+o(1)) \), where \( d \) is the number of parameters; see [Ris84] for a general theory of this type. Indeed, on a fixed alphabet of size \( k \), we have \( \text{Red}_n = \frac{k-1}{2} \log n(1+o(1)) \) for iid model [Dav73] and \( \text{Red}_n = \frac{k^m(k-1)}{2} \log n(1+o(1)) \) for \( m \)-order Markov models [Tro74], with more refined asymptotics shown in [XB97, SW12]. For large alphabets, nonasymptotic results have also been obtained. For example, for first-order Markov model, \( \text{Red}_n \asymp k^2 \log \frac{n}{k^2} \) provided that \( n \gtrsim k^2 \) [Dav83, TJW18].

“Prediction”. Consider the problem of predicting the next unseen data point \( X_{n+1} \) based on the observations \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \), where \( (X_1, \ldots, X_{n+1}) \) are jointly distributed as \( P_{X_{n+1}|\theta} \) for some unknown \( \theta \in \Theta \). Here, an estimator is a distribution (for \( X_{n+1} \)) as a function of \( X^n \), which, in turn, can be written as a conditional distribution \( Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \). As such, its worst-case average risk is

\[
\text{Risk}(Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}) \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n,\theta} \parallel Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}|P_{X^n|\theta}), \tag{18}
\]

where the conditional KL divergence is defined in (13). The minimax prediction risk is then defined as

\[
\text{Risk}_n \triangleq \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} \text{Risk}(Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}), \tag{19}
\]
While (16) does not directly correspond to a statistical estimation problem, (19) is exactly the familiar setting of “density estimation”, where $Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}$ is understood as an estimator for the distribution of the unseen $X_{n+1}$ based on the available data $X_1, \ldots, X_n$.

In the Bayesian setting where $\theta$ is drawn from a prior $P_\theta$, the Bayes prediction risk coincides with the conditional mutual information as a consequence of the variational representation (14):

$$\inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} \mathbb{E}_\theta[D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n, \theta} \| Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n|P_{X^n|\theta}})] = I(\theta; X_{n+1}|X^n).$$

(20)

Furthermore, the Bayes estimator that achieves this infimum takes the following form:

$$Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}^{\text{Bayes}} = P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} = \frac{\int_{\Theta} P_{X_{n+1}|\theta} dP_\theta}{\int_{\Theta} P_{X^n|\theta} dP_\theta},$$

(21)

known as the Bayes predictive density \cite{Dav73, LB04}. These representations play a crucial role in the lower bound proof of Theorem 1. Under appropriate conditions which hold for Markov models (see Lemma 19 in Appendix A), the minimax prediction risk (19) also admits a dual representation analogous to (17):

$$\text{Risk}_n = \sup_{\theta \sim \pi} I(\theta; X_{n+1}|X^n),$$

(22)

which, in view of (20), show that the principle of “minimax=worst-case Bayes” continues to hold for prediction problem in Markov models.

The following result relates the redundancy and the prediction risk.

**Lemma 5.** For any model $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\text{Red}_n \leq \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \text{Risk}_t. \quad (23)$$

In addition, suppose that each $P_{X^n|\theta} \in \mathcal{P}$ is stationary and $m^{th}$-order Markov. Then for all $n \geq m + 1$,

$$\text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n-1} \leq \frac{\text{Red}_n}{n - m}. \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, for any joint distribution $Q_{X^n}$ factorizing as $Q_{X^n} = \prod_{t=1}^n Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}$, the prediction risk of the estimator

$$\tilde{Q}_{X_n|X^{n-1}}(x_n|x^{n-1}) \triangleq \frac{1}{n - m} \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}(x_n|x^{n-1}_{n-t+1})$$

(25)

is bounded by the redundancy of $Q_{X^n}$ as

$$\text{Risk}(\tilde{Q}_{X_n|X^{n-1}}) \leq \frac{1}{n - m} \text{Red}(Q_{X^n}). \quad (26)$$

**Remark 2.** Note that the upper bound (23) on redundancy, known as the “estimation-compression inequality” \cite{KOPS15, FOPS16}, holds without conditions, while the lower bound (24) relies on stationarity and Markovity. For iid data, the estimation-compression inequality is almost an equality; however, this is not the case for Markov chains, as both sides of (23) differ by an unbounded factor of $\Theta(\log \log n)$ for $k = 2$ and $\Theta(\log n)$ for fixed $k \geq 3$ – see (2) and Theorem 1. On the other hand, Markov chains with at least three states offers a rare instance where (24) is tight, namely, $\text{Risk}_n \asymp \frac{\text{Red}_n}{n}$ (cf. Lemma 6).
Proof. The upper bound on the redundancy follows from the chain rule of KL divergence:

\[
D(P_{X^n|\theta}||Q_{X^n}) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} D(P_{X_t|X^{t-1},\theta}||Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}|P_{X^{t-1}}).
\]

Thus

\[
\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} D(P_{X^n|\theta}||Q_{X^n}) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{n} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} D(P_{X_t|X^{t-1},\theta}||Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}|P_{X^{t-1}}).
\]

Minimizing both sides over \(Q_{X^n}\) (or equivalently, \(Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}\) for \(t = 1, \ldots, n\)) yields (23).

To upper bound the prediction risk using redundancy, fix any \(Q_{X^n}\), which gives rise to \(Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}}\) for \(t = 1, \ldots, n\). For clarity, let use denote the \(t^\text{th}\) estimator as \(\hat{P}_t(\cdot|x^{t-1}) = Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}=x^{t-1}}\). Consider the estimator \(\tilde{Q}_{X_n|X^{n-1}}\) defined in (25), namely,

\[
\tilde{Q}_{X_n|X^{n-1}=x^{n-1}} \equiv \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} \hat{P}_t(\cdot|x_{n-t}, \ldots, x_{n-1}).
\]

That is, we apply \(\hat{P}_t\) to the most recent \(t-1\) symbols prior to \(X_n\) for predicting its distribution, then average over \(t\). We may bound the prediction risk of this estimator by redundancy as follows: Fix \(\theta \in \Theta\). To simplify notation, we suppress the dependency of \(X\), and write \(P_{X^n|\theta} \equiv P_{X^n}\). Then

\[
D(P_{X^n|X^{n-1}}||\tilde{Q}_{X_n|X^{n-1}}|P_{X^n}) \overset{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ D\left(P_{X^n|X^{n-1}}||\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \hat{P}_t(\cdot|x^{n-1}_{n-t+1})\right) \right]
\]

\[
\overset{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left[ D(P_{X^n|X^{n-1}}||\hat{P}_t(\cdot|x^{n-1}_{n-t+1})) \right]
\]

\[
\overset{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} \mathbb{E} \left[ D(P_{X_t|X^{t-1}}||\hat{P}_t(\cdot|x^{t-1})) \right]
\]

\[
\overset{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{n-m} \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} D(P_{X_t|X^{t-1}}||Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}=x^{t-1}})
\]

\[
\overset{(e)}{=} \frac{1}{n-m} D(P_{X^n||Q_{X^n}}),
\]

where (a) uses the \(m^\text{th}\)-order Markovian assumption; (b) is due to the convexity of the KL divergence; (c) uses the crucial fact that for all \(t = 1, \ldots, n-1\), \((X_{n-t}, \ldots, X_{n-1})\) \(\text{law} = (X_1, \ldots, X_t)\), thanks to stationarity; (d) follows from substituting \(\hat{P}_t(\cdot|x^{t-1}) = Q_{X_t|X^{t-1}=x^{t-1}}\), the Markovian assumption \(P_{X_t|X^{t-1}} = P_{X_t|X^{t-1}}\), and rewriting the expectation as conditional KL divergence; (e) is by the chain rule (27) of KL divergence. Since the above holds for any \(\theta \in \Theta\), the desired (26) follows which implies that \(\text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n-1}\). Finally, \(\text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n-1}\) follows from \(\mathbb{E}[D(P_{X^{n+1}|X_n}||\hat{P}_n(X^n))] = \mathbb{E}[D(P_{X^n|X_{n-1}}||\hat{P}_n(X_n^{n-1}))]\), since \((X_2, \ldots, X_n)\) and \((X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})\) are equal in law. \(\square\)
\( I(\theta; X^n) = \sum_{t=1}^{n} I(\theta; X_t|X^{t-1}) \),

(29)

taking the supremum over \( \pi \) (the distribution of \( \theta \)) on both sides yields (17). For (22), it suffices to show that \( I(\theta; X_t|X^{t-1}) \) is decreasing in \( t \): for any \( \theta \sim \pi \),

\[
I(\theta; X_{n+1}|X^n) = \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n, \theta}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} = \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n, \theta}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} + \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}}
\]

and the first term is

\[
\mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n, \theta}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} = \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n, \theta}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} = \mathbb{E} \log \frac{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}}{P_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} = I(\theta; X_n|X^{n-1})
\]

where the first and second equalities follow from the \( m \)th-order Markovity and stationarity, respectively. Taking supremum over \( \pi \) yields \( \text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n-1} \). Finally, by the chain rule (29), we have

\[
I(\theta; X^n) \geq (n - m)I(\theta; X_n|X^{n-1}) \quad \text{yielding} \quad \text{Risk}_{n-1} \leq \frac{\text{Red}_{n}}{n-m}.
\]

2.2 Proof of the upper bound part of Theorem 1

Specializing to first-order stationary Markov chains with \( k \) states, we denote the redundancy and prediction risk in (16) and (19) by \( \text{Red}_{k,n} \) and \( \text{Risk}_{k,n} \), the latter of which is precisely the quantity previously defined in (1). Applying Lemma 5 yields \( \text{Risk}_{k,n} \leq \frac{1}{n-m} \text{Red}_{k,n} \). To upper bound \( \text{Red}_{k,n} \),

consider the following probability assignment:

\[
Q(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{1}{k^n} \prod_{t=1}^{n-1} \tilde{M}_{x_t}^{x_{t+1}}(x_{t+1}|x_t)
\]

(30)

where \( \tilde{M}^{x_{t+1}}(x_{t+1}|x_t) \) is the add-one estimator defined in (5). This \( Q \) factorizes as \( Q(x_1) = \frac{1}{k^n} \) and \( Q(x_{t+1}|x^t) = \tilde{M}_{x_t}^{x_{t+1}}(x_{t+1}|x_t) \). The following lemma bounds the redundancy of \( Q \):

Lemma 6. \( \text{Red}(Q) \leq k(k - 1) \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{n-1}{k(k-1)} \right) + 1 \right] + \log k. \)

Combined with Lemma 5, Lemma 6 shows that \( \text{Risk}_{k,n} \leq C \frac{k^2}{n} \log \frac{n}{k^2} \) for all \( k \leq \sqrt{n/C} \) and some universal constant \( C \), achieved by the estimator (6), which is obtained by applying the rule (25) to (30).

It remains to show Lemma 6. To do so, we in fact bound the pointwise redundancy of the add-one probability assignment (30) over all (not necessarily stationary) Markov chains on \( k \) states. The proof is similar to those of [CS04, Theorems 6.3 and 6.5], which, in turn, follow the arguments of [DMPW81, Sec. III-B].

Proof. We show that for every Markov chain with transition matrix \( M \) and initial distribution \( \pi \), and every trajectory \( (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \), it holds that

\[
\log \frac{\pi(x_1) \prod_{t=1}^{n-1} M(x_{t+1}|x_t)}{Q(x_1, \ldots, x_n)} \leq k(k - 1) \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{n}{k(k-1)} \right) + 1 \right] + \log k,
\]

(31)
where we abbreviate the add-one estimator $M_{1:t}(x_{t+1}|x_t)$ defined in (5) as $M(x_{t+1}|x_t)$.

To establish (31), note that $Q(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ could be equivalently expressed using the empirical counts $N_i$ and $N_{ij}$ in (4) as

$$Q(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \frac{1}{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{k} N_{ij}!}{N_i!} \cdot \frac{k \cdot (k+1) \cdots (N_i + k - 1)}{N_i^N} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{N_{ij}}{N_{ij}!}.$$  

Note that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} M(x_{t+1}|x_t) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j=1}^{k} M(j|i)^{N_{ij}} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left( \frac{N_{ij}}{N_i} \right)^{N_{ij}},$$

where the inequality follows from $\sum_j \frac{N_{ij}}{N_i} \log \left( \frac{N_{ij}}{N_i} \right) \geq 0$ for each $i$, by the nonnegativity of the KL divergence. Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\pi(x_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} M(x_{t+1}|x_t)}{Q(x_1, \cdots, x_n)} \leq k \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{k \cdot (k+1) \cdots (N_i + k - 1)}{N_i^{N_i}} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{N_{ij}^{N_{ij}}}{N_{ij}!}. \quad (32)$$

We claim that: for $n_1, \cdots, n_k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} \left( \frac{n_i}{n} \right)^{n_i} \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{n_i!}{n!}, \quad (33)$$

with the understanding that $(\frac{n}{n})^0 = 0! = 1$. Applying this claim to (32) gives

$$\log \frac{\pi(x_1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} M(x_{t+1}|x_t)}{Q(x_1, \cdots, x_n)} \leq \log k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \log \frac{k \cdot (k+1) \cdots (N_i + k - 1)}{N_i!}$$

$$= \log k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N_i} \log \left( 1 + \frac{k - 1}{\ell} \right)$$

$$\leq \log k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{0}^{N_i} \log \left( 1 + \frac{k - 1}{x} \right) \, dx$$

$$= \log k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( (k - 1) \log \left( 1 + \frac{N_i}{k - 1} \right) + N_i \log \left( 1 + \frac{k - 1}{N_i} \right) \right)$$

$$\leq k(k - 1) \log \left( 1 + \frac{n - 1}{k(k - 1)} \right) + k(k - 1) + \log k,$$

where (a) follows from the concavity of $x \mapsto \log x$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i = n - 1$, and $\log(1 + x) \leq x$.

It remains to justify (33), which has a simple information-theoretic proof: Let $T$ denote the collection of sequences $x^n$ in $[k]^n$ whose type is given by $(n_1, \ldots, n_k)$. Namely, for each $x^n \in T$, $i$ appears exactly $n_i$ times for each $i \in [k]$. Let $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ be drawn uniformly at random from the set $T$. Then

$$\log \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} n_i!} = H(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{n} H(X_j) \overset{(b)}{=} n \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{n_i}{n} \log \frac{n_i}{n},$$

where (a) follows from the fact that the joint entropy is at most the sum of marginal entropies; (b) is because each $X_j$ is distributed as $(\frac{n_i}{n}, \ldots, \frac{n_k}{n})$. \qed
3 Optimal rates without spectral gap

In this section, we prove the lower bound part of Theorem 1, which shows the optimality of the average version of the add-one estimator (25). We first describe the lower bound construction for three-state chains, which is subsequently extended to $k$ states.

3.1 Warmup: an $\Omega(\frac{\log n}{n})$ lower bound for three-state chains

Theorem 7. Risk$_{3,n} = \Omega \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right)$.

To show Theorem 7, consider the following one-parameter family of transition matrices:

$$
\mathcal{M} = \left\{ M_p = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{2}{n} & \frac{1}{n} & \frac{1}{n} \\
\frac{1}{n} & 1 - \frac{1}{n} - p & \frac{1}{n} \\
\frac{1}{n} & \frac{1}{n} & 1 - \frac{1}{n} - p \end{bmatrix} : 0 \leq p \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right\}.
$$

(34)

Note that each transition matrix in $\mathcal{M}$ is symmetric (hence doubly stochastic), whose corresponding chain is reversible with a uniform stationary distribution and spectral gap $\Theta(\frac{1}{n})$; see Fig. 1.

![Figure 1: Lower bound construction for three-state chains.](image)

The main idea is as follows. Notice that by design, with constant probability, the trajectory is of the following form: The chain starts and stays at state 1 for $t$ steps, and then transitions into state 2 or 3 and never returns to state 1, where $t = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. Since $p$ is the single unknown parameter, the only useful observations are visits to state 2 and 3 and each visit entails one observation about $p$ by flipping a coin with bias roughly $p$. Thus the effective sample size for estimating $p$ is $n - t - 1$ and we expect the best estimation error is of the order of $\frac{1}{n - t}$. However, $t$ is not fixed. In fact, conditioned on the trajectory is of this form, $t$ is roughly uniformly distributed between 1 and $n - 1$. As such, we anticipate the estimation error of $p$ is approximately

$$
\frac{1}{n - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n - i} = \Theta \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right).
$$

Intuitively speaking, the construction in Fig. 1 “embeds” a symmetric two-state chain (with states 2 and 3) with unknown parameter $p$ into a space of three states, by adding a “nuisance” state 1, which effectively slows down the exploration of the useful part of the state space, so that in a trajectory of length $n$, the effective number of observations we get to make about $p$ is roughly
uniformly distributed between 1 and \(n\). This explains the extra log factor in Theorem 7, which actually stems from the harmonic sum in \(\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\text{uniform}(n)}\right]\). We will fully explore this embedding idea in Section 3.2 to deal with larger state space.

Next we make the above intuition rigorous using a Bayesian argument. Let us start by recalling the following well-known lemma.

**Lemma 8.** Let \(q \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)\). Conditioned on \(q\), let \(N \sim \text{Binom}(m, q)\). Then the Bayes estimator of \(q\) given \(N\) is the “add-one” estimator:

\[
\mathbb{E}[q|N] = \frac{N + 1}{m + 2}
\]

and the Bayes risk is given by

\[
\mathbb{E}[(q - \mathbb{E}[q|N])^2] = \frac{1}{6(m + 2)}.
\]

**Proof of Theorem 7.** Consider the following Bayesian setting: First, we draw \(p\) uniformly at random from \([0, 1 - \frac{1}{n}]\). Then, we generate the sample path \(X^n = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)\) of a stationary (uniform) Markov chain with transition matrix \(M_p\) as defined in (34). For each \(t = 1, \ldots, n - 1\), define

\[X_t = \{x^n : x_1 = \ldots = x_t = 1, x_i \neq 1, i = t + 1, \ldots, n\}\]

and let \(\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{t=1}^n X_t\). Let \(\mu(x^n|p) = \mathbb{P}[X = x^n]\). Then

\[
\mu(x^n|p) = \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{t-1} \frac{2}{n} p^{N(x^n)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} - p\right)^{n-t-1-N(x^n)} , \quad x^n \in X_t,
\]

where \(N(x^n)\) denotes the number of transitions from state 2 to 3 or from 3 to 2. Then

\[
\mathbb{P}[X^n \in X_t] = \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{t-1} \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-t-1} \binom{n-t-1}{k} p^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} - p\right)^{n-t-1-k} = \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{t-1} \frac{2}{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-t-1-k} = \frac{2}{3n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{t-1}
\]

and hence

\[
\mathbb{P}[X^n \in \mathcal{X}] = \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}[X^n \in X_t] = \frac{2(n-1)}{3n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{n-1}\right) = \frac{2(1 - 1/e)}{3e} + o_n(1).
\]

Consider the Bayes estimator (for estimating \(p\) under the mean-squared error)

\[
\hat{p}(x^n) = \mathbb{E}[p|x^n] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[p \cdot \mu(x^n|p)]}{\mathbb{E}[\mu(x^n|p)]}.
\]

For \(x^n \in X_t\), using (35) we have

\[
\hat{p}(x^n) = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[p^{N(x^n)+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} - p\right)^{n-t-1-N(x^n)}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[p^{N(x^n)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} - p\right)^{n-t-1-N(x^n)}\right]}, \quad p \sim \text{Uniform}\left(0, \frac{n-1}{n}\right)
\]

\[
= \frac{n-1}{n} \mathbb{E}\left[U^{N(x^n)+1} (1 - U)^{n-t-1-N(x^n)}\right], \quad U \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)
\]

\[
= \frac{n-1}{n} \frac{N(x^n) + 1}{n - t + 1},
\]
Thus, by Pinsker inequality, we conclude that conditioned on $X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i$ and on $p$, $N(X^n) \sim \text{Binom}(n-t-1, q)$, where $q = \frac{p}{1-p} \sim \text{Uniform}(0,1)$. Applying Lemma 8 (with $m = n-t-1$ and $N = N(X^n)$), we get

$$
\mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}(X^n))^2 | X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i] = \left( \frac{n-1}{n} \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( q - \frac{N(x^n) + 1}{n-t+1} \right)^2 \right] = \left( \frac{n-1}{n} \right)^2 \frac{1}{6(n-t+1)}.
$$

Finally, note that conditioned on $X^n \in \mathcal{X}$, the probability of $X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i$ is close to uniform. Indeed, from (36) and (37) we get

$$
\mathbb{P}[X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i | \mathcal{X}] = \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{1}{1 - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{n-1} \right)} \right)^{n-1} \geq \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \frac{1}{e-1} + o_n(1) \right), \quad t = 1, \ldots, n-1.
$$

Thus

$$
\mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}(X^n))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i\}}] = \mathbb{P}[X^n \in \mathcal{X}] \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}(X^n))^2 | X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i] \mathbb{P}[X^n \in \mathcal{X}_i | \mathcal{X}] \geq \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n-t+1} = \Theta \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right).
$$

Finally, we relate (38) formally to the minimax prediction risk under the KL divergence. Consider any predictor $\hat{M}(\cdot | i)$ (as a function of the sample path $X$) for the $i$th row of $M$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. By Pinsker inequality, we conclude that

$$
D(M(\cdot | 2) \| \hat{M}(\cdot | 2)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \| M(\cdot | 2) - \hat{M}(\cdot | 2) \|_{\ell_1}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} (p - \hat{M}(3|2))^2
$$

and similarly, $D(M(\cdot | 3) \| \hat{M}(\cdot | 3)) \geq \frac{1}{2} (p - \hat{M}(2|3))^2$. Abbreviate $\hat{M}(3|2) \equiv \hat{p}_2$ and $\hat{M}(2|3) \equiv \hat{p}_3$, both functions of $X$. Taking expectations over both $p$ and $X$, the Bayes prediction risk can be bounded as follows

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{3} \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot | i) \| \hat{M}(\cdot | i)) \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = i\}}] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}_2)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 2\}} + (p - \hat{p}_3)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 3\}}] \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x^n) \left( \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}_2)^2 | X = x^n] \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 2\}} + \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}_3)^2 | X = x^n] \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 3\}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}} \mu(x^n) \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}(x^n))^2 | X = x^n] \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 2\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{X^n = 3\}} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[(p - \hat{p}(X))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X \in \mathcal{X}\}}] \overset{(38)}{=} \Theta \left( \frac{\log n}{n} \right).
$$

$\square$
3.2 k-state chains

The lower bound construction for 3-state chains in Section 3.1 can be generalized to k-state chains. The high-level argument is again to augment a \((k - 1)\)-state chain into a k-state chain. Specifically, we partition the state space \([k]\) into two sets \(S_1 = \{1\}\) and \(S_2 = \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}\). Consider a k-state Markov chain such that the transition probabilities from \(S_1\) to \(S_2\), and from \(S_2\) to \(S_1\), are both very small (on the order of \(\Theta(1/n)\)). At state 1, the chain either stays at 1 with probability 1 - \(1/n\) or moves to one of the states in \(S_2\) with equal probability \(1/(n(k - 1))\); at each state in \(S_2\), the chain moves to 1 with probability \(1/n\); otherwise, within the state subspace \(S_2\), the chain evolves according to some symmetric transition matrix \(T\). (See Fig. 2 in Section 3.2.1 for the precise transition diagram.)

The key feature of such a chain is as follows. Let \(\mathcal{X}_t\) be the event that \(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_t \in S_1\) and \(X_{t+1}, \ldots, X_n \in S_2\). For each \(t \in [n - 1]\), one can show that \(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_t) \geq c/n\) for some absolute constant \(c > 0\). Moreover, conditioned on the event \(\mathcal{X}_t\), \((X_{t+1}, \ldots, X_n)\) is equal in law to a stationary Markov chain \((Y_1, \ldots, Y_{n-t})\) on state space \(S_2\) with symmetric transition matrix \(T\). It is not hard to show that estimating \(M\) and \(T\) are nearly equivalent. Consider the Bayesian setting where \(T\) is drawn from some prior. We have

\[
\inf_{\hat{M}} \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n))|\hat{M}(\cdot|X_n)|\mathcal{X}_t] \right] \approx \inf_{\hat{T}} \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(T(\cdot|Y_{n-t})|\hat{T}(\cdot|Y_{n-t}))] \right] = \text{Risk}_{n-t}(T; Y_{n-t+1}|Y^{n-t}),
\]

where the last equality follows from the representation (20) of Bayes prediction risk as conditional mutual information. Lower bounding the minimax risk by the Bayes risk, we have

\[
\text{Risk}_{k,n} \geq \inf_{\hat{M}} \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n))|\hat{M}(\cdot|X_n))] \right] \\
\geq \inf_{\hat{M}} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_M \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n)|\hat{M}(\cdot|X_n))|\mathcal{X}_t] \cdot \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{X}_t) \right] \\
\geq \frac{c}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_M \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n)|\hat{M}(\cdot|X_n))|\mathcal{X}_t] \right] \\
\approx \frac{c}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \text{Risk}_{n-t}(T; Y_{n-t+1}|Y^{n-t}) = \frac{c}{n} \cdot \left( \text{Risk}(T; Y^n) - \text{Risk}(T; Y_1) \right). 
\]

Note that \(\text{Risk}(T; Y_1) \leq H(Y_1) \leq \log(k - 1)\) since \(Y_1\) takes values in \(S_2\). Maximizing the right hand side over the prior \(P_T\) and recalling the dual representation for redundancy in (17), the above inequality (40) leads to a risk lower bound of \(\text{Risk}_{k,n} \geq \frac{1}{n}(\text{Red}_{k-1,n}^{\text{sym}} - \log k)\), where \(\text{Red}_{k-1,n}^{\text{sym}} = \sup I(T; Y_1)\) is the redundancy for symmetric Markov chains with \(k - 1\) states and sample size \(n\). Since symmetric transition matrices still have \(\Theta(k^2)\) degrees of freedom, it is expected that \(\text{Red}_{k,n}^{\text{sym}} \approx k^2 \log \frac{n}{k^2}\) for \(n \gtrsim k^2\), so that (40) yields the desired lower bound \(\text{Risk}_{k,n} = \Omega(k^2 \log \frac{n}{k^2})\) in Theorem 1.

Next we rigorously carry out the lower bound proof sketched above: In Section 3.2.2, we explicitly construct the k-state chain which satisfies the desired properties in Section 3.2. In Section 3.2.2, we make the steps in (40) precise and bound the Bayes risk from below by an appropriate mutual information. In Section 3.2.3, we choose a prior distribution on the transition probabilities and prove a lower bound on the resulting mutual information, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 1, with the added bonus that the construction is restricted to irreducible and reversible chains.
3.2.1 Construction of the $k$-state chain

We construct a $k$-state chain with the following transition probability matrix:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \frac{1}{n} & \frac{1}{n(k-1)} & \frac{1}{n(k-1)} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n(k-1)} \\
1/n & 1/n & \cdots & 1/n \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
1/n & 1/n & \cdots & 1/n &\end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \frac{1}{n} \\
T_1 \\
\vdots \\
T_k \\
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{41}
$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{S_2 \times S_2}$ is a symmetric stochastic matrix to be chosen later. The transition diagram of $M$ is shown in Figure 2. One can also verify that the spectral gap of $M$ is $\Theta(1/n)$.

Let $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ be the trajectory of a stationary Markov chain with transition matrix $M$. We observe the following properties:

(P1) This Markov chain is irreducible and reversible, with stationary distribution $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2(k-1)}, \cdots, \frac{1}{2(k-1)})$;
(P2) For \( t \in [n - 1] \), let \( X_t \) denote the collections of trajectories \( x^n \) such that \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t \in S_1 \) and \( x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_n \in S_2 \). Then

\[
\mathbb{P}(X^n \in X_t) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 = \cdots = X_t = 1) \cdot \prod_{s=t+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(X_{s+1} \neq 1 | X_s = 1) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{t-1} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-1-t} \geq \frac{1}{2en^2} \quad (42)
\]

Moreover, this probability does not depend of the choice of \( T \);

(P3) Conditioned on the event that \( X^n \in X_t \), the trajectory \( (X_{t+1}, \ldots, X_n) \) has the same distribution as a length-\((n - t)\) trajectory of a stationary Markov chain with state space \( S_2 = \{2, 3, \ldots, k\} \) and transition probability \( T \), and the uniform initial distribution. Indeed,

\[
\mathbb{P}[X_{t+1} = x_{t+1}, \ldots, X_n = x_n | X^n \in X_t] = \frac{1}{k} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{t-1} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \prod_{s=t+1}^{n-1} T(x_{s+1}|x_s) \]

\[
= \frac{1}{k} \cdot \prod_{s=t+1}^{n-1} T(x_{s+1}|x_s).
\]

### 3.2.2 Reducing the Bayes prediction risk to redundancy

Let \( \mathcal{M}_{k-1}^{\text{sym}} \) be the collection of all symmetric transition matrices on state space \( S_2 = \{2, \ldots, k\} \). Consider a Bayesian setting where the transition matrix \( M \) is constructed in (41) and the submatrix \( T \) is drawn from an arbitrary prior on \( \mathcal{M}_{k-1}^{\text{sym}} \). The following lemma lower bounds the Bayes prediction risk.

**Lemma 9.** Conditioned on \( T \), let \( Y^n = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \) denote a stationary Markov chain on state space \( S_2 \) with transition matrix \( T \) and uniform initial distribution. Then

\[
\inf_{\hat{M}} \mathbb{E}_{T} \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot | X^n)||\hat{M}(\cdot | X^n))] \right] \geq \frac{n-1}{2en^2} (I(T; Y^n) - \log(k-1)) .
\]

Lemma 9 is the formal statement of the inequality (40) presented in the proof sketch. Maximizing the lower bound over the prior on \( T \) and in view of the mutual information representation (17), we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 10.** Let \( \text{Risk}_{k,n}^{\text{sym}} \) denote the minimax prediction risk for stationary irreducible and reversible Markov chains on \( k \) states and \( \text{Red}_{k,n}^{\text{sym}} \) the redundancy for stationary symmetric Markov chains on \( k \) states. Then

\[
\text{Risk}_{k,n}^{\text{rev}} \geq \frac{n-1}{2en^2} (\text{Red}_{k,n}^{\text{sym}} - \log(k-1)).
\]

We make use of the properties (P1)–(P3) in Section 3.2.1 to prove Lemma 9.

**Proof of Lemma 9.** Recall that in the Bayesian setting, we first draw \( T \) from some prior on \( \mathcal{M}_{k-1}^{\text{sym}} \), then generate the stationary Markov chain \( X^n = (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) with state space \( [k] \) and transition matrix \( M \) in (41), and \( (Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \) with state space \( S_2 = \{2, \ldots, k\} \) and transition matrix \( T \).

We first relate the Bayes estimator of \( M \) and \( T \) (given the \( X \) and \( Y \) chain respectively). For clarity, we spell out the explicit dependence of the estimators on the input trajectory. For each
and the uniformity of the stationary distribution of $Y^t$, neither of which depends on $T$. Furthermore, by construction in (41), $\hat{M}_n(1|x^n) = \frac{1}{n}$ is deterministic. In all, we have

$$\hat{M}_n(\cdot|x^n) = \frac{1}{n} \delta_1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \hat{T}_{n-t}(\cdot|x^n_t), \quad x^n \in \mathcal{X}_t. \quad (43)$$

with $\delta_1$ denoting the point mass at state 1, which parallels the fact that

$$M(\cdot|x) = \frac{1}{n} \delta_1 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) T(\cdot|x), \quad x \in S_2. \quad (44)$$

By (P2), each event $\{X^n \in \mathcal{X}_t\}$ occurs with probability at least $1/(2en)$, and is independent of $T$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n)\|\hat{M}(\cdot|X^n))] \right] \geq \frac{1}{2en} \sum_{t=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n)\|\hat{M}(\cdot|X^n))]|X^n \in \mathcal{X}_t] \right]. \quad (45)$$

By (P3), the conditional joint law of $(T, X_{t+1}, \ldots, X_n)$ on the event $\{X^n \in \mathcal{X}_t\}$ is the same as the joint law of $(T, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{n-t})$. Thus, we may express the Bayes prediction risk in the $X$ chain as

$$\mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(M(\cdot|X_n)\|\hat{M}(\cdot|X^n))]|X^n \in \mathcal{X}_t] \right] \overset{(a)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \mathbb{E}[D(T(\cdot|Y_{n-t})\|\hat{T}(\cdot|Y^{n-t}))]|Y_n = \cdot] \right] \overset{(b)}{=} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \cdot I(T; Y_{n-t+1}|Y^{n-t}), \quad (46)$$

where (a) follows from (43), (44), and the fact that for distributions $P, Q$ supported on $S_2$, $D(\delta_1 + (1 - \epsilon)P\|\epsilon \delta_1 + (1 - \epsilon)Q) = (1 - \epsilon)D(P\|Q)$; (b) is the mutual information representation (20) of the Bayes prediction risk. Finally, the lemma follows from (45), (46), and the chain rule

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n-1} I(T; Y_{n-t+1}|Y^{n-t}) = I(T; Y^n) - I(T; Y_1) \geq I(T; Y^n) - \log(k - 1),$$

as $I(T; Y_1) \leq H(Y_1) \leq \log(k - 1)$. \hfill \qedsymbol
3.2.3 Prior construction and lower bounding the mutual information

In view of Lemma 9, it remains to find a prior on $\mathcal{M}_{k-1}^\text{sym}$ for $T$, such that the mutual information $I(T; Y^n)$ is large. We make use of the connection identified in [DMPW81, Dav83, Ris84] between estimation error and mutual information (see also [CS04, Theorem 7.1] for a self-contained exposition). To lower the mutual information, a key step is to find a good estimator $\hat{T}(Y^n)$ of $T$. This is carried out in the following lemma.

Lemma 11. In the setting of Lemma 9, suppose that $T \in \mathcal{M}_{k}^\text{sym}$ with $T_{ij} \in \left[\frac{1}{2k}, \frac{3}{2k}\right]$ for all $i, j \in [k]$. Then there is an estimator $\hat{T}$ based on $Y^n$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{T} - T\|_F^2] \leq \frac{16k^2}{n-1},$$

where $\|\hat{T} - T\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} (\hat{T}_{ij} - T_{ij})^2}$ denotes the Frobenious norm.

We show how Lemma 11 leads to the desired lower bound on the mutual information $I(T; Y^n)$.

Since $k \geq 3$, we may assume that $k-1 = 2k_0$ is an even integer. Consider the following prior distribution $\pi$ on $T$: let $u = (u_{i,j})_{i,j \in [k_0], i \leq j}$ be iid and uniformly distributed in $[1/(4k_0), 3/(4k_0)]$, and $u_{i,j} = u_{j,i}$ for $i > j$. Let the transition matrix $T$ be given by

$$T_{2i-1,2j-1} = T_{2i,2j} = u_{i,j}, \quad T_{2i-1,2j} = T_{2i,2j-1} = \frac{1}{k_0} - u_{i,j}, \quad \forall i, j \in [k]. \quad (47)$$

It is easy to verify that $T$ is symmetric and a stochastic matrix, and each entry of $T$ is in the interval $[1/(4k_0), 3/(4k_0)]$. Since $2k_0 = k-1$, the condition of Lemma 11 is fulfilled, so there exist estimators $\hat{T}(Y^n)$ and $\hat{u}(Y^n)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{u}(Y^n) - u\|_2^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{T}(Y^n) - T\|_F^2] \leq \frac{64k_0^2}{n-1}. \quad (48)$$

Here and below, we identify $u$ and $\hat{u}$ as $\frac{k_0(k_0+1)}{2}$-dimensional vectors.

Let $h(X) = \int -f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx$ denote the differential entropy of a continuous random vector $X$ with density $f_X$ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure and $h(X|Y) = \int -f_{X|Y}(xy) \log f_{X|Y}(xy|y) dxdy$ the conditional differential entropy (cf. e.g. [CT06]). Then

$$h(u) = \sum_{i,j \in [k_0], i \leq j} h(u_{i,j}) = -\frac{k_0(k_0+1)}{2} \log(2k_0). \quad (49)$$

Then

$$I(T; Y^n) \overset{(a)}{=} I(u; Y^n) \overset{(b)}{\geq} I(u; \hat{u}(Y^n)) = h(u) - h(u|\hat{u}(Y^n)) \overset{(c)}{\geq} h(u) - h(u - \hat{u}(Y^n)) \overset{(d)}{\geq} \frac{k_0(k_0+1)}{4} \log \left(\frac{n-1}{1024\pi e k_0^2}\right) \geq \frac{k^2}{16} \log \left(\frac{n-1}{256\pi e k^2}\right).$$

where (a) is because $u$ and $T$ are in one-to-one correspondence by (47); (b) follows from the data processing inequality; (c) is because $h(\cdot)$ is translation invariant and concave; (d) follows from the maximum entropy principle [CT06]: $h(u - \hat{u}(Y^n)) \leq \frac{k_0(k_0+1)}{4} \log \left(\frac{2e}{k_0(k_0+1)/2} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{u}(Y^n) - u\|_2^2]\right)$, which in turn bounds by (48). Plugging this lower bound into Lemma 9 completes the lower bound proof of Theorem 1.
Motivated by this observation, consider the following estimator completing the proof. for \(i, j \in [k]\), let

\[
\hat{T}_{ij} = k \cdot \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n} 1\{Y_t=i, Y_{t+1}=j\}}{n-1}.
\]

Clearly \(E[\hat{T}_{ij}] = k \cdot P(Y_1 = i, Y_2 = j) = T_{ij}\). The following variance bound is shown in [TJW18, Lemma 7, Lemma 8] using the concentration inequality of [Pau15]:

\[
\text{Var}(\hat{T}_{ij}) \leq k^2 \cdot \frac{8T_{ij}k^{-1}}{\gamma_*(T)(n-1)},
\]

where \(\gamma_*(T)\) is the absolute spectral gap of \(T\) defined in (8). Note that \(T = k^{-1}J + \Delta\), where \(J\) is the all-one matrix and each entry of \(\Delta\) lying in \([-1/(2k), 1/(2k)]\). Thus the spectral radius of \(\Delta\) is at most 1/2 and thus \(\gamma_*(T) \geq 1/2\). Consequently, we have

\[
E[\|\hat{T} - T\|^2_F] = \sum_{i,j \in [k]} \text{Var}(\hat{T}_{ij}) \leq \sum_{i,j \in [k]} \frac{16kT_{ij}}{n-1} = \frac{16k^2}{n-1},
\]

completing the proof.

\[\square\]

4 \ Proofs of spectral gap-dependent risk bounds

4.1 Two states

To show Theorem 2, let us prove a refined version. In addition to the absolute spectral gap defined in (8), define the spectral gap

\[
\gamma \triangleq 1 - \lambda_2
\]

and \(\mathcal{M}_k(\gamma)\) the collection of transition matrices whose spectral gap exceeds \(\gamma\). Paralleling \(\text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma)\) defined in (9), define \(\text{Risk}'_{k,n}(\gamma)\) as the minimax prediction risk restricted to \(M \in \mathcal{M}_k(\gamma)\). Since \(\gamma \geq \gamma^*\), we have \(\mathcal{M}_k(\gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k(\gamma^*)\) and hence \(\text{Risk}'_{k,n}(\gamma) \geq \text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma)\). Nevertheless, the next result shows that for \(k = 2\) they have the same rate:

**Theorem 12** (Spectral gap dependent rates for binary chain). For any \(\gamma_0 \in (0, 1)\)

\[
\text{Risk}_{2,n}(\gamma_0) \asymp \text{Risk}'_{2,n}(\gamma_0) \asymp \frac{1}{n} \max \left\{ 1, \log \log \left( \min \left\{ n, \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \right\} \right) \right\}.
\]

We first prove the upper bound on \(\text{Risk}'_{2,n}\). Note that it is enough to show

\[
\text{Risk}'_{2,n}(\gamma_0) \lesssim \frac{\log \log (1/\gamma_0)}{n}, \quad \text{if } n^{-0.9} \leq \gamma_0 \leq e^{-e^5}.
\]

Indeed, for any \(\gamma_0 \leq n^{-0.9}\), the upper bound \(O(\log \log n/n)\) proven in [FOPS16], which does not depend on the spectral gap, suffices; for any \(\gamma_0 > e^{-e^5}\), by monotonicity we can use the upper bound \(\text{Risk}'_{2,n}(e^{-e^5})\).

We now define an estimator that achieves (51). Following [FOPS16], consider trajectories with a single transition, namely, \(\{2^{n-\ell}1, 1^{n-\ell}2^{\ell} : 1 \leq \ell \leq n-1\}\), where \(2^{n-\ell}1^{\ell}\) denotes the trajectory
$(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ with $x_1 = \cdots = x_{n-\ell} = 2$ and $x_{n-\ell+1} = \cdots = x_n = 1$. We refer to this type of $x^n$ as step sequences. For all non-step sequences $x^n$, we apply the add-$1/2$ estimator similar to (5), namely

$\hat{M}_x^n(j|i) = \frac{N_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}}{N_i + 1}, \quad i, j \in \{1, 2\},$

where the empirical counts $N_i$ and $N_{ij}$ are defined in (4); for step sequences of the form $2^{n-\ell}1^\ell$, we estimate by

$\hat{M}_\ell(2|1) = 1/(\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)), \quad \hat{M}_\ell(1|1) = 1 - \hat{M}_\ell(2|1). \quad (52)$

The other type of step sequences $1^{n-\ell}2^\ell$ are dealt with by symmetry.

Due to symmetry it suffices to analyze the risk for sequences ending in 1. The risk of add-$1/2$ estimator for the non-step sequence $1^n$ is bounded as

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\{X^n=1^n\}} D(M(\cdot|1)||\hat{M}_1^n(\cdot|1)) \right] = P_{X^n}(1^n) \left\{ M(2|1) \log \left( \frac{M(2|1)}{1/(2n)} \right) + M(1|1) \log \left( \frac{M(1|1)}{(n - \frac{1}{2})/n} \right) \right\}
\leq (1 - M(2|1))^{n-1} \left\{ 2M(2|1)^2 n + \log \left( \frac{n}{n - \frac{1}{2}} \right) \right\} \lesssim \frac{1}{n}.
$$

where the last step followed by using $(1 - x)^{n-1}x^2 \leq n^{-2}$ with $x = M(2|1)$ and $\log x \leq x - 1$. From [FOPS16, Lemma 7.8] we have that the total risk of other non-step sequences is bounded from above by $O(\frac{1}{\gamma})$ and hence it is enough to analyze the risk for step sequences, and further by symmetry, those in $\{2^{n-\ell}1^\ell : 1 \leq \ell \leq n - 1\}$. The desired upper bound (51) then follows from Lemma 13 next.

**Lemma 13.** For any $n^{-0.9} \leq \gamma_0 \leq e^{-c^2}$, $\hat{M}_\ell(\cdot|1)$ in (52) satisfies

$$
\sup_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2(\gamma_0)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\{X^n=2^{n-\ell}1^\ell\}} D(M(\cdot|1)||\hat{M}_\ell(\cdot|1)) \right] \lesssim \frac{\log(1/\gamma_0)}{n}.
$$

**Proof.** For each $\ell$ using $\log \left( \frac{1}{1-x} \right) \leq 2x, x \leq \frac{1}{2}$ with $x = \frac{1}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)}$,

$$
D(M(\cdot|1)||\hat{M}_\ell(\cdot|1)) = M(1|1) \log \left( \frac{M(1|1)}{1 - \frac{1}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)}} \right) + M(2|1) \log \left( \frac{M(2|1)}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)} \right)
\lesssim \frac{1}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)} + M(2|1) \log(M(2|1)\ell) + M(2|1) \log(1/\gamma_0)
\lesssim \frac{1}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)} + M(2|1) \log(M(2|1)\ell) + M(2|1) \log(1/\gamma_0), \quad (53)
$$

where we define $\log_+(x) = \max\{1, \log x\}$. Recall the following Chebyshev's sum inequality: for $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq b_n$, it holds that

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i b_i \leq \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right) \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i \right).
$$
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The following inequalities are thus direct corollaries: for \( x, y \in [0, 1], \)

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1}y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n-1}, \tag{54}
\]

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1}y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \log_+(\ell y) \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \log_+(\ell y) \right) \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} y(1-y)^{\ell-1}(1+\ell y) \leq \frac{2}{n}, \tag{55}
\]

where in (55) we need to verify that \( \ell \mapsto y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \log_+(\ell y) \) is non-increasing. To verify it, w.l.o.g. we may assume that \( (\ell+1)y \geq e, \) and therefore

\[
\frac{y(y-1)^{\ell-1} \log_+(\ell y)}{y(1-y)^{\ell-1} \log_+(\ell y)} = \frac{(1-y) \log((\ell+1)y)}{\log_+(\ell y)} \leq \left(1 - \frac{e}{\ell+1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\log(1+1/\ell)}{\log_+(\ell y)}\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{e}{\ell+1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ell}\right) < 1 + \frac{1}{\ell} - \frac{e}{\ell+1} < 1.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{\chi_i=2^{n-1}\ell\}} D(M(\cdot|1)||\widehat{M}_{\ell}(\cdot|1)) \right] \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} M(2|2)^{n-\ell-1} M(1|2) M(1|1)^{\ell-1} D(M(\cdot|1)||\widehat{M}_{\ell}(\cdot|1)) \leq \frac{M(2|2)^{n-1} M(1|2) M(1|1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell \log(1/\gamma_0)} + 2 + \log(1/\gamma_0), \tag{56}
\]

where (a) is due to (53), (b) follows from (54) and (55) applied to \( x = M(1|2), y = M(2|1). \) To deal with the remaining sum, we distinguish into two cases. Sticking to the above definitions of \( x \) and \( y, \) if \( y > \gamma_0/2, \) then

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \frac{x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1}(1-y)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1} \right) \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \frac{(1-y)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \right) \leq \frac{\log(2/\gamma_0)}{n-1},
\]

where the last step has used that \( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{\ell-1}/\ell = \log(1/(1-t)) \) for \(|t| < 1.\) If \( y \leq \gamma_0/2, \) notice that for two-state chain the spectral gap is given explicitly by \( \gamma = M(1|2) + M(2|1) = x + y, \) so that the assumption \( \gamma \geq \gamma_0 \) implies that \( x \geq \gamma_0/2. \) In this case,

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \frac{x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1}(1-y)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \leq \sum_{\ell<n/2} (1-x)^{n/2-1} + \sum_{\ell\geq n/2} x(1-x)^{n-\ell-1}/n^2 \leq \frac{n^2 e^{-(n/2-1)\gamma_0}}{2} + \frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n},
\]
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thanks to the assumption $\gamma_0 \geq n^{-0.9}$. Therefore, in both cases, the first term in (56) is $O(1/n)$, as desired.

Next we prove the lower bound on $\text{Risk}_{2,n}$. It is enough to show that $\text{Risk}_{2,n}(\gamma_0) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha} \log \log \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_0}\right)$ for $n^{-1} \leq \gamma_0 \leq e^{-\epsilon^5}$. Indeed, for $\gamma_0 \geq e^{-\epsilon^5}$, we can apply the result in the iid setting (see, e.g., [BFSS02]), in which the absolute spectral gap is 1, to obtain the usual parametric-rate lower bound $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$; for $\gamma_0 < n^{-1}$, we simply bound $\text{Risk}_{2,n}(\gamma_0)$ from below by $\text{Risk}_{2,n}(n^{-1})$. Define

$$\alpha = \log(1/\gamma_0), \quad \beta = \left[\frac{\alpha}{5 \log \alpha}\right], \quad (57)$$

and consider the prior distribution

$$\mathcal{M} = \text{Uniform}(\mathcal{M}), \quad \mathcal{M} = \left\{ M : M(1|2) = \frac{1}{n}, M(2|1) = \frac{1}{\alpha m} : m \in \mathbb{N} \cap (\beta, 5\beta) \right\}. \quad (58)$$

Then the lower bound part of Theorem 2 follows from the next lemma.

**Lemma 14.** Assume that $n^{-0.9} \leq \gamma_0 \leq e^{-\epsilon^5}$. Then

(i) $\gamma_s > \gamma_0$ for each $M \in \mathcal{M}$;

(ii) the Bayes risk with respect to the prior $\mathcal{M}$ is at least $\Omega\left(\frac{\log \log (1/\gamma_0)}{n}\right)$.

**Proof.** Part (i) follows by noting that absolute spectral gap for any two states matrix $M$ is $1 - |1 - M(2|1) - M(1|2)|$ and for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $M(2|1) \in (\alpha^{-5\beta}, \alpha^{-\beta}) \subseteq (\gamma_0, \gamma_0^{1/5}) \subseteq (\gamma_0, 1/2)$ which guarantees $\gamma_s = M(1|2) + M(2|1) > \gamma_0$.

To show part (ii) we lower bound the Bayes risk when the observed trajectory $X^n$ is a step sequence in $\{2^{n-\ell}1^\ell : 1 \leq \ell \leq n - 1\}$. Our argument closely follows that of [HOP18, Theorem 1]. Since $\gamma_0 \geq n^{-1}$, for each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, the corresponding stationary distribution $\pi$ satisfies

$$\pi_2 = \frac{M(2|1)}{M(2|1) + M(1|2)} \geq \frac{1}{2}. \quad (59)$$

Denote by $\text{Risk}(\mathcal{M})$ the Bayes risk with respect to the prior $\mathcal{M}$ and by $\hat{M}_\ell^B(\cdot|1)$ the Bayes estimator for prior $\mathcal{M}$ given $X^n = 2^{n-\ell}1^\ell$. Note that

$$\mathbb{P}[X^n = 2^{n-\ell}1^\ell] = \pi_2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{n-\ell-1} \frac{1}{n} M(1|1)^{\ell-1} \geq \frac{1}{2en} M(1|1)^{\ell-1}. \quad (59)$$

Then

$$\text{Risk}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}} \left[ \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1\{X^n = 2^{n-\ell}1^\ell\} D(M(\cdot|1)\|\hat{M}_\ell^B(\cdot|1)) \right] \right]$$

$$\geq \mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}} \left[ \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \frac{M(1|1)^{\ell-1}}{2en} D(M(\cdot|1)\|\hat{M}_\ell^B(\cdot|1)) \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2en} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}_{M \sim \mathcal{M}} \left[ M(1|1)^{\ell-1} D(M(\cdot|1)\|\hat{M}_\ell^B(\cdot|1)) \right]. \quad (60)$$
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Recalling the general form of the Bayes estimator in (21) and in view of (59), we get
\[
\hat{M}_\ell^B(2|1) = \frac{E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1|M(2|1)]}{E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]}, \quad \hat{M}_\ell^B(1|1) = 1 - \hat{M}_\ell^B(2|1).
\] (61)

Plugging (61) into (60), and using
\[
D((x, 1-x)||y, 1-y)) = x \log \frac{x}{y} + (1-x) \log \frac{1-x}{1-y} \geq x \max \left\{ 0, \log \frac{x}{y} - 1 \right\},
\]
we arrive at the following lower bound for the Bayes risk:
\[
\text{Risk}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \frac{1}{2en} \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}} \left[ M(1|1)\ell-1 M(2|1) \max \left\{ 0, \log \left( \frac{M(2|1)}{E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]} - 1 \right) \right\} \right].
\] (62)

Under the prior \(\mathcal{M} , M(2|1) = 1 - M(1|1) = \alpha^{-m} \) with \(\beta \leq m \leq 5\beta\).

We further lower bound (62) by summing over an appropriate range of \(\ell\). For any \(m \in [\beta, 3\beta]\), define
\[
\ell_1(m) = \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha^m}{\log \alpha} \right\rfloor, \quad \ell_2(m) = \left\lceil \alpha^m \log \alpha \right\rceil.
\]
Since \(\gamma_0 \leq e^{-e^\gamma}\), our choice of \(\alpha\) ensures that the intervals \(\{[\ell_1(m), \ell_2(m)]\}_{\beta \leq m \leq 3\beta}\) are disjoint. We will establish the following claim: for all \(m \in [\beta, 3\beta]\) and \(\ell \in [\ell_1(m), \ell_2(m)]\), it holds that
\[
\frac{\alpha^{-m} \cdot E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]}{E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]} \geq \frac{\log(1/\gamma_0)}{\log(1/\gamma_0)}.
\] (63)

We first complete the proof of the Bayes risk bound assuming (63). Using (62) and (63), we have
\[
\text{Risk}(\mathcal{M}) \geq \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{4\beta} \sum_{m=\beta}^{3\beta} \sum_{\ell=\ell_1(m)}^{\ell_2(m)} \alpha^{-m}(1 - \alpha^{-m})^{\ell-1} \cdot \log \log(1/\gamma_0)
\]
\[
= \frac{\log \log(1/\gamma_0)}{4n\beta} \sum_{m=\beta}^{3\beta} \left\{ (1 - \alpha^{-m})^{\ell_1(m)-1} - (1 - \alpha^{-m})^{\ell_2(m)} \right\}
\]
\[
\geq (a) \frac{\log \log(1/\gamma_0)}{4n\beta} \sum_{m=\beta}^{3\beta} \left( \frac{1}{4} - \left( \frac{1}{e} \right)^{-1+\log \alpha} \right) \geq \frac{\log \log(1/\gamma_0)}{n},
\]
with (a) following from \(\frac{1}{4} \leq (1-x)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{e} \) if \(x \leq \frac{1}{2}\), and \(\alpha^{-m} \leq \alpha^{-\beta} \leq \gamma_0^{1/5} \leq \frac{1}{2}\).

Next we prove the claim (63). Expanding the expectation in (58), we write the LHS of (63) as
\[
\frac{\alpha^{-m} \cdot E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]}{E_{M \sim \mathcal{M}}[M(1|1)\ell-1]} = \frac{X_\ell + A_\ell + B_\ell}{X_\ell + C_\ell + D_\ell},
\]
where
\[
X_\ell = (1 - \alpha^{-m})^\ell, \quad A_\ell = \sum_{j=\beta}^{m-1} (1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell, \quad B_\ell = \sum_{j=m+1}^{5\beta} (1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell,
\]
\[
C_\ell = \sum_{j=\beta}^{m-1} (1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell \alpha^{m-j}, \quad D_\ell = \sum_{j=m+1}^{5\beta} (1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell \alpha^{m-j}.
\]
We bound each of the terms individually. Clearly, \( X_\ell \in (0, 1) \) and \( A_\ell \geq 0 \). Thus it suffices to show that \( B_\ell \geq \beta \) and \( C_\ell, D_\ell \lesssim 1 \), for \( m \in [\beta, 3\beta] \) and \( \ell_1(m) \leq \ell \leq \ell_2(m) \). Indeed,

- For \( j \geq m + 1 \), we have

\[
(1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell \geq (1 - \alpha^{-j})^{\ell_2(m)} \geq (1/4) \frac{\ell_2(m)}{\alpha^j} \geq (1/4) \frac{\log \alpha}{\alpha} \geq 1/4,
\]

where in (a) we use the inequality \((1 - x)^{1/x} \geq 1/4\) for \( x \leq 1/2 \). Consequently, \( B_\ell \geq \beta/2 \);

- For \( j \leq m - 1 \), we have

\[
(1 - \alpha^{-j})^\ell \leq (1 - \alpha^{-j})^{\ell_1(m)} \leq e^{-\frac{\alpha^{m-j}}{\log \alpha}} = \gamma_0 \frac{\alpha^{m-j-1}}{\log \alpha},
\]

where (b) follows from \((1 - x)^{1/x} \leq 1/e\) and the definition of \( \ell_1(m) \). Consequently,

\[
C_\ell \leq \gamma_0 \frac{\alpha}{\log \alpha} \sum_{j=\beta}^{m-2} \alpha^{m-j} + \alpha \gamma_0 \frac{1}{\log \alpha} \leq e^{-\frac{\alpha^2}{\log \alpha} + (2\beta+1) \log \alpha} + e^{\log \alpha - \frac{\alpha}{\log \alpha}} \leq 2,
\]

where the last step uses the definition of \( \beta \) in (57);

- \( D_\ell \leq \sum_{j=m+1}^{5\beta} \alpha^{m-j} \leq 1 \), since \( \alpha = \log \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \geq e^5 \).

Combining the above bounds completes the proof of (63).

\[\square\]

### 4.2 \textit{k} states

#### 4.2.1 Proof of Theorem 3 (i)

Notice that the prediction problem consists of \( k \) sub-problems of estimating the individual rows of \( M \), so it suffices show the contribution from each of them is \( O(\frac{k}{n}) \). In particular, assuming the chain terminates in state 1 we bound the risk of estimating the first row by the add-one estimator \( \hat{M}^{+1}(j|1) = N_1 j + 1 \). Under the absolute spectral gap condition of \( \gamma_\ast \geq \gamma_0 \), we show

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n=1\}} D \left( M(\cdot|1) \| \hat{M}^{+1}(\cdot|1) \right) \right] \lesssim \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log k}{k\gamma_0}} \right).
\]

By symmetry, we get the desired \( \text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log k}{k\gamma_0}} \right) \).

The basic steps of our analysis are as follows:

- When \( N_1 \) is substantially smaller than its mean, we can bound the risk using the worst-case risk bound for add-one estimators and the probability of this rare event.

- Otherwise, we decompose the prediction risk as

\[
D(M(\cdot|1) \| \hat{M}^{+1}(\cdot|1)) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} M(j|1) \log \left( \frac{M(j|1)(N_1 + k)}{N_1 j + 1} \right) - M(j|1) + \frac{N_1 j + 1}{N_1 + k}.
\]

We then analyze each term depending on whether \( N_{1j} \) is typical or not. Unless \( N_{1j} \) is atypically small, the add-one estimator works well whose risk can be bounded quadratically.
To analyze the concentration of the empirical counts we use the following moment bounds. The proofs are deferred to Appendix B.

**Lemma 15.** Finite reversible and irreducible chains observe the following moment bounds:

(i) \[ \mathbb{E} \left[ (N_{ij} - n_i M(j|i))^2 \big| X_n = i \right] \lesssim n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma} + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma^*} \]

(ii) \[ \mathbb{E} \left[ (N_{ij} - n_i M(j|i))^4 \big| X_n = i \right] \lesssim (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma} + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma^*} \]

(iii) \[ \mathbb{E} \left[ (N_i - (n-1) \pi_i)^4 \big| X_n = i \right] \lesssim \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma^*} + \frac{1}{\gamma^*}. \]

When \( \gamma^* \) is high this shows that the moments behave as if for each \( i \in [k] \), \( N_i \) is approximately Binomial\((n - 1, \pi_i)\) and \( N_{ij} \) is approximately Binomial\((N_i, M(j|i))\), which happens in case of iid sampling. For iid models [KOPS15] showed that the add-one estimator achieves \( O\left( \frac{k}{n} \right) \) risk bound which we aim here too. In addition, dependency of the above moments on \( \gamma^* \) gives rise to sufficient conditions that guarantees parametric rate. The technical details are given below.

We decompose the left hand side in (64) based on \( N_i \) as

\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n=1\}} D\left( M\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \bigg\vert \hat{M}^{+1}\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^<\}} D\left( M\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \bigg\vert \hat{M}^{+1}\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^>\}} D\left( M\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \bigg\vert \hat{M}^{+1}\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \right) \right] \]

where the typical set \( A^< \) and atypical set \( A^> \) are defined as

\[ A^< \triangleq \{X_n = 1, N_1 \leq (n-1) \pi_1/2\}, \quad A^> \triangleq \{X_n = 1, N_1 > (n-1) \pi_1/2\}. \]

For the atypical case, note the following deterministic property of the add-one estimator. Let \( \hat{Q} \) be an add-one estimator with sample size \( n \) and alphabet size \( k \) of the form \( \hat{Q}_i = \frac{n_i + 1}{n_i + k} \), where \( \sum n_i = n \). Since \( \hat{Q} \) is bounded below by \( \frac{1}{n+k} \) everywhere, for any distribution \( P \), we have

\[ D(P\|\hat{Q}) \leq \log(n + k). \tag{65} \]

Applying this bound on the event \( A^< \), we have

\[ \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^<\}} D\left( M\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \bigg\vert \hat{M}^{+1}\left(\cdot \big| \cdot \right) \right) \right] \leq \log(n \pi_1 + k) \mathbb{P}[X_n = 1, N_1 \leq (n-1) \pi_1/2] \]

\[ \overset{(a)}{\lesssim} \left( \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{E} \left[ (N_1 - (n-1) \pi_1)^4 \big| X_n = 1 \right] \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{n \pi_1 \gamma_s \leq 10\}} \pi_1 \log(n \pi_1 + k) + 1_{\{n \pi_1 \gamma_s > 10\}} \pi_1 \log(n \pi_1 + k) \right] \end{array} \right) \frac{n \pi_1}{n+k} \]

\[ \overset{(b)}{\lesssim} \left( \begin{array}{c} \frac{10}{n \gamma_s} \log\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_s} + k\right) + 1_{\{n \pi_1 \gamma_s > 10\}} \log(n \pi_1 + k) \left( \frac{1}{n \pi_1 \gamma_s^4} + \frac{1}{n^{4/3} \pi_1 \gamma_s^4} \right) \\ \frac{1}{n \pi_1 \gamma_s^3} \log(1/\gamma_s) + \log k \right) \end{array} \right) \]

\[ \overset{(c)}{\lesssim} \left( \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{n} \left( 1_{\{n \pi_1 \gamma_s \leq 10\}} \frac{\log(1/\gamma_s)}{\gamma_s} + 1_{\{n \pi_1 \gamma_s > 10\}} (\pi_1 + \log k) \left( \frac{1}{n \pi_1 \gamma_s^4} + \frac{1}{n^{3/4} \pi_1 \gamma_s^4} \right) \right) \\ \frac{1}{n \gamma_0} + \frac{\log k}{n \gamma_0} \end{array} \right) \]

where we got (a) from Markov inequality, (b) from Lemma 15(iii) and (c) using \( x + y \leq xy, x, y \geq 2 \).
Next we bound $\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^>\}} D \left( M(\cdot|1) || \hat{M}^+(\cdot|1) \right) \right]$. Define

$$
\Delta_i = M(i|1) \log \left( \frac{M(i|1)}{M^+(i|1)} \right) - M(i|1) + \hat{M}^+(i|1).
$$

As $D(M(\cdot|1) || \hat{M}^+(\cdot|1)) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \Delta_i$, it suffices to bound $\mathbb{E} [1_{\{A^>\}} \Delta_i]$ for each $i$. For some $r \geq 1$ to be optimized later consider the following cases separately.

**Case (a) $n\pi_1 \leq r$ or $n\pi_1 M(i|1) \leq 10$:** Using the fact $y \log(y) - y + 1 \leq (y - 1)^2$ with $y = \frac{M(i|1)}{M^+(i|1)} N_{1i} + 1$, we get

$$
\Delta_i \leq \frac{(M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i} + M(i|1)k - 1)^2}{(N_1 + k)(N_{1i} + 1)}.
$$

This implies

$$
\mathbb{E} [1_{\{A^>\}} \Delta_i] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1_{\{A^>\}} (M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i} + M(i|1)k - 1)^2}{(N_1 + k)(N_{1i} + 1)} \right]
\overset{(a)}{\lesssim} \frac{1_{\{A^>\}} (M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i})^2}{n\pi_1 + k} + k^2 \pi_1 M(i|1)^2 + \pi_1
\overset{(b)}{\lesssim} \frac{\pi_1 \mathbb{E} \left[ (M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i})^2 \mid X\n = 1 \right]}{n\pi_1 + k} + \frac{1 + rkM(i|1)}{n},
$$

where (a) follows from $N_1 > \frac{(n-1)\pi_1}{2}$ in $A^>$ and the fact that $(x + y + z)^2 \leq 3(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)$; (b) uses the assumption that either $n\pi_1 \leq r$ or $n\pi_1 M(i|1) \leq 10$. Applying Lemma 15(i) and the fact that $x + x^2 \leq 2(1 + x^2)$, continuing the last display we get

$$
\mathbb{E} [1_{\{A^>\}} \Delta_i] \lesssim \frac{n\pi_1 M(i|1)}{n} + \frac{1 + M(i|1)}{\pi_1} \lesssim \frac{1 + rkM(i|1)}{n} + \frac{M(i|1)}{n\gamma_0^2}.
$$

Hence

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^>\}} D(M(\cdot|1) || \hat{M}^+(\cdot|1)) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{E} [1_{\{A^>\}} \Delta_i] \lesssim \frac{rk}{n} + \frac{1}{\gamma_0^2}.
$$

**Case (b) $n\pi_1 > r$ and $n\pi_1 M(i|1) > 10$:** We decompose $A^>$ based on count of $N_{1i}$ into atypical part $B^\leq$ and typical part $B^>$

$$
B^\leq = \{ X\n = 1, N_1 > (n - 1)\pi_1/2, N_{1i} \leq (n - 1)\pi_1 M(i|1)/4 \}
$$

$$
B^> = \{ X\n = 1, N_1 > (n - 1)\pi_1/2, N_{1i} > (n - 1)\pi_1 M(i|1)/4 \}
$$

and bound each of $\mathbb{E} [1_{\{B^\leq\}} \Delta_i]$ and $\mathbb{E} [1_{\{B^>\}} \Delta_i]$ separately.
Bound on $\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} \Delta_i\right]$. Using $\hat{M}^{+1}(i|1) \geq \frac{1}{N_i + k}$ and $N_{1i} < N_i M(i|1)/2$ in $B^c$ we get

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} \Delta_i\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} M(i|1) \log \left( \frac{M(i|1)(N_i + k)}{N_i + 1} \right) \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} \left( \frac{N_{1i} + 1}{N_i + k} - M(i|1) \right) \right]
$$

$$
\leq \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(N_i + k)) \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} \left( \frac{N_{1i}}{N_i} - M(i|1) \right) \right] + \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} \right]
$$

$$
\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(N_i + k)) \right] + \frac{1}{n}
$$

where the last inequality followed as $\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} / N_1\right] \lesssim \mathbb{P}[X_n = 1] / n \pi_1 = \frac{1}{n}$. Note that for any event $B$ and any function $g$,

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[g(N_1)1_{\{N_1 \geq t_0, B\}}\right] = g(t_0)\mathbb{P}[N_1 \geq t_0, B] + \sum_{t = t_0 + 1}^{n} (g(t) - g(t - 1)) \mathbb{P}[N_1 \geq t, B].
$$

Applying this identity with $t_0 = [(n - 1)\pi_1 / 2]$, we can bound the expectation term in (71) as

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[1_{\{B^c\}} M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(N_i + k)) \right]
$$

$$
= M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(t_0 + k)) \mathbb{P}\left[N_1 \geq t_0, N_{1i} \leq \frac{n \pi_1 M(i|1)}{4}, X_n = 1\right]
$$

$$
+ M(i|1) \sum_{t = t_0 + 1}^{n - 1} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{t - 1 + k}\right) \mathbb{P}\left[N_1 \geq t + 1, N_{1i} \leq \frac{n \pi_1 M(i|1)}{4}, X_n = 1\right]
$$

$$
\leq \pi_1 M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(t_0 + k)) \mathbb{P}\left[M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i} \geq \frac{M(i|1)t_0}{4} \mid X_n = 1\right]
$$

$$
+ \frac{M(i|1)}{n} \sum_{t = t_0 + 1}^{n - 1} \mathbb{P}\left[M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i} \geq \frac{M(i|1)t}{4} \mid X_n = 1\right]
$$

where last inequality uses $\log \left(1 + \frac{1}{t - 1 + k}\right) \leq \frac{1}{t} \leq \frac{1}{n \pi_1}$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Using Markov inequality $\mathbb{P}[Z > c] \leq c^{-4} \mathbb{E}[Z^4]$ for $c > 0$, Lemma 15(ii) and $x + x^4 \leq 2(1 + x^4)$ with $x = \sqrt{M(i|1)} / \gamma_s$

$$
\mathbb{P}\left[M(i|1)N_1 - N_{1i} \geq \frac{M(i|1)t}{4} \mid X_n = 1\right] \lesssim \frac{(n \pi_1 M(i|1))^2 + M(i|1)^2}{(tM(i|1))^4}.
$$
In view of above continuing (72) we get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \leq \}} M(i|1) \log (M(i|1)(N_1 + k)) \right]
\lesssim \left( n\pi_1 M(i|1) \right)^2 \left( \frac{M(i|1)^2}{\gamma_i^4} \right) \left( \frac{\pi_1 M(i|1) \log(M(i|1)(n\pi_1 + k))}{(n\pi_1 M(i|1))^4} + \frac{1}{n(M(i|1))^3} \sum_{i=10+1}^n \frac{1}{t_i^4} \right)
\lesssim \left( \frac{n\pi_1 M(i|1)}{n} \right)^2 \left( \frac{M(i|1)^2}{\gamma_i^2} \right) \left( \frac{\log(n\pi_1 M(i|1) + k M(i|1))}{(n\pi_1 M(i|1))^3} + \frac{1}{(n\pi_1 M(i|1))^3} \right)
\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n\pi_1 M(i|1)^2}{\gamma_i^4} \right) \log(n\pi_1 M(i|1) + k M(i|1))
\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left( \frac{n\pi_1 M(i|1) + k M(i|1)}{n\pi_1 M(i|1)} \right) + \frac{M(i|1) \log(n\pi_1 M(i|1))}{n\pi_1 M(i|1)^2} + \frac{M(i|1) \log k}{n\pi_1 M(i|1)}
\lesssim \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 + k M(i|1) + \frac{M(i|1) \log k}{r\gamma_0^3} \right)
\]

where (a) followed using \( x + y \leq xy \) for \( x, y \geq 2 \) and (b) followed as \( n\pi_1 \geq r, n\pi_1 M(i|1) \geq 10 \) and \( \log(n\pi_1 M(i|1)) \leq n\pi_1 M(i|1) \). In view of (71) this implies
\[
\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \leq \}} \Delta_i \right] \lesssim \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{n} \left( 1 + k M(i|1) \left( 1 + \frac{\log k}{r\gamma_0^4} \right) \right) \lesssim \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{\log k}{r\gamma_0^4} \right).
\]  

**Bound on \( \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \geq \}} \Delta_i \right] \)**

Using the inequality (68)
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \geq \}} \Delta_i \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1_{\{B \geq \}} (M(i|1)N_1 - N_i - M(i|1)k - 1)^2}{(N_1 + k)(N_1 + 1)} \right]
\lesssim \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1_{\{B \geq \}} \left( (M(i|1)N_1 - N_i) \right)^2}{(n\pi_1 + k)(n\pi_1 M(i|1) + 1)} \right] + k^2 \pi_1 M(i|1)^2 + \pi_1
\lesssim \frac{\pi_1 \mathbb{E} \left[ (M(i|1)N_1 - N_i) \right] X_n = 1}{(n\pi_1 + k)(n\pi_1 M(i|1) + 1)} + \frac{k M(i|1)}{n}
\]

where (a) follows using properties of the set \( B \) along with \((x + y + z)^2 \leq 3(x^2 + y^2 + z^2)\). Using Lemma 15(i) we get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \geq \}} \Delta_i \right] \lesssim \frac{n\pi_1 M(i|1) + \left( 1 + \frac{M(i|1)}{\gamma_i^2} \right)}{n(n\pi_1 M(i|1) + 1)} + \frac{k M(i|1)}{n} \lesssim \frac{1 + k M(i|1)}{n} + \frac{M(i|1) n\pi_1}{n \gamma_0^2}.
\]

Summing up the last bound over \( i \in [k] \) and using we get for \( n\pi_1 > r, n\pi_1 M(i|1) > 10 \)
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{A \geq \}} D(M(|\cdot|)||\tilde{M}^+1(|\cdot|)) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^k \left[ \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \leq \}} \Delta_i \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{B \geq \}} \Delta_i \right] \right] \lesssim \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k\gamma_0^2} + \frac{\log k}{r\gamma_0^4} \right).
\]
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Combining this with (70) we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1}_{\{A > \epsilon\}} D(M(\cdot|1)||\hat{M}^1(\cdot|1)) \right] \lesssim \frac{k}{n} \left( \frac{1}{k\gamma_0^{\gamma}} + r + \frac{\log k}{r k \gamma_0^{\gamma}} \right) \lesssim \frac{k}{n} \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\log k}{k\gamma_0^{\gamma}}} \right)
\]
where we chose \( r = 10 + \sqrt{\frac{\log k}{k\gamma_0^{\gamma}}} \) for the last inequality. In view of (67) this implies the required bound.

**Remark 4.** We explain the subtlety of the concentration bound in Lemma 15 based on fourth moment and why existing Chernoff bound or Chebyshev inequality falls short. For example, the risk bound in (67) relies on bounding the probability that \( N_1 \) is atypically small. To this end, one may use the classical Chernoff-type inequality for reversible chains (see [Lez98, Theorem 1.1] or [Pau15, Proposition 3.10 and Theorem 3.3])
\[
\mathbb{P} [N_1 \leq (n-1)\pi_1/2 | X_1 = 1] \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi_1}} e^{-\Theta(n\pi_1 \gamma^*)};
\]
in contrast, the fourth moment bound in (66) yields \( \mathbb{P} [N_1 \leq (n-1)\pi_1/2 | X_1 = 1] = O\left(\frac{1}{(n\pi_1 \gamma^*)^{2}}\right) \). Although the exponential tail in (74) is much better, the pre-factor \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi_1}} \), due to conditioning on the initial state, can lead to a suboptimal result when \( \pi_1 \) is small. (As a concrete example, consider two states with \( M(2|1) = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \) and \( M(1|2) = \Theta(1) \). Then \( \pi_1 = \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \gamma = \gamma^* \approx \Theta(1) \), and (74) leads to \( \mathbb{P} [N_1 \leq (n-1)\pi_1/2, X_n = 1] = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \) as opposed to the desired \( O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \).)

In the same context it is also insufficient to use 2nd moment based bound (Chebyshev), which leads to \( \mathbb{P} [N_1 \leq (n-1)\pi_1/2 | X_1 = 1] = O\left(1/n^{\pi_1 \gamma^*}\right) \). This bound is too loose, which, upon substitution into (66), results in an extra \( \log n \) factor in the final risk bound when \( \pi_1 \) and \( \gamma^* \) are large.

4.2.2 Proof of Theorem 3 (ii)

Let \( k \geq (\log n)^6 \) and \( \gamma_0 \geq \frac{(\log(n+k))^2}{k} \). We prove a stronger result using spectral gap as opposed to the absolute spectral gap. Fix \( M \) such that \( \gamma \geq \gamma_0 \). Denote its stationary distribution by \( \pi \). For absolute constants \( \tau > 0 \) to be chosen later and \( c_0 \) as in Lemma 16 below, define
\[
\epsilon(m) = \frac{2k}{m} + \frac{c_0 (\log n)^3 \sqrt{k}}{m}, \quad c_n = 100 \tau^2 \log n / n\gamma,
\]
\[
n_i = n \pi_i \pm \tau \max \left\{ \frac{\log n}{n\gamma}, \sqrt{\frac{\pi_i \log n}{n\gamma}} \right\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, k.
\]
Let $N_i$ be the number of visits to state $i$ as in (4). We bound the risk by accounting for the contributions from different ranges of $N_i$ and $\pi_i$ separately:

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} 1_{\{X_n = i\}} D \left( M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i) \right) \right] \\
= \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n = i, n_i^- \leq N_i \leq n_i^+\}} D \left( M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i) \right) \right] \\
+ \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n = i, N_i > n_i^+ \text{ or } N_i < n_i^-\}} D \left( M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i) \right) \right] + \sum_{i: \pi_i \leq c_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n = i\}} D \left( M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i) \right) \right]
$$

\[
\leq \log(n + k) \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \mathbb{P} \left[ D(M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i)) > \epsilon(N_i), n_i^- \leq N_i \leq n_i^+ \right] + \sum_{i: \pi_i \leq c_n} \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_n = i, n_i^- \leq N_i \leq n_i^+\}} \epsilon(N_i) \right] \\
+ \log(n + k) \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \left( \mathbb{P} \left[ N_i > n_i^+ \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[ N_i \leq n_i^- \right] \right) + \sum_{i: \pi_i \leq c_n} \pi_i \log(n + k)
\]

\[
\lesssim \log(n + k) \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \mathbb{P} \left[ D(M(\cdot|i) \| \hat{M}^{i+1}(\cdot|i)) > \epsilon(N_i), n_i^- \leq N_i \leq n_i^+ \right] + \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \pi_i \max_{n_i^- \leq m \leq n_i^+} \epsilon(m)
\]

\[
+ \log(n + k) \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \left( \mathbb{P} \left[ N_i > n_i^+ \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[ N_i < n_i^- \right] \right) + k \frac{(\log(n + k))^2}{n^\gamma}. \tag{76}
\]

where the first inequality uses the worst-case bound (65) for add-one estimator. We analyze the terms separately as follows.

For the second term, given any $i$ such that $\pi_i \geq c_n$, we have, by definition in (75), $n_i^- \geq 9n\pi_i/10$ and $n_i^+ - n_i^- \leq n\pi_i/5$, which implies

$$
\sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \pi_i \max_{n_i^- \leq m \leq n_i^+} \epsilon(m) \leq \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \pi_i \left( \frac{2k}{0.9n\pi_i} + \frac{10}{9} \frac{c_0(\log(n)^3 \sqrt{k}}{n\pi_i} \right) \leq \frac{k^2}{n} + \frac{(\log(n))^3 k^{3/2}}{n}. \tag{77}
$$

For the third term, applying [HJL18, Lemma 16] (which, in turn, is based on ther Bernstein inequality in [Pau15]), we get $\mathbb{P} \left[ N_i > n_i^+ \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[ N_i < n_i^- \right] \leq 2n^{\frac{3}{10} + \frac{2}{35}}$.

To bound the first term in (76), we follow the method in [Bil61,HJL+18] of representing the sample path of the Markov chain using independent samples generated from $M(\cdot|i)$ which we describe below. Consider a random variable $X_1 \sim \pi$ and an array $W = \{W_{i\ell} : i = 1, \ldots, k \text{ and } \ell = 1, 2, \ldots \}$ of independent random variables, such that $X$ and $W$ are independent and $W_{i\ell} \overset{iid}{\sim} M(\cdot|i)$ for each $i$. Starting with generating $X_1$ from $\pi$, at every step $i \geq 2$ we set $X_i$ as the first element in the $X_{i-1}$-th row of $W$ that has not been sampled yet. Then one can verify that $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ is a Markov chain with initial distribution $\pi$ and transition matrix $M$. Furthermore, the transition counts satisfy $N_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_i} 1_{\{W_{i\ell} = j\}}$, where $N_i$ be the number of elements sampled from the $i$th row of $W$. Note the conditioned on $N_i = m$, the random variables $\{W_{1i}, \ldots, W_{imi}\}$ are no longer iid. Instead, we apply a union bound. Note that for each fixed $m$, the estimator

$$
\hat{M}^{i+1}(j|i) = \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^{m} 1_{\{W_{\ell\ell} = j\}} + 1}{m + k} \hat{M}^{i+1}(j|i), \quad j \in [k]
$$

is an add-one estimator for $M(\cdot|i)$ based on an iid sample of size $m$. Lemma 16 below provides a high-probability bound for the add-one estimator in this iid setting. Using this result and the
union bound, we have
\[
\sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \mathbb{P} \left[ D(M(\cdot | i)) \| \widehat{M}^{+1}(\cdot | i) > \epsilon(N_i), n_i^- \leq N_i \leq n_i^+ \right] \\
\leq \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} (n_i^+ - n_i^-) \max_{n_i^- \leq m \leq n_i^+} \mathbb{P} \left[ D(M(\cdot | i)) \| \widehat{M}^{+1}(\cdot | i) > \epsilon(m) \right] \leq \sum_{i: \pi_i \geq c_n} \frac{1}{n_i^2} \leq \frac{k}{n^2}
\]
where the second inequality applies Lemma 16 with \( t = n \geq n_i^+ \geq m \) and uses \( n_i^+ - n_i^- \leq n \pi_i / 5 \) for \( \pi_i \geq c_n \).

Combining the above with (77), we continue (76) with \( \tau = 25 \) to get
\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} 1_{\{X_i = i\}} D \left( M(\cdot | i) \| \widehat{M}^{+1}(\cdot | i) \right) \right] \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n} + \frac{(\log n)^3 k^{3/2}}{n} + k (\log(n + k))^2
\]
which is \( O \left( \frac{k^2}{n} \right) \) whenever \( k \geq (\log n)^6 \) and \( \gamma \geq \frac{(\log(n+k))^2}{k} \).

**Lemma 16** (KL risk bound for add-one estimator). Let \( V_1, \ldots, V_m \overset{iid}{\sim} Q \) for some distribution \( Q = \{Q_i\}_{i=1}^{k} \) on \([k]\). Consider the add-one estimator \( \widehat{Q}^{+1} \) with \( \widehat{Q}_i^{+1} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} 1_{\{V_j = i\}} + 1}{m+k} \). There exists an absolute constant \( c_0 \) such that for any \( t \geq m \),
\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ D(Q \| \widehat{Q}^{+1}) \geq \frac{2k}{m} + \frac{c_0(\log t)^3 \sqrt{k}}{m} \right] \leq \frac{1}{t^3}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( \widehat{Q} \) be the empirical estimator \( \widehat{Q}_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} 1_{\{V_j = i\}} \). Then \( \widehat{Q}_i^{+1} = \frac{m \widehat{Q}_i + 1}{m+k} \) and hence
\[
D(Q \| \widehat{Q}^{+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{\widehat{Q}_i^{+1}} - Q_i + \widehat{Q}_i^{+1} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i (m+k)}{m \widehat{Q}_i + 1} - Q_i + \frac{m \widehat{Q}_i + 1}{m+k} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{Q_i + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \frac{1}{m} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{m+k}{m \widehat{Q}_i + 1} - \frac{k \widehat{Q}_i}{m+k} - \frac{k}{m(m+k)} \right)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{Q_i + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \frac{1}{m} \right) + \frac{k}{m}
\]
(78)

with last equality following by \( 0 \leq \log \left( \frac{m+k}{m} \right) \leq k/m \).

To control the sum in the above display it suffices to consider its Poissonized version. Specifically, we aim to show
\[
\mathbb{P} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{\widehat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \widehat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} + \frac{1}{m} \right) > \frac{k}{m} + \frac{c_0(\log t)^3 \sqrt{k}}{m} \right] \leq \frac{1}{t^4}
\]
(79)

where \( m \widehat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}}, i = 1, \ldots, k \) are distributed independently as \( \text{Poi}(mQ_i) \). (Here and below \( \text{Poi}(\lambda) \) denotes the Poisson distribution with mean \( \lambda \).) To see why (79) implies the desired result, letting
\[ w = \frac{k}{m} + \frac{c_0 (\log t)^3 \sqrt{\sigma}}{m} \] and \( Y = \sum_{i=1}^{k} m\hat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} \sim \text{Poi}(m) \), we have

\[
P \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{Q_i + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \hat{Q}_i + \frac{1}{m} \right) > w \right]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{Q_i + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \hat{Q}_i + \frac{1}{m} \right) > w \left| \sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i^{\text{poi}} = 1 \right.
\]

where (a) followed from the fact that conditioned on their sum independent Poisson random variables follow a multinomial distribution; (b) applies (79); (c) follows from Stirling’s approximation.

To prove (79) we rely on concentration inequalities for sub-exponential distributions. A random variable \( X \) is called sub-exponential with parameters \( \sigma^2, b > 0 \), denoted as \( \text{SE}(\sigma^2, b) \) if

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ e^{\lambda (X - \mathbb{E}[X])} \right] \leq e^{\frac{\lambda^2 \sigma^2}{2b}}, \quad \forall|\lambda| < \frac{1}{b}.
\] (81)

Sub-exponential random variables satisfy the following properties [Wai19, Sec. 2.1.3]:

- If \( X \) is \( \text{SE}(\sigma^2, b) \) for any \( t > 0 \)
  \[ \mathbb{P} \left[ |X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq v \right] \leq \begin{cases} 2e^{-v^2/(2\sigma^2)}, & 0 < v \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{b} \\ 2e^{-v/(2b)}, & v > \frac{\sigma^2}{b} \end{cases} \] (82)

- Bernstein condition: A random variable \( X \) is \( \text{SE}(\sigma^2, b) \) if it satisfies
  \[ \mathbb{E} \left[ |X - \mathbb{E}[X]|^\ell \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \ell! \sigma^2 b^{\ell-2}, \quad \ell = 2, 3, \ldots \] (83)

- If \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \) are independent \( \text{SE}(\sigma^2, b) \), then \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i \) is \( \text{SE}(k\sigma^2, b) \).

Define \( X_i = Q_i \log \frac{Q_i}{Q_i + \frac{1}{m}} - Q_i + \hat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} + \frac{1}{m}, \quad i \in [k] \). Then Lemma 17 below shows that \( X_i \)’s are independent \( \text{SE}(\sigma^2, b) \) with \( \sigma^2 = \frac{c_1 (\log m)^2}{m}, \quad b = \frac{c_2 (\log m)^2}{n} \) for absolute constants \( c_1, c_2 \), and hence \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) \) is \( \text{SE}(k\sigma^2, b) \). In view of (82) for the choice \( c_0 = 8(c_1 + c_2) \) this implies

\[
P \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) \geq c_0 \left( \frac{\log t}{m} \right)^3 \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{m}} \right] \leq 2e^{-\frac{c_0 (\log t)^6}{2m^2 \sigma^2}} + 2e^{-\frac{c_0 \sqrt{\log t}^3}{2mb}} \leq \frac{1}{t^3}.
\] (84)

Using \( 0 \leq y \log y - y + 1 \leq (y - 1)^2, \quad y > 0 \) and \( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\lambda}{\text{Poi}(\lambda) + 1} \right] = \sum_{v=0}^{\infty} e^{-(v+1)\lambda} = 1 - e^{-\lambda} \)

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( Q_i - \left( \hat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} + \frac{1}{m} \right) \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{k} mQ_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{m\hat{Q}_i^{\text{poi}} + 1} \right] - 1 + \frac{k}{m} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Q_i (1 - e^{-mQ_i}) - 1 + \frac{k}{m} \leq \frac{k}{m}.
\]

Combining the above with (84) we get (79) as required. \( \square \)
Lemma 17. There exist absolute constants $c_1, c_2$ such that the following holds. For any $p \in (0,1)$ and $nY \sim \text{Poi}(np)$, $X = p \log \frac{p}{Y + \frac{1}{n}} - p + Y + \frac{1}{n}$ is $\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{c_1 (\log n)^2}{n^2}, \frac{c_2 (\log n)^2}{n} \right)$.

Proof. Note that $X$ is a non-negative random variable. Since $\mathbb{E} \left[ (X - \mathbb{E}[X])^\ell \right] \leq 2^\ell \mathbb{E} \left[ X^\ell \right]$, by the Bernstein condition (83), it suffices to show $\mathbb{E}[X^\ell] \leq \left( \frac{c_2 (\log n)^2}{n} \right)^\ell$, $\ell = 2, 3, \ldots$ for some absolute constant $c_3$. guarantees the desired sub-exponential behavior. The analysis is divided into following two cases for some absolute constant $c_4 \geq 24$.

Case I $p \geq \frac{c_4 \ell \log n}{n}$: Using Chernoff bound for Poisson [Jan02, Theorem 3]

$$
\mathbb{P} \left[ |\text{Poi}(\lambda) - \lambda| > x \right] \leq 2e^{- \frac{x^2}{2(\lambda + x/\sqrt{\lambda})}}, \quad \lambda, x > 0,
$$

we get

$$
\mathbb{P} \left[ |Y - p| > \sqrt{\frac{c_4 \ell p \log n}{4n}} \right] \leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{c_4 \ell p \log n}{8np + 2\sqrt{c_4 \ell p \log n}} \right)
\leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{c_4 \ell \log n}{8 + 2\sqrt{c_4 \ell \log n/np}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{n^{2\ell}}
$$

which implies $p/2 \leq Y \leq 2p$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-2\ell}$. Since $0 \leq X \leq \frac{(Y-p-\frac{1}{n})^2}{Y + \frac{1}{n}}$, we get

$$
\mathbb{E}[X^\ell] \lesssim \left( \frac{\sqrt{c_4 \ell \log n/4n}}{p/2} \right)^{2\ell} + \frac{n \ell}{n^{2\ell}} \lesssim \left( \frac{c_4 \ell \log n}{n} \right)^\ell.
$$

Case II $p < \frac{c_4 \ell \log n}{n}$:

- On the event $\{Y > p\}$, we have $X \leq Y + \frac{1}{n} \leq 2Y$, where the last inequality follows because $nY$ takes non-negative integer values. Since $X \geq 0$, we have $X^\ell 1_{\{Y > p\}} \leq (2Y)^\ell 1_{\{Y > p\}}$ for any $\ell \geq 2$. Using the Chernoff bound (85), we get $Y \leq \frac{2c_4 \ell \log n}{n}$ with probability at least $1 - n^{-2\ell}$, which implies

$$
\mathbb{E} \left[ X^\ell 1_{\{Y > p\}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ (2Y)^\ell 1_{\{Y > p, Y \leq \frac{2c_4 \ell \log n}{n}\}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ (2Y)^\ell 1_{\{Y > p, Y > \frac{2c_4 \ell \log n}{n}\}} \right]
\leq \left( \frac{4c_4 \ell \log n}{n} \right)^\ell + 2^\ell \left( \mathbb{E}[Y^{2\ell}] \mathbb{P} \left[ Y > \frac{2c_4 \ell \log n}{n} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \left( \frac{c_5 \ell \log n}{n} \right)^\ell
$$

for absolute constant $c_5$. Here, the last inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz and using the Poisson moment bound [Ahl21, Theorem 2.1].

$$
\mathbb{E}[X^{2\ell}] \leq \left( \frac{2\ell}{\log (1 + \frac{2\ell}{np})} \right)^{2\ell} \leq (c_6 \ell \log n)^{2\ell}
$$

for some absolute constant $c_6$, with the second inequality applying the assumption $p < \frac{c_4 \ell \log n}{n}$.

- As $X 1_{\{Y \leq p\}} \leq p \log n + \frac{1}{n} \lesssim \ell (\log n)^2$, we get $\mathbb{E} \left[ X^\ell 1_{\{Y \leq p\}} \right] \leq \left( \frac{c_7 \ell (\log n)^2}{n} \right)^\ell$ for some absolute constant $c_7$.

\[\square\]

4 For a result with less precise constants, see also [Ahl21, Eq. (1)] based on [Lat97, Corollary 1].
4.2.3 Proof of Corollary 4

We show the following monotonicity result of the prediction risk. In view of this result, Corollary 4 immediately follows from Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 (i). Intuitively, the optimal prediction risk is monotonically increasing with the number of states; this, however, does not follow immediately due to the extra assumptions of irreducibility, reversibility, and prescribed spectral gap.

Lemma 18. \( \text{Risk}_{k+1,n}(\gamma_0) \geq \text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \) for all \( \gamma_0 \in (0, 1), k \geq 2 \).

Proof. Fix an \( M \in \mathcal{M}_k(\gamma_0) \) such that \( \gamma_M(M) > \gamma_0 \). Denote the stationary distribution \( \pi \) such that \( \pi M = \pi \). Fix \( \delta \in (0, 1) \) and define a transition matrix \( \tilde{M} \) with \( k+1 \) states as follows:

\[
\tilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix}
(1 - \delta)M & \delta \mathbf{1} \\
(1 - \delta)\pi & \delta
\end{pmatrix}
\]

One can verify the following:

- \( \tilde{M} \) is irreducible and reversible;
- The stationary distribution for \( \tilde{M} \) is \( \tilde{\pi} = ((1 - \delta)\pi, \delta) \);
- The absolute spectral gap of \( \tilde{M} \) is \( \gamma_M(\tilde{M}) = (1 - \delta)\gamma_M(M) \), so that \( \tilde{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\gamma_0) \) for all sufficiently small \( \delta \);
- Let \( (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) and \( (\tilde{X}_1, \ldots, \tilde{X}_n) \) be stationary Markov chains with transition matrices \( M \) and \( \tilde{M} \), respectively. Then as \( \delta \to 0 \), \( (X_1, \ldots, X_n) \) converges to \( (\tilde{X}_1, \ldots, \tilde{X}_n) \) in law, i.e., the joint probability mass function converges pointwise.

Next fix any estimator \( \hat{M} \) for state space \([k + 1]\). Note that without loss of generality we can assume \( \hat{M}(j|i) > 0 \) for all \( i, j \in [k + 1] \) for otherwise the KL risk is infinite. Define \( \hat{M}_\text{trunc} \) as \( \hat{M} \) without the \( k+1 \)-th row and column, and denote by \( \hat{M}' \) its normalized version, namely, \( \hat{M}'(-i) = \frac{\hat{M}_\text{trunc}(-i)}{1 - \hat{M}_\text{trunc}(-1)} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). Then

\[
\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}_n} \left[ D(\hat{M}(-|X_n)||\hat{M}'(-|X_n)) \right] \overset{\delta \to 0}{\longrightarrow} \mathbb{E}_{X_n} \left[ D(M(-|X_n)||\hat{M}'(-|X_n)) \right] \\
\geq \mathbb{E}_{X_n} \left[ D(M(-|X_n)||\hat{M}'(-|X_n)) \right] \\
\geq \inf_{\hat{M}} \mathbb{E}_{X_n} \left[ D(M(-|X_n)||\hat{M}'(-|X_n)) \right]
\]

where in the first step we applied the convergence in law of \( \tilde{X}_n \) to \( X^n \) and the continuity of \( P \mapsto D(P||Q) \) for fixed componentwise positive \( Q \); in the second step we used the fact that for any sub-probability measure \( Q = (q_i) \) and its normalized version \( \tilde{Q} = Q/\alpha \) with \( \alpha = \sum q_i \leq 1 \), we have \( D(P||Q) = D(P||\tilde{Q}) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha} \geq D(P||\tilde{Q}) \). Taking the supremum over \( M \in \mathcal{M}_k(\gamma_0) \) on the LHS and the supremum over \( \tilde{M} \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(\gamma_0) \) on the RHS, and finally the infimum over \( \hat{M} \) on the LHS, we conclude \( \text{Risk}_{k+1,n}(\gamma_0) \geq \text{Risk}_{k,n}(\gamma_0) \). \( \square \)

5 Discussions and open problems

We discuss the assumptions and implications of our results as well as related open problems.
Very large state space. Theorem 1 determines the optimal prediction risk under the assumption of \( k \lesssim \sqrt{n} \). When \( k \gtrsim \sqrt{n} \), Theorem 1 shows that the KL risk is bounded away from zero. However, as the KL risk can be as large as \( \log k \), it is a meaningful question to determine the optimal rate in this case, which, thanks to the general reduction in (11), reduces to determining the redundancy for symmetric and general Markov chains. For iid data, the minimax pointwise redundancy is known to be \( n \log k + O(n^2) \) [SW12, Theorem 1] when \( k \gg n \). Since the average and pointwise redundancy usually behave similarly, for Markov chains it is reasonable to conjecture that the redundancy is \( \Theta(n \log k) \) in the large alphabet regime of \( k \gtrsim \sqrt{n} \), which, in view of (11), would imply the optimal prediction risk is \( \Theta(n \log k) \) for \( k \gg \sqrt{n} \). In comparison, we note that the prediction risk is at most \( \log k \), achieved by the uniform distribution.

Other loss functions As mentioned in Section 1.1, standard arguments based on concentration inequalities inevitably rely on mixing conditions such as the spectral gap. In contrast, the risk bound in Theorem 1, which is free of any mixing condition, is enabled by powerful techniques from universal compression which bound the redundancy by the pointwise maximum over all trajectories combined with information-theoretic or combinatorial argument. This program only relies on the Markovity of the process rather than stationarity or spectral gap assumptions. The limitation of this approach, however, is that the reduction between prediction and redundancy crucially depends on the form of the KL loss function in (1), which allows one to use the mutual information representation and the chain rule to relate individual risks to the cumulative risk. More general loss in terms of \( f \)-divergence have been considered in [HOP18]. Obtaining spectral gap-independent risk bound for these loss functions, this time without the aid of universal compression, is an open question.

Stationarity As mentioned above, the redundancy result in Lemma 6 (see also [Dav83, TJW18]) holds for nonstationary Markov chains as well. However, our redundancy-based risk upper bound in Lemma 5 crucially relies on stationarity. It is unclear whether the result of Theorem 1 carries over to nonstationary chains.

A Mutual information representation of prediction risk

The following lemma justifies the representation (22) for the prediction risk as maximal conditional mutual information. Unlike (17) for redundancy which holds essentially without any condition [Kem74], here we impose certain compactness assumptions which hold finite alphabets such as finite-state Markov chains studied in this paper.

**Lemma 19.** Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be finite and let \( \Theta \) be a compact subset of \( \mathbb{R}^d \). Given \( \{ P_{X^{n+1}|\theta} : \theta \in \Theta \} \), define the prediction risk

\[
\text{Risk}_n \triangleq \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n,\theta} \| Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} | P_{X^n}(\theta)),
\]

(87)

Then

\[
\text{Risk}_n = \sup_{P_{\theta} \in \mathcal{M}(\Theta)} I(\theta; X_{n+1}|X^n).
\]

(88)

where \( \mathcal{M}(\Theta) \) denotes the collection of all (Borel) probability measures on \( \Theta \).

\[\text{In fact, this connection breaks down if one swap } M \text{ and } \hat{M} \text{ in the KL divergence in (1).}\]
Note that for stationary Markov chains, (22) follows from Lemma 19 since one can take $\theta$ to be the joint distribution of $(X_1, \ldots, X_{n+1})$ itself which forms a compact subset of the probability simplex on $X^{n+1}$.

**Proof.** It is clear that (87) is equivalent to

$$\text{Risk}_n = \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \in M(\Theta)} \sup_{P_0 \in M(\Theta)} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} | P_{X^n}).$$

By the variational representation (14) of conditional mutual information, we have

$$I(\theta; X_{n+1} | X^n) = \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} | P_{X^n}).$$

Thus (88) amounts to justifying the interchange of infimum and supremum in (87). It suffices to prove the upper bound.

Let $|X| = K$. For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, define an auxiliary quantity:

$$\text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon} = \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \in M(\Theta)} \sup_{P_0 \in M(\Theta) \ni \epsilon U \leq \frac{\epsilon}{K}} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} | P_{X^n}),$$

where the constraint in the infimum is pointwise, namely, $Q_{X_{n+1}=x_{n+1}|X^n=x^n} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{K}$ for all $x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \in X$. By definition, we have $\text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon}$. Furthermore, $\text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon}$ can be equivalently written as

$$\text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon} = \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \in M(\Theta)} \sup_{P_0 \in M(\Theta) \ni \epsilon U \leq \frac{\epsilon}{K}} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel (1 - \epsilon)Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} + \epsilon U | P_{X^n}),$$

where $U$ denotes the uniform distribution on $X$.

We first show that the infimum and supremum in (91) can be interchanged. This follows from the standard minimax theorem. Indeed, note that $D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel (1 - \epsilon)Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} + \epsilon U | P_{X^n})$ is convex in $Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}$, affine in $P_0$, continuous in each argument, and takes values in $[0, \log \frac{K}{\epsilon}]$. Since $M(\Theta)$ is convex and weakly compact (by Prokhorov’s theorem) and the collection of conditional distributions $Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}$ is convex, the minimax theorem (see, e.g., [Fan53, Theorem 2]) yields

$$\text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon} = \sup_{\pi \in M(\Theta)} \inf_{Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n}} D(P_{X_{n+1}|X^n} \parallel (1 - \epsilon)Q_{X_{n+1}|X^n} + \epsilon U | P_{X^n}).$$

Finally, by the convexity of the KL divergence, for any $P$ on $X$, we have

$$D(P \parallel (1 - \epsilon)Q + \epsilon U) \leq (1 - \epsilon)D(P \parallel Q) + \epsilon D(P \parallel U) \leq (1 - \epsilon)D(P \parallel Q) + \epsilon \log K,$$

which, in view of (89) and (92), implies

$$\text{Risk}_n \leq \text{Risk}_{n, \epsilon} \leq \sup_{P_0 \in M(\Theta)} I(\theta; X_{n+1} | X^n) + \epsilon \log K.$$

By the arbitrariness of $\epsilon$, (88) follows. \qed

**B Proof of Lemma 15**

Recall that for any irreducible and reversible finite states transition matrix $M$ with stationary distribution $\pi$ the followings are satisfied:

1. $\pi_i > 0$ for all $i$. 


2. \( M(j|i)\pi_i = M(i|j)\pi_j \) for all \( i, j \).

The following is a direct consequence of the Markov property.

**Lemma 20.** For any \( 1 \leq t_1 < \cdots < t_m < \cdots < t_k \) and any \( Z_2 = f(X_{t_k}, \ldots, X_{t_m}), Z_1 = g(X_{t_{m-1}}, \ldots, X_{t_1}) \) we have

\[
\mathbb{E} [Z_2 1_{\{X_{t_m} = j\}} Z_1 | X_1 = i] = \mathbb{E} [Z_2 | X_{t_m} = j] \mathbb{E} [1_{\{X_{t_m} = j\}} | Z_1 | X_1 = i]
\]

(93)

For \( t \geq 0 \), denote the \( t \)-step transition probability by \( P[X_{t+1} = j | X_1 = i] = M^t(i|j) \), which is the \( ij \)th entry of \( M^t \). The following result is standard (see, e.g., [LP17, Chap. 12]). We include the proof mainly for the purpose of introducing the spectral decomposition.

**Lemma 21.** Define \( \lambda_s \triangleq 1 - \gamma_s = \max \{|\lambda_i| : i \neq 1\} \). For any \( t \geq 0 \), \( |M^t(i|j) - \pi_j| \leq \lambda_s^t \sqrt{\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}} \).

**Proof.** Throughout the proof all vectors are column vectors except for \( \pi \). Let \( D_\pi \) denote the diagonal matrix with entries \( D_\pi(i, i) = \pi_i \). By reversibility, \( D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} M D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} \), which shares the same spectrum with \( M \), is a symmetric matrix and admits the spectral decomposition \( D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} M D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{a=1}^{k} \lambda_a u_a u_a^\top \) for some orthonormal basis \( \{u_1, \ldots, u_k\} \); in particular, \( \lambda_1 = 1 \) and \( u_i = \sqrt{\pi_i} \). Then for each \( t \geq 1 \),

\[
M^t = \sum_{a=1}^{k} \lambda_a^t D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_a u_a^\top D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 1\pi + \sum_{a=2}^{k} \lambda_a^t D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}} u_a u_a^\top D_\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

(94)

where \( 1 \) is the all-ones vector. As \( u_a \)'s satisfy \( \sum_{a=1}^{k} u_a u_a^\top = I \) we get \( \sum_{a=2}^{k} u_a^2 = 1 - u_1^2 \leq 1 \) for any \( b = 1, \ldots, k \). Using this along with Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

\[
|M^t(i|j) - \pi_j| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}} \sum_{a=2}^{k} |\lambda_a|^t |u_{ai} u_{aj}| \leq \lambda_s^t \sqrt{\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}} \left( \sum_{a=2}^{k} u_{ai}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{a=2}^{k} u_{aj}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \lambda_s^t \sqrt{\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}}
\]

as required.

\[ \square \]

**Lemma 22.** Fix states \( i, j \). For any integers \( a \geq b \geq 1 \), define

\[
h_s(a, b) = \mathbb{E} [1_{\{X_{a+1} = i\}} (1\{X_{a} = j\} - M(j|i))^s | X_b = i], \quad s = 1, 2, 3, 4.
\]

Then

(i) \( h_1(a, b) \leq 2 \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_s^{a-b}} \)

(ii) \( h_2(a, b) - \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) \leq 4 \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_s^{a-b}} \).

(iii) \( h_3(a, b), h_4(a, b) \leq \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + 4 \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_s^{a-b}} \).

**Proof.** We apply Lemma 21 and time reversibility:

(i)

\[
h_1(a, b) = \mathbb{P} [X_{a+1} = i, X_a = j | X_b = i] - M(j|i) \mathbb{P} [X_{a+1} = i | X_b = i] = M(i|j) M^{a-b}(j|i) - M(j|i) M^{a-b+1}(i|i) \leq M(i|j) \left| M^{a-b}(j|i) - \pi_j \right| + M(j|i) \left| M^{a-b+1}(i|i) - \pi_i \right| \leq \lambda_s^{a-b} M(i|j) \sqrt{\frac{\pi_j}{\pi_i}} + M(j|i) \lambda_s^{a-b+1} \leq 2 \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_s^{a-b}}.
\]
(ii) \[ |h_2(a, b) - \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i))| \]
\[
= \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_{a+1} = i, X_a = j\}} | X_b = i \right] - \pi_i M(j|i) + (M(j|i))^2 (\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_{a+1} = i\}} | X_b = i \right] - \pi_i) \\
- 2M(j|i) (\mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_{a+1} = i, X_a = j\}} | X_b = i \right] - \pi_i M(j|i)) \\
\leq |\mathbb{P}[X_{a+1} = i, X_a = j | X_b = i] - \pi_j M(i|j)| + (M(j|i))^2 |\mathbb{P}[X_{a+1} = i | X_b = i] - \pi_i| \\
+ 2M(j|i) |\mathbb{P}[X_{a+1} = i, X_a = j | X_b = i] - \pi_j M(i|j)| \\
= M(i|j) |M^{a-b}(j|i) - \pi_j| + (M(j|i))^2 |M^{a-b+1}(i|j) - \pi_i| + 2M(j|i) M(i|j) |M^{a-b}(j|i) - \pi_j| \\
\leq M(i|j) \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\pi_i}} \lambda^{a-b} + (M(j|i))^2 \lambda^{a-b+1} + 2M(j|i) M(i|j) \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{\pi_i}} \lambda^{a-b} \\
\leq \lambda^{a-b} \left( \sqrt{\frac{M(i|j) \pi_i}{\eta}} + (M(j|i))^2 \sqrt{\frac{M(i|j) \pi_i}{\eta}} \right) \\
\leq 4 \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda^{a-b}.
\]

(iii) \( h_3(a, b), h_4(a, b) \leq h_2(a, b). \) \( \square \)

**Proof of Lemma 15(i).** For ease of notation we use \( c_0 \) to denote an absolute constant whose value may vary at each occurrence. Fix \( i, j \in [k] \). Note that the empirical count defined in (4) can be written as \( N_i = \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} 1_{\{X_{n-a} = i\}} \) and \( N_{ij} = \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} 1_{\{X_{n-a} = i, X_{n-a+1} = j\}} \). Then

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ (M(j|i)N_i - N_{ij})^2 | X_n = i \right] \\
= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} 1_{\{X_{n-a} = i\}} \left( 1_{\{X_{n-a+1} = j\}} - M(j|i) \right) \right)^2 | X_n = i \right] \\
\overset{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} 1_{\{X_{a+1} = i\}} \left( 1_{\{X_a = j\}} - M(j|i) \right) \right)^2 | X_1 = i \right] \\
\overset{(b)}{=} \sum_{a, b} |\mathbb{E}[\eta_a \eta_b | X_1 = i]| \leq 2 \sum_{a \geq b} |\mathbb{E}[\eta_a \eta_b | X_1 = i]|,
\]

where (a) is due to time reversibility; in (b) we defined \( \eta_a \triangleq 1_{\{X_{a+1} = i\}} \left( 1_{\{X_a = j\}} - M(j|i) \right) \). We divide the summands into different cases and apply Lemma 22.

**Case I: Two distinct indices.** For any \( a > b \), using Lemma 20 we get

\[
|\mathbb{E}[\eta_a \eta_b | X_1 = i]| = |\mathbb{E}[\eta_a | X_{b+1} = i]| |\mathbb{E}[\eta_b | X_1 = 1]| = h_1(a, b + 1) h_1(b, 1)
\]

which implies

\[
\sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E}[\eta_a \eta_b | X_1 = i]| = \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq 1} h_1(a, b + 1) h_1(b, 1) \lesssim M(j|i) \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq 1} \lambda^{a-2} \lesssim \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma^2_\ast}.
\]

Here the last inequality (and similar sums in later deductions) can be explained as follows. Note that for \( \gamma_\ast \geq \frac{1}{2} \) (i.e. \( \lambda_\ast \leq \frac{1}{2} \)), the sum is clearly bounded by an absolute constant; for \( \gamma_\ast < \frac{1}{2} \) (i.e. \( \lambda_\ast > \frac{1}{2} \)), we compare the sum with the mean (or higher moments in other calculations) of a geometric random variable.
we have the required fourth moment. We first divide the indices of $a > b > d > e$
and then use Lemma
Using Lemma
Case II: Single index.
Proof of Lemma 15(ii). We first note that due to reversibility we can write (similar as in proof of Lemma 15(i)) with $\eta_a = 1_{\{X_{a+1}=i\}} \left(1_{\{X_a=j\}} - M(j|i)\right)$
We bound the sum over different combinations of $a \geq b \geq d \geq e$ to come up with a bound on the required fourth moment. We first divide the $\eta$'s into groups depending on how many distinct indices of $\eta$ there are. We use the following identities which follow from Lemma 20: for indices $a > b > d > e$
- $|E[\eta_a \eta_b \eta_d \eta_e |X_1 = i]| = h_1(a, b + 1) h_1(b, d + 1) h_1(d, e + 1) h_1(e, 1)$
- For $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in \{1, 2\}$, $|E[\eta_a s_1 \eta_b s_2 \eta_d s_3 |X_1 = i]| = h_{s_1}(a, b + 1) h_{s_2}(b, d + 1) h_{s_3}(d, 1)$
- For $s_1, s_2 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $|E[\eta_a s_1 \eta_b s_2 |X_1 = i]| = h_{s_1}(a, b + 1) h_{s_2}(b, 1)$
- $E[\eta_a^4 |X_1 = 1] = h_4(a, 1)$
and then use Lemma 22 to bound the $h$ functions.
Case I: Four distinct indices. Using Lemma 22 we have
\[
\sum_{n=1}^{n-1} \sum_{a \geq b \geq d \geq e \geq 1} |E[\eta_a \eta_b \eta_d \eta_e |X_1 = i]| = \sum_{n=1}^{n-1} \sum_{a \geq b \geq d \geq e \geq 1} h_1(a, b + 1) h_1(b, d + 1) h_1(d, e + 1) h_1(e, 1)
\leq M(j|i)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{n-1} \sum_{a \geq b \geq d \geq e \geq 1} \lambda_{a-4} \lesssim \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_*^2}. \]
Case II: Three distinct indices. There are three cases, namely $\eta_a^2\eta_b\eta_d$, $\eta_a\eta_b^3\eta_d$ and $\eta_a\eta_b\eta_d^2$.

1. Bounding $\sum \sum \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^2\eta_b\eta_d | X_1 = i]|$:

\[
\sum \sum \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^2\eta_b\eta_d | X_1 = i]| = \sum \sum \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} h_2(a, b + 1)h_1(b, d + 1)h_1(d, 1)
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum \sum \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_a^{b-1}} \right) M(j|i)\lambda_a^{b-2}
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_a^2} n\pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)^{3/2}}{\gamma_a^3} + \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_a^4}
\]

where the last inequality followed by using $xy \leq x^2 + y^2$.

2. Bounding $\sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a\eta_b^2\eta_d | X_1 = i]|$:

\[
\sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a\eta_b^2\eta_d | X_1 = i]| = \sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} h_1(a, b + 1)h_2(b, d + 1)h_1(d, 1)
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_a^{b+d-1}} \right) M(j|i)\lambda_a^{a-b+d-2}
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_a^2} n\pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)^{3/2}}{\gamma_a^3} + \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_a^4}
\]

3. Bounding $\sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a\eta_b\eta_d^2 | X_1 = i]|$:

\[
\sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a\eta_b\eta_d^2 | X_1 = i]| = \sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} h_1(a, b + 1)h_1(b, d + 1)h_2(d, 1)
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)\lambda_a^{d-1}} \right) M(j|i)\lambda_a^{a-d-2}
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_a^2} n\pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)^{3/2}}{\gamma_a^3} + \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_a^4}
\]

Case III: Two distinct indices. There are three different cases, namely $\eta_a^2\eta_b^2\eta_d$, $\eta_a^3\eta_b\eta_d$ and $\eta_a\eta_b^3\eta_d$. 
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1. Bounding \( \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^2 \eta_b^2 | X_1 = i]| \):

\[
\sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^2 \eta_b^2 | X_1 = i]| \\
= \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} h_2(a, b + 1)h_2(b, 1) \\
\leq \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{a-b-1} \right) \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{b-1} \right) \\
\leq \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} \left\{ \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) \sqrt{M(j|i)} \left( \lambda_i^{a-b-1} + \lambda_i^{b-1} \right) \\
+ (\pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + M(j|i) \lambda_i^{a-2} \right\} \\
\leq (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma_i} n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2} \\
\leq (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2}.
\]

2. Bounding \( \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^3 \eta_b^2 | X_1 = i]| \):

\[
\sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^3 \eta_b^2 | X_1 = i]| \\
= \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} h_3(a, b + 1)h_1(b, 1) \\
\leq \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{a-b-1} \right) \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{b-1} \\
\leq \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma_i} n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2} \leq (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2}.
\]

3. Bounding \( \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a \eta_b^3 | X_1 = i]| \):

\[
\sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a \eta_b^3 | X_1 = i]| \\
= \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} h_1(a, b + 1)h_3(b, 1) \\
\leq \sum \sum_{n-2 \geq a > b \geq 1} \left( \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{b-1} \right) \sqrt{M(j|i)} \lambda_i^{a-b-1} \\
\leq \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma_i} n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2} \leq (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_i^2}.
\]

Case IV: Single index. Bound on \( \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^4 | X_1 = i]| \):

\[
\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} |\mathbb{E} [\eta_a^4 | X_1 = i]| = \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} h_4(a, 1) \leq n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)) + \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma_i}.
\]
Combining all cases we get

\[
\mathbb{E} \left[ (M(j|i)N_i - N_{ij})^4 | X_n = i \right] \lesssim (n \pi_i M(j|i)(1 - M(j|i)))^2 + \frac{\sqrt{M(j|i)}}{\gamma_*} + \frac{M(j|i)}{\gamma_*^2} + \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_*^3} + \frac{M(j|i)^2}{\gamma_*^4}
\]

as required.

**Proof of Lemma 15(iii).** Throughout our proof we repeatedly use the spectral decomposition (94) applied to the diagonal elements:

\[
M^t(i|i) = \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} \lambda_i^v u_{vi}^2, \quad \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \leq 1.
\]

Write \( N_i - (n - 1)\pi_i = \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} \xi_a \) where \( \xi_a = 1_{\{X_a = i\}} - \pi_i \). For \( a \geq b \geq d \geq e \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b \xi_d \xi_e | X_1 = i] &= \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b \{1_{\{X_d = i, X_e = i\}} - \pi_i 1_{\{X_d = i\}} - \pi_i 1_{\{X_e = i\}} + \pi_i^2\} | X_1 = i] \nonumber \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b 1_{\{X_d = i, X_e = i\}} | X_1 = i] - \pi_i \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b 1_{\{X_d = i\}} | X_1 = i] \\
&\quad - \pi_i \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b 1_{\{X_e = i\}} | X_1 = i] + \pi_i^2 \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_1 = i] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_d = i] \mathbb{P}[X_d = i | X_e = i] \mathbb{P}[X_e = i | X_1 = i] - \pi_i \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_d = i] \mathbb{P}[X_d = i | X_1 = i] \\
&\quad - \pi_i \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_e = i] \mathbb{P}[X_e = i | X_1 = i] + \pi_i^2 \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_1 = i] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_d = i] \left\{ M^{d-e}(i|i)M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i M^{d-1}(i|i) \right\} \\
&\quad - \left\{ \pi_i \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_e = i] M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i^2 \mathbb{E} [\xi_a \xi_b | X_1 = i] \right\} 
\end{align*}
\] (98)
Using the Markov property for any $d \leq b \leq a$, we get

\[
\mathbb{E}[\xi_a \xi_b | X_d = i] - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b} = \mathbb{E} \left[ 1_{\{X_a = i, X_b = i\}} - \pi_i 1_{\{X_a = i\}} - \pi_i 1_{\{X_b = i\}} + \pi_i^2 | X_d = i \right] - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b}
\]

\[
= M^{a-b}(i|i)M^{b-d}(i|i) - \pi_i M^{a-d}(i|i) - \pi_i M^{b-d}(i|i) + \pi_i^2 - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b}
\]

\[
= \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b} \right) \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{b-d} \right) - \pi_i \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-d} \right)
\]

\[
- \pi_i \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{b-d} \right) + \pi_i^2 - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b}
\]

\[
= \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b} \right) \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{b-d} \right) - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-d}
\]

\[
\leq \lambda_s^{a-d} \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \right) \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \right) + \lambda_s^{a-d} \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \leq 2 \lambda_s^{a-d}. \tag{99}
\]

We also get for $d \geq e$

\[
\left| M^{d-e}(i|i)M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i M^{d-1}(i|i) \right|
\]

\[
= \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{d-e} \right) \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{e-1} \right) - \pi_i \left( \pi_i + \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{d-1} \right)
\]

\[
= \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{e-1} + \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{d-e} + \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{e-1} \right) \left( \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{d-e} \right) - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{d-1}
\]

\[
\leq 2 \lambda_s^{d-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{e-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{d-e}. \tag{100}
\]

This implies

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}[\xi_a \xi_b | X_d = i] \right| \left| M^{d-e}(i|i)M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i M^{d-1}(i|i) \right|
\]

\[
\leq \left( \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{vi}^2 \lambda_v^{a-b} + 2 \lambda_s^{a-d} \right) \left( 2 \lambda_s^{d-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{e-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{d-e} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \left( \pi_i \lambda_s^{a-b} + 2 \lambda_s^{a-d} \right) \left( 2 \lambda_s^{d-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{e-1} + \pi_i \lambda_s^{d-e} \right)
\]

\[
\leq 4 \left[ \pi_i^2 \lambda_s^{a-b+d-e} + \pi_i^2 \lambda_s^{a-b+e-1} + \pi_i \left( \lambda_s^{a-b+d-1} + \lambda_s^{a-d+e-1} + \lambda_s^{a-e} \right) + \lambda_s^{a-1} \right] \tag{101}
\]
Using (99) along with Lemma 21 for any $e \leq b \leq a$ we get
\[
\begin{align*}
|\pi_i [\xi_0 \xi_b | X_e = i] M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i^2 [\xi_0 \xi_b | X_1 = i]| \\
\leq \pi_i |\mathbb{E}[\xi_0 \xi_b | X_e = i] | M^{e-1}(i|i) - \pi_i + \pi_i^2 |\mathbb{E}[\xi_0 \xi_b | X_e = i] - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{v1}^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} |
\end{align*}
\]
\[\tag{102}\]
\[\]
\[+ \pi_i^2 |\mathbb{E}[\xi_0 \xi_b | X_1 = i] - \pi_i \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{v1}^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-b}| \]
\[\leq \pi_i \left[ \sum_{v \geq 2} u_{v1}^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} + 2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-e} \right] 2 \lambda_{v1}^{e-1} + 2 \pi_i^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-e} + 2 \pi_i^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-1} \]
\[\leq 2 \pi_i^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+e-1} + 4 \pi_i^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-e} + 4 \pi_i^2 \lambda_{v1}^{a-1}. \tag{103}\]

This together with (101) and (98) implies
\[
|\mathbb{E}[\xi_0 \xi_b \xi_d | X_1 = i]| \lesssim \pi_i^2 \left( \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+d-e} + \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+e-1} \right) + \lambda_{v1}^{a-1}
\]
\[+ \pi_i \left( \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+d-1} + \lambda_{v1}^{a-d+e-1} + \lambda_{v1}^{a-e} \right) \tag{104}\]

To bound the sum over $n-1 \geq a \geq b \geq d \geq e \geq 1$, we divide the analysis according to the number of distinct ordered indices related variations in terms.

**Case I: four distinct indices.** We sum (104) over all possible $a > b > d > e$.

- For the first term,
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_i^2 \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+d-e} & \lesssim \frac{n \pi_i^2}{\gamma_*^2} \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 3} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} \lesssim \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_*^2}.
\end{align*}
\]

- For the second term,
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_i^2 \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+e-1} & \lesssim \frac{n \pi_i^2}{\gamma_*^2} \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 3} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} \lesssim \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_*^2}.
\end{align*}
\]

- For the third term,
\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_{v1}^{a-1} & \lesssim \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq 4} a^3 \lambda_{v1}^{a-1} \lesssim \frac{1}{\gamma_*^4}.
\end{align*}
\]

- For the fourth term,
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_i \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b+d-1} & \lesssim \frac{\pi_i}{\gamma_*^2} \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 3} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} \lesssim \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_*^3}.
\end{align*}
\]

- For the fifth term,
\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_i \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_{v1}^{a-d+e-1} & \lesssim \pi_i \left( \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 3} \lambda_{v1}^{a-b} \right) \left( \sum_{d \geq 2} \lambda_{v1}^{b-d} \right) \lesssim \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_*^3}.
\end{align*}
\]
For the sixth term,
\[
\pi_i \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \lambda_s^{a-b} \leq \pi_i \left( \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d \geq 2} \lambda_s^{a-b} \right) \left( \sum_{e \geq 1} \lambda_s^{d-e} \right) \leq \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_s^3}.
\]

Combining the above bounds and using the fact that \(ab \leq a^2 + b^2\), we obtain
\[
\sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > d > e \geq 1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_d \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_s^3} + \frac{1}{\gamma_s^3} \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_s^3}.
\]

**Case II: three distinct indices.** There are three cases, namely, \(\xi_a \xi_b \xi_c\), \(\xi_a \xi_b \xi_d\), and \(\xi_a \xi_b \xi_e\).

1. Bounding \(\sum \sum n-1 \geq a > b > e \geq 1 | \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] |\): We specialize (104) with \(b = d\) to get
\[
\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \pi_i \left( \lambda_s^{a-b+e-1} + \lambda_s^{a-e} \right) + \lambda_s^{a-1}.
\]

Summing over \(a, b, e\) we have
\[
\sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > e \geq 1} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \pi_i \left( \frac{\lambda_s^{a-b+e-1} + \lambda_s^{a-e}}{\gamma_s^2} + \lambda_s^{a-1} \right)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_s^2} \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 2} \lambda_s^{a-b} + \pi_i \left( \sum_{n-1 \geq a > b \geq 2} \lambda_s^{a-b} \right) \left( \sum_{e \geq 1} \lambda_s^{b-e} \right) + \sum_{n-1 \geq a \geq 3} a^3 \lambda_s^{a-1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_s^3} \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_s^3}.
\]

with last inequality following from \(xy \leq x^2 + y^2\).

2. Bounding \(\sum \sum n-1 \geq a > b > e \geq 1 | \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] |\): We specialize (104) with \(e = d\) to get
\[
\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \pi_i \left( \lambda_s^{a-b+e-1} + \lambda_s^{a-e} \right) + \lambda_s^{a-1}.
\]

Summing over \(a, b, e\) and applying (106), we get
\[
\sum_{n-1 \geq a > b > e \geq 2} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_s^3} \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma_s^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_s^3}.
\]

3. Bounding \(\sum \sum n-1 \geq a > b > e \geq 1 | \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] |\): Specializing (104) with \(a = b\) we get
\[
\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \xi_a \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i \right] \right| \leq \pi_i \left( \lambda_s^{d-e} + \lambda_s^{e-1} \right) + \lambda_s^{b-1} + \pi_i \left( \lambda_s^{d-1} + \lambda_s^{b-d+e-1} + \lambda_s^{b-e} \right),
\]
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which is equivalent to
\[ |E [\xi_a^2 \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i] | \lesssim \pi_i^2 \left( \lambda_{b-e} + \lambda_e^{a-1} \right) + \pi_i \left( \lambda_{b-1} + \lambda_{b+e-1} + \lambda_{a-e}^{a-1} \right). \]

For the first, second and fourth terms
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{a \geq b \geq e \geq 1} \pi_i \left( \lambda_{b-e} + \lambda_e^{a-1} \right) + \pi_i \lambda_{b-1}^{a-1} \leq \pi_i \lambda_{b-e} + \pi_i \lambda_{b-1}^{a-1} \leq \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma^2} + \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2^2},
\]
and for summing the remaining terms we use (106), which implies
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{a \geq b \geq e \geq 1} |E [\xi_a^2 \xi_b \xi_e | X_1 = i] | \leq \pi_i \lambda_{b-e} + \pi_i \lambda_{b-1}^{a-1} \leq \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma^2} + \frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma_2} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2^2}. \tag{108}
\]

Case III: two distinct indices. There are three cases, namely, \(\eta_e^2 \), \(\eta_e^3 \), and \(\eta_e^4 \).

1. Bounding \(\sum_{a \geq b \geq e \geq 1} E [\xi_a^2 \xi_b | X_1 = i] \): Specializing (104) for \(a = b \) and \(e = d \) we get
\[ E [\xi_a^2 \xi_b | X_1 = i] \leq \pi_i \lambda_{a-e} + \lambda_{a-1}^{a-1}. \]

2. Bounding \(\sum_{a \geq b \geq e \geq 1} E [\xi_a^2 \xi_e | X_1 = i] \): Specializing (104) for \(e = b = d \) we get
\[ E [\xi_a^2 \xi_e | X_1 = i] \leq \pi_i \lambda_{a-e} + \lambda_{a-1}^{a-1}. \]

3. Bounding \(\sum_{a \geq b \geq e \geq 1} E [\xi_a^2 \xi_e | X_1 = i] \): Specializing (104) for \(a = b = d \) we get
\[ E [\xi_a^2 \xi_e | X_1 = i] \leq \pi_i \lambda_{a-e} + \lambda_{a-1}^{a-1}. \]

Case IV: single distinct index. We specialize (104) to \(a = b = d = e \) to get
\[ E [\xi_a^4 | X_1 = i] \leq \pi_i + \lambda_{a-1}^{a-1}. \]

Summing the above over \(a\)
\[
\sum_{a=1}^{n-1} E [\xi_a^4 | X_1 = i] \leq n \pi_i + \frac{1}{\gamma^2}. \tag{112}
\]

Combining (105)–(112) and using \(\frac{n \pi_i}{\gamma^2} \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \), we get
\[
E \left[ \left( N_i - (n-1) \pi_i \right)^4 | X_1 = i \right] \leq \frac{n^2 \pi_i^2}{\gamma^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2}. \]
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