

Global convergence of optimized adaptive importance samplers

Ömer Deniz Akyildiz^{*,†}

^{*}The Alan Turing Institute, London, UK.

[†]University of Cambridge, UK.

odakyildiz@turing.ac.uk

January 4, 2022

Abstract

We analyze the *optimized adaptive importance sampler* (OAIS) for performing Monte Carlo integration with general proposals. We leverage a classical result which shows that the bias and the mean-squared error (MSE) of the importance sampling scales with the χ^2 -divergence between the target and the proposal and develop a scheme which performs global optimization of χ^2 -divergence. While it is known that this quantity is convex for exponential family proposals, the case of the general proposals has been an open problem. We close this gap by utilizing stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics (SGLD) and its underdamped counterpart for the global optimization of χ^2 -divergence and derive nonasymptotic bounds for the MSE by leveraging recent results from non-convex optimization literature. The resulting AIS schemes have explicit theoretical guarantees uniform in the number of iterations.

1 Introduction

Importance sampling (IS) is one of the most fundamental methods to compute expectations w.r.t. a target distribution π using samples from a proposal distribution q and reweighting these samples. This procedure is known to be inefficient when the discrepancy between π and q is large. To remedy this, adaptive importance samplers (AIS) are based on the principle that one can iteratively update a sequence of proposal distributions $(q_k)_{k \geq 1}$ to obtain refined and better proposals over time. This provides a significant improvement over a naive importance sampler with a single proposal q . For this reason, AIS schemes received a significant attention over the past decades and enjoy an ongoing popularity, see, e.g., [Bengio and Senécal \(2008\)](#), [Bugallo et al. \(2015\)](#), [Martino et al. \(2015\)](#), [Kappen and Ruiz \(2016\)](#), [Bugallo et al. \(2017\)](#), [Elvira et al. \(2017\)](#), [Martino et al. \(2017b\)](#), [Elvira et al. \(2019\)](#). The general and most generic AIS scheme retains N distinct distributions centred at the samples from the previous iteration and constructs a mixture proposal; variants of this approach include population Monte Carlo (PMC) ([Cappé et al., 2004](#)) or adaptive mixture importance sampling ([Cappé et al., 2008](#)). Although these versions of the methods have been widely popular, all these methods still lack theoretical guarantees and convergence results as the number of iterations grows to infinity (see [Douc et al. \(2007\)](#) for an analysis in terms of N). In other words, there has been a lack of theoretical guarantees about whether this kind of adaptation moves the proposal density towards the target, and if so, in which metric and at what rate. The difficulty of providing such

rates stems from the fact that it is difficult to quantify the convergence of the nonparametric mixture distributions to the target measure.

In this paper, we aim to address this fundamental question for a different (and more tractable) class of samplers, parametric AIS schemes, using the available results from nonconvex optimization literature. Recently, this fundamental theoretical problem was addressed by [Akyildiz and Míguez \(2021\)](#) who considered a specific family of proposals, i.e., the exponential family as fixed proposal family. In this case, a fundamental quantity in the MSE bound of the importance sampler, specifically the χ^2 -divergence (or equivalently the variance of the importance weights), can be shown to be convex which leads to a natural adaptation strategy based on convex optimization, see, e.g., [Arouna \(2004a,b\)](#), [Kawai \(2008\)](#), [Lapeyre and Lelong \(2011\)](#), [Ryu and Boyd \(2014\)](#), [Kawai \(2017, 2018\)](#) for the algorithmic applications of this property. This quantity appeared and was investigated in other contexts, e.g., sequential Monte Carlo methods ([Cornebise et al., 2008](#)), asymptotic analysis ([Delyon and Portier, 2018](#)), or to determine the necessary sample size for the IS ([Sanz-Alonso, 2018](#), [Sanz-Alonso and Wang, 2021](#)). The convexity property of χ^2 -divergence when the proposal is from the exponential family was exploited by [Akyildiz and Míguez \(2021\)](#) to prove finite, uniform-in-time error bounds for the AIS, in particular, providing a general convergence rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{kN} + 1/N)$ for the L_2 error for the importance sampler, where k is the number of iterations and N is the number of Monte Carlo samples used for integration. However, this result does not apply for a general proposal distribution, as this results in a function in the MSE bound that is non-convex in the parameter of the proposal.

We address the problem of globally optimizing AIS by designing non-convex optimization schemes for χ^2 divergence. This enables us to prove global convergence results for the AIS that can be controlled by the parameters of the non-convex optimization schemes. Specifically, we use stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics (SGLD) ([Welling and Teh, 2011](#)) and its underdamped counterpart, stochastic gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (SGHMC) ([Chen et al., 2014](#)), for non-convex optimization. Recently, global convergence of these algorithms for non-convex optimization were shown in several works, see, e.g., [Raginsky et al. \(2017\)](#), [Xu et al. \(2018\)](#), [Erdogdu et al. \(2018\)](#), [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), [Akyildiz and Sabanis \(2020\)](#), [Gao et al. \(2021\)](#), [Lim and Sabanis \(2021\)](#), [Lim et al. \(2021\)](#). We leverage these results for proving that optimizing a general non-convex χ^2 -divergence leads to a global convergence result for the resulting AIS schemes. In particular, we design two schemes, (i) Stochastic Overdamped Langevin AIS (SOLAIS) which uses SGLD to adapt its proposal, (ii) Stochastic Underdamped Langevin AIS (SULAIS) which uses SGHMC to adapt its proposal, and prove global convergence rates of these two schemes.

We note that the use of Langevin dynamics within the AIS is explored before, see, e.g., [Fasiolo et al. \(2018\)](#), [Elvira and Chouzenoux \(2019\)](#), [Mousavi et al. \(2021\)](#), also see, [Martino et al. \(2017b,a\)](#), [Llorente et al. \(2021\)](#) for the use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) based proposals. However, these ideas are distinct from our work, in the sense that they explore driving the parameters (or samples) w.r.t. the gradient of the log-target, i.e., $\log \pi$, rather than χ^2 -divergence. Our proposal adaptation approach is motivated by quantitative error bounds, hence has provable guarantees. Other MCMC-based methods also perform well and interesting for a future analysis – but require a different approach.

Organization. The paper is organized as follows. In [Sec 2](#), we provide a brief background of adaptive importance sampling schemes and, specifically, the parametric AIS which we aim at analyzing. We also introduce the fundamental results on which we rely in later sections. In [Sec. 3](#), we describe two algorithms which are explicitly designed to globally optimize the χ^2 -divergence between the target and the proposal. In [Sec. 4](#), we prove nonasymptotic error rates for the MSE of these samplers using results from non-convex optimization literature. These bounds are then discussed in detail in [Sec. 5](#). Finally, we conclude with [Sec. 6](#).

Notation

For an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$. The state-space is denoted as X where $\mathsf{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ with $d_x \geq 1$. We use $B(\mathsf{X})$ to denote the set of bounded functions on X and $\mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ to denote the set of probability measures on X , respectively. We write $(\varphi, \pi) = \int \varphi(x)\pi(\mathrm{d}x)$ or $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\varphi(X)]$ and $\mathrm{var}_\pi(\varphi) = (\varphi^2, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi)^2$.

We will use π to denote the target distribution. Accordingly, we use Π to denote the unnormalized target, i.e., we have $\pi(x) = \Pi(x)/Z_\pi$. We denote the proposal distribution with q_θ where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ where d_θ denotes the parameter dimension. We denote both the measures, π and q_θ , and their densities with the same letters.

To denote the minimum value of functions ρ, R , we use ρ_\star, R_\star .

2 Background

In this section, we give a brief background and formulation of the problem.

2.1 Importance sampling

Given a target density $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$, we are interested in computing integrals of the form

$$(\varphi, \pi) = \int_{\mathsf{X}} \varphi(x)\pi(x)\mathrm{d}x. \quad (1)$$

We assume that we can only evaluate the unnormalized density and cannot sample from π directly. Importance sampling is based on the idea of using a proposal distribution to sample from and weight these samples to account for the discrepancy between the target and the proposal. These weights and samples are finally used to construct an estimator of the integral. In particular, let $q_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ be the proposal with parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, then the unnormalised target density $\Pi : \mathsf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is given as

$$\pi(x) = \frac{\Pi(x)}{Z_\pi},$$

where $Z_\pi := \int_{\mathsf{X}} \Pi(x)\mathrm{d}x < \infty$. Next, we define the unnormalized weight function $W_\theta : \mathsf{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$W_\theta(x) = \frac{\Pi(x)}{q_\theta(x)}.$$

Given a target π and a proposal q_θ , the importance sampling procedure first draws a set of independent and identically distributed (iid) samples $\{x^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ from q_θ . Next, we construct the empirical measure π_θ^N as

$$\pi_\theta^N(\mathrm{d}x) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_\theta^{(i)} \delta_{x^{(i)}}(\mathrm{d}x),$$

where,

$$w_\theta^{(i)} = \frac{W_\theta(x^{(i)})}{\sum_{j=1}^N W_\theta(x^{(j)})}.$$

Finally this measure yields the self-normalizing importance sampling (SNIS) estimate

$$(\varphi, \pi_\theta^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_\theta^{(i)} \varphi(x^{(i)}). \quad (2)$$

Although the estimator (2) is biased in general, one can show that the bias and the MSE vanish with a rate $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$. Below, we present the well-known MSE bound (see, e.g., [Agapiou et al. \(2017\)](#) or [Akyildiz and Míguez \(2021\)](#)).

Theorem 1. *Assume that $(W_\theta^2, q_\theta) < \infty$. Then for any $\varphi \in B(X)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[((\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_\theta^N))^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_\varphi \rho(\theta)}{N}, \quad (3)$$

where $c_\varphi = 4\|\varphi\|_\infty^2$ and the function $\rho : \Theta \rightarrow [\rho_*, \infty)$ is defined as

$$\rho(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[\frac{\pi^2(X)}{q_\theta^2(X)} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\rho_* := \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \rho(\theta) \geq 1$.

Proof. See [Agapiou et al. \(2017, Thm. 2.1\)](#) or [Akyildiz and Míguez \(2021, Thm. 1\)](#) for a proof. \square

Remark 1. It will be useful for us to write the bound (3) as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[((\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_\theta^N))^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_\varphi R(\theta)}{N Z_\pi^2}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$R(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[\frac{\Pi^2(X)}{q_\theta^2(X)} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Note that while the function ρ and related quantities (such as its gradients) cannot be computed by sampling from q_θ (since we cannot evaluate $\pi(x)$), same quantities for $R(\theta)$ can be computed since $\Pi(x)$ can be evaluated.

Remark 2. As shown in [Agapiou et al. \(2017\)](#), the function ρ can be written in terms of χ^2 divergence between π and q_θ , i.e.,

$$\rho(\theta) := \chi^2(\pi || q_\theta) + 1.$$

Note also that $\rho(\theta)$ can also be written in terms of the variance of the weight function $w_\theta = \pi(x)/q_\theta(x)$, which is the χ^2 -divergence, i.e.,

$$\rho(\theta) = \text{var}_{q_\theta}(w_\theta(X)) + 1.$$

Finally, a similar result can be presented for the bias from [Agapiou et al. \(2017\)](#).

Theorem 2. *Assume that $(W_\theta^2, q_\theta) < \infty$. Then for any $\varphi \in B(X)$, we have*

$$|\mathbb{E} [(\varphi, \pi_\theta^N)] - (\varphi, \pi)| \leq \frac{\bar{c}_\varphi \rho(\theta)}{N},$$

where $\bar{c}_\varphi = 12\|\varphi\|_\infty^2$ and the function $\rho : \Theta \rightarrow [\rho_*, \infty)$ is the same as in [Thm. 1](#).

Proof. See [Thm. 2.1](#) in [Agapiou et al. \(2017\)](#). \square

Algorithm 1 Parametric AIS

- 1: Choose a parametric proposal q_θ with initial parameter $\theta = \theta_0$.
- 2: **for** $t \geq 1$ **do**
- 3: Adapt the proposal,

$$\theta_k^\eta = \mathcal{T}_{k,\eta}(\theta_{k-1}^\eta),$$

- 4: Sample,

$$x_k^{(i)} \sim q_{\theta_k^\eta}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N,$$

- 5: Compute weights,

$$w_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} = \frac{W_{\theta_k^\eta}(x_k^{(i)})}{\sum_{i=1}^N W_{\theta_k^\eta}(x_k^{(i)})}, \quad \text{where } W_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} = \frac{\Pi(x_k^{(i)})}{q_{\theta_k^\eta}(x_k^{(i)})}.$$

- 6: Report the point-mass probability measure

$$\pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N(dx) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} \delta_{x_k^{(i)}}(dx),$$

and the estimator

$$(\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} \varphi(x_k^{(i)}).$$

- 7: **end for**
-

2.2 Parametric adaptive importance samplers

Importance sampling schemes tend to perform poorly in practice when the chosen proposal is “far away” from the target – leading to samples with degenerate weights, resulting in lower effective sample sizes. We can already see this fact from Thm. 1: For any parametric family q_θ , the function $\rho(\theta)$ defines a distance measure between π and q_θ . A large discrepancy between the target and the proposal implies a large ρ , which degrades the error bound. For this reason, in practice, the proposals are *adapted*, meaning that they are refined over iterations to better match the target. In literature, mainly, the nonparametric adaptive mixture samplers are employed, see, e.g., (Cappé et al., 2004, Bugallo et al., 2017) and many variants including multiple proposals are proposed, see, e.g., (Martino et al., 2017b, Elvira et al., 2019).

In contrast to the mixture samplers, we review here the *parametric AIS*. In this scheme, the proposal distribution is not a mixture with weights, but instead, a parametric family of distributions, denoted q_θ . Adaptation, therefore, becomes a problem of updating the parameter θ_k^η , where η is the parameter of the updating mechanism, which results in a sequence of proposal distributions denoted $(q_{\theta_k^\eta})_{k \geq 1}$.

Consider the proposal distribution $q_{\theta_{k-1}^\eta}$ at iteration $k - 1$. For performing one step of this scheme, the parameter θ_{k-1}^η is updated via a mapping

$$\theta_k^\eta = \mathcal{T}_{\eta,k}(\theta_{k-1}^\eta),$$

where $\{\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k} : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta, k \geq 1\}$, is a sequence of deterministic or stochastic maps parameterized

by η , typically in the form of optimizers (hence η can be the step-size). We then continue with the conventional importance sampling technique, by simulating from this proposal

$$x_k^{(i)} \sim q_{\theta_k^\eta}(dx), \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N,$$

computing the weights

$$w_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} = \frac{W_{\theta_k^\eta}(x_k^{(i)})}{\sum_{i=1}^N W_{\theta_k^\eta}(x_k^{(i)})},$$

and finally constructing the empirical measure

$$\pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N(dx) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\theta_k^\eta}^{(i)} \delta_{x_k^{(i)}}(dx).$$

The estimator of the integral (1) can be computed as in Eq. (2).

The parametric AIS method is given in Algorithm 1. We can now adapt Thm. 1 to this particular, time-varying case.

Theorem 3. *Assume that, given a sequence of proposals $(q_{\theta_k^\eta})_{k \geq 1} \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, we have $(W_{\theta_k^\eta}^2, q_{\theta_k^\eta}) < \infty$ for every $k \geq 1$. Then for any $\varphi \in B(X)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_\varphi \rho(\theta_k^\eta)}{N},$$

where $c_\varphi = 4\|\varphi\|_\infty^2$ and the function $\rho(\theta_k^\eta) : \Theta \rightarrow [\rho_*, \infty)$ is defined as in Eq. (4).

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Thm. 1. We have just re-stated the result to introduce the iteration index k . \square

This result is useful in the sense of providing a finite error bound, however, it does not indicate whether iterations of the AIS help reducing the error. This is the core problem we address in this paper: We aim at designing maps $\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k} : \Theta \rightarrow \Theta$ explicitly to optimize ρ , which is essentially the χ^2 divergence.

2.3 Adaptation as global nonconvex optimization

When q_θ is an exponential family density, it is shown that $\rho(\theta)$, and consequently $R(\theta)$, are convex functions (Ryu and Boyd, 2014, Ryu, 2016, Akyildiz and Míguez, 2021). Based on this, Akyildiz and Míguez (2021) have derived algorithms which minimize ρ and R assuming an exponential family q_θ . They proved finite-time uniform MSE bounds since convex optimization algorithms have well-known convergence rates. In particular, they showed that the optimized AIS with stochastic gradient descent as the minimization procedure has $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{k}N + 1/N)$ convergence rate which vanishes as k and N grows. While this rate is first of its kind for adaptive importance samplers, it has been limited to a single proposal family (the exponential family). In general, when q_θ is not from exponential family, then ρ and R are non-convex functions.

In this paper, we do not limit the choice of q_θ to any fixed proposal family. Therefore, in the adaptation step, we are interested in solving the global nonconvex optimization problem

$$\theta^* \in \underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} R(\theta),$$

where $R(\theta)$ is given in (6). This will lead to a global optimizer θ^* which will give the best possible proposal in terms of minimizing the MSE of the importance sampler. We use stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics (SGLD) (Zhang et al., 2019) and its underdamped counterpart stochastic gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (SGHMC) (Akyildiz and Sabanis, 2020) for global optimization. We summarize the algorithms in the next section.

3 The Algorithms

In this section, we describe two methods for adaptation of AIS that leads to globally optimal importance samplers. We note that, within this section, we only consider the case of self-normalized importance sampling (SNIS) which is the practical case. We also assume, we have only stochastic estimates of the gradient of the $R(\theta)$ function.

Remark 3. We remark that the gradient can be computed as (see Appendix A for a derivation)

$$\nabla R(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} \left[\frac{\Pi^2(X)}{q_\theta^2(X)} \nabla \log q_\theta(X) \right]. \quad (7)$$

Therefore the stochastic estimate of $\nabla R(\theta)$ can be obtained by sampling from q_θ , a straightforward and routine operation of the AIS. We also remark that this gradient can be written in terms of the unnormalized weight function

$$\nabla R(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{q_\theta} [W_\theta^2(X) \nabla \log q_\theta(X)].$$

This suggests that the adaptation will use weights and samples from q_θ , which makes this operation much closer to the classical mixture AIS approaches.

3.1 Low Variance Gradient Estimation

We assume that the proposal is reparameterizable: We assume $x \sim q_\theta$ can be performed by first sampling $\varepsilon \sim r_\varepsilon$ and setting $x = g_\theta(\varepsilon)$. Therefore, the gradient expression in eq. (7) becomes

$$\nabla R(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{r_\varepsilon} \left[\frac{\Pi^2(g_\theta(\varepsilon))}{q_\theta^2(g_\theta(\varepsilon))} \nabla \log q_\theta(g_\theta(\varepsilon)) \nabla g_\theta(\varepsilon) \right].$$

We remark that this does not limit the flexibility of our parametric family, as reparameterization is widely used as a variance reduction technique in variational inference (VI) and variational autoencoders (VAEs) and a flexible choice of parametric families is possible via this mechanism (see Dieng et al. (2017) and Lopez et al. (2020) for applications of χ^2 -divergence minimization in VI and VAEs, respectively). A second motivation to do so is to consider the numerical difficulties related to high-variance in estimating χ^2 -divergence as laid out by Pradier et al. (2019). Finally, the Langevin dynamics with stochastic gradients is well studied when the randomness in the gradient is independent of the parameter of interest. It is therefore natural to consider this setting for gradient estimation.

We denote the stochastic gradient accordingly as $H(\theta, \varepsilon)$ and define

$$H(\theta, \varepsilon) = -\frac{\Pi^2(g_\theta(\varepsilon))}{q_\theta^2(g_\theta(\varepsilon))} \nabla \log q_\theta(g_\theta(\varepsilon)) \nabla g_\theta(\varepsilon). \quad (8)$$

In order to prove convergence of the schemes we analyze, we assume certain regularity conditions of this term, see Sec. 4 for details.

3.2 Stochastic Overdamped Langevin AIS

We aim at the global optimization of $R(\theta)$. We consider two schemes for this purpose. The first method we consider uses stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics (SGLD) (Welling and Teh, 2011, Zhang et al., 2019) to adapt the proposal. For this purpose, we design the mappings $\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k}$ as SGLD steps

$$\theta_{k+1}^\eta = \theta_k^\eta - \eta H(\theta_k^\eta, \varepsilon_k) + \sqrt{\frac{2\eta}{\beta}} \xi_{k+1}, \quad (9)$$

i.e., $\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k}(\theta_k^\eta) = \theta_k^\eta - \eta H(\theta_k^\eta, \varepsilon_k) + \sqrt{\frac{2\eta}{\beta}} \xi_{k+1}$, where $\varepsilon_k \sim r_\varepsilon$, $\mathbb{E}[H(\theta, \varepsilon_k)] = \nabla R(\theta)$, and $(\xi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are standard Normal random variables with zero mean and unit variance. The parameter β is called the inverse temperature parameter. Note that we consider a single sample estimate of the gradient $\nabla R(\theta)$ as it is customary in the gradient estimation literature with reparameterization trick. This mapping $\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k}$ acts as a global optimizer in Algorithm 1 as we described before. The method is dubbed as stochastic overdamped Langevin AIS (SOLAIS).

3.3 Stochastic Underdamped Langevin AIS

The second method we use is the stochastic gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (SGHMC) (Chen et al., 2014, Akyildiz and Sabanis, 2020) which read as

$$V_{k+1}^\eta = V_k^\eta - \eta[\gamma V_k^\eta + H(\theta_k^\eta, X_{k+1})] + \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma\eta}{\beta}} \xi_{k+1}, \quad (10)$$

$$\theta_{k+1}^\eta = \theta_k^\eta + \eta V_k^\eta. \quad (11)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the friction parameter, $(V_k^\eta)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are so-called momentum variables, $\mathbb{E}[H(\theta_k^\eta, \varepsilon_{k+1})] = \nabla R(\theta_k^\eta)$, and $(\xi_k)_{k \geq 1}$ are standard Normal random variables with zero mean and unit variance. In this case, the mapping $\mathcal{T}_{\eta,k}$ comprises of two steps (10)-(11). This method is dubbed as stochastic underdamped Langevin AIS (SULAIS).

4 Analysis

In this section, we provide the analysis of the adaptive importance samplers described above. In particular, we start by assuming that the adaptation can be driven by an exact gradient $\nabla R(\theta)$ as an illustrative case and analyze this case in Sec. 4.1. Albeit unrealistic, this gives us a starting point. Then we analyze the SOLAIS and SULAIS schemes in Sec. 4.2 and 4.3, respectively.

4.1 Convergence rates for deterministic overdamped Langevin AIS

In this section, we provide a simplified analysis to give the intuition of our main results. This case considers a fictitious scenario where the gradients of R can be exactly obtained. Hence, we can use overdamped Langevin dynamics to optimize the parameters of the proposal

$$\theta_{k+1}^\eta = \theta_k^\eta - \eta \nabla R(\theta_k^\eta) + \sqrt{\frac{2\eta}{\beta}} \xi_{k+1}. \quad (12)$$

We place the following assumptions on R .

Assumption 1. *The gradient of R is L_R -Lipschitz, i.e., for any $\theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\|\nabla R(\theta) - \nabla R(\theta')\| \leq L_R \|\theta - \theta'\|. \quad (13)$$

Next, we assume the standard dissipativity assumption in non-convex optimization literature.

Assumption 2. *The gradient of R is (m_R, b_R) -dissipative, i.e., for any θ*

$$\langle \nabla R(\theta), \theta \rangle \geq m_R \|\theta\|^2 - b_R. \quad (14)$$

We can now adapt Thm. 3.3 of [Xu et al. \(2018\)](#).

Theorem 4. ([Xu et al., 2018, Thm. 3.3](#)) *Under Assumptions 1-2, we obtain*

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_k^\eta)] - R_\star \leq c_1 e^{-c_0 k \eta} + \frac{c_2}{\beta} \eta + c_3,$$

where

$$c_3 = \frac{d}{2\beta} \log \left(\frac{eL_R(b_R\beta/d + 1)}{m_R} \right), \quad (15)$$

where $R_\star = \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} R(\theta)$ and $c_0, c_1, c_2 > 0$ are constants given in [Xu et al. \(2018, Thm. 3.3\)](#).

In order to shed light onto some of the intuition, we note that c_0 is related to the spectral gap of the underlying Markov chain, characterizing the speed of convergence of the underlying continuous-time Langevin diffusion to the target. The constant c_2 is a result of the discretization error of the Langevin algorithm. Finally, c_3 is the error caused by the fact that the latest sample of the Markov chain θ_k^η is used to estimate the optima, i.e., c_3 quantifies the gap between

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_\infty)] - R_\star,$$

where $\theta_\infty \sim \exp(-R(\theta))$, i.e., a random variable with the target measure of the chain. This gap is independent of η .

We next provide the MSE result of the importance sampler whose proposal is driven by the Langevin algorithm (12).

Theorem 5. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, let $(\theta_k^\eta)_{k \geq 1}$ be generated by the recursion in (12), and assume that for a sequence of proposals $(q_{\theta_k^\eta})_{k \geq 1} \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, we have $(W_{\theta_k^\eta}, q_{\theta_k^\eta}) < \infty$ for every k . Then for any $\varphi \in B(X)$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} c_1 e^{-c_0 k \eta}}{N} + \frac{c_2 c_{\varphi, \pi}}{\beta} \frac{\eta}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} c_3}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi} \rho_\star}{N}. \quad (16)$$

where $c_{\varphi, \pi} = c_\varphi / Z_\pi^2$ and c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 are given in Thm. 4.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_{k-1} = \sigma(\theta_0^\eta, \dots, \theta_{k-1}^\eta)$. We note using Thm. 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right] &\leq \frac{c_\varphi R(\theta_k^\eta)}{Z_\pi^2 N}, \\ &\leq \frac{c_\varphi (R(\theta_k^\eta) - R_\star)}{Z_\pi^2 N} + \frac{c_\varphi \rho_\star}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations of both sides and using Thm. 4 for the first term on the r.h.s. concludes the result. \square

This result provides a uniform-in-time error bound for the adaptive importance samplers with general proposals.

4.2 Convergence rates of SOLAIS

In this section, we start with placing assumptions on stochastic gradients $H(\theta, \varepsilon)$ as defined in (8). We note that these assumptions are the most relaxed conditions to prove the convergence of Langevin dynamics to this date, see, e.g., [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), [Chau et al. \(2021\)](#). We first need to assume that sufficient moments of the distribution r_ε exists.

Assumption 3. We have $|\theta_0| \in L^4$. The process $(\varepsilon_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. with $|\varepsilon_0| \in L^{4(\rho+1)}$. Also, $\mathbb{E}[H(\theta, \varepsilon_0)] = \nabla R(\theta)$.

Next, we place a local Lipschitz assumption on H .

Assumption 4. There exists positive constants L_1, L_2 , and ρ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |H(\theta, \varepsilon) - H(\theta', \varepsilon)| &\leq L_1(1 + |\varepsilon|)^\rho |\theta - \theta'| \\ |H(\theta, \varepsilon) - H(\theta, \varepsilon')| &\leq L_2(1 + |\varepsilon| + |\varepsilon'|)^\rho (1 + |\theta|) |\varepsilon - \varepsilon'| \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we assume a local dissipativity assumption.

Assumption 5. There exist $M : \mathbb{R}^{d_\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta \times d_\theta}$, $b : \mathbb{R}^{d_\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$,

$$\langle y, M(x)y \rangle \geq 0$$

and for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{d_\varepsilon}$,

$$\langle H(\theta, \varepsilon), \theta \rangle \geq \langle \theta, M(\varepsilon)\theta \rangle - b(\varepsilon).$$

Remark 4. We note that we can relate parameters introduced in these assumptions to the ones we introduced in the deterministic case L_R and b_R . In particular,

$$L_R = L_1 \mathbb{E}[(1 + |\varepsilon_0|)^\rho], \quad \text{and} \quad b_R = \mathbb{E}[b(\varepsilon_0)].$$

We also note that the smallest eigenvalue of the matrix $\mathbb{E}[M(\varepsilon_0)]$ is m_R .

We can finally state the convergence result of the SGLD for non-convex optimization from [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#).

Theorem 6. ([Zhang et al., 2019](#), Corollary 2.9) Let θ_k^η be generated by the SOLAIS recursion (9). Let Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 hold. Then, there exist constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta_{\max} > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_{\max}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_k^\eta)] - R_\star \leq c_1 e^{-c_0 \eta k} + c_2 \eta^{1/4} + c_3,$$

where $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta_{\max}$ are given explicitly in [Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#).

With this result at hand, we can state the global convergence result of SOLAIS.

Theorem 7. Let θ_k^η be generated by the SOLAIS recursion (9). Let Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 hold. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} c_1 e^{-c_0 \eta k}}{N} + \frac{c_2 c_{\varphi, \pi} \eta^{1/4}}{N} + \frac{c_3 c_{\varphi, \pi}}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi} \rho_\star}{N}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_{k-1} = \sigma(\theta_0^\eta, \dots, \theta_{k-1}^\eta)$ and $\mathcal{G}_k = \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$. Let $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \vee \mathcal{G}_k$. We next note

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \middle| \mathcal{H}_k \right] \leq \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} R(\theta_k^\eta)}{N}.$$

We expand the r.h.s. as

$$\frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} R(\theta_k^\eta)}{N} = c_{\varphi, \pi} \frac{R(\theta_k^\eta) - R_\star}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} R_\star}{N}.$$

Taking unconditional expectations of boths sides, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq c_{\varphi, \pi} \frac{\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_k^\eta)] - R_\star}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} R_\star}{N}.$$

Using Thm. 6 for the term $\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_k^\eta)] - R_\star$, we obtain the result. \square

We can again see that this is a uniform-in-iterations result for the AIS. As opposed to Thm. 5, the dependence to step-size in this theorem is worse: It is $\mathcal{O}(\eta^{1/4})$ rather than $\mathcal{O}(\eta)$. The difference between this result and Thm. 5 about the deterministic case is twofold: First, we assume that the gradients are stochastic, which is the case for real applications. Second, for the stochastic gradient $H(\theta, \varepsilon)$, our assumptions are the weakest possible assumptions, hence allows us to choose a wider family. It is possible, for example, to obtain better dependence in η if one assumes that stochastic gradients are uniformly Lipschitz, see, e.g., [Xu et al. \(2018\)](#).

4.3 Convergence rates of SULAIS

SGLD can be slow to converge for some problems. For this reason, its underdamped variant, SGHMC (and similar others) received significant attention recently for their better numerical behaviour. In this section, we provide the convergence rates for the case when SGHMC is used to drive the adaptation to minimize the χ^2 divergence.

Theorem 8. ([Akyildiz and Sabanis, 2020](#), Thm. 2.2) *Let θ_k^η be generated by the SULAIS recursion (10)-(11). Let Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 hold. Then, there exist constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta_{\max} > 0$ such that for every $0 < \eta \leq \eta_{\max}$*

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\theta_k^\eta)] - R_\star \leq c_1 e^{-c_0 \eta k} + c_2 \eta^{1/4} + c_3, \quad (17)$$

where $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, \eta_{\max}$ are given explicitly in [Akyildiz and Sabanis \(2020\)](#).

We can finally conclude with our global convergence result for SULAIS.

Theorem 9. *Let θ_k^η be generated by the SULAIS recursion (10)-(11). Let Assumptions 3, 4, and 5 hold. Then under the setting of Thm. 8*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^\eta}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} c_1 e^{-c_0 \eta k}}{N} + \frac{c_2 c_{\varphi, \pi} \eta^{1/4}}{N} + \frac{c_3 c_{\varphi, \pi}}{N} + \frac{c_{\varphi, \pi} R_\star}{N}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same steps as the proof of Thm. 7 using Thm. 8. \square

We should note that in general the rates of SOLAIS and SULAIS are the same, unlike in the convex case ([Akyildiz and Míguez, 2021](#), Remark 12). This is not an artefact of the analysis above. In general, for dissipative potentials, the analysis of non-convex optimizers is difficult because of the worst-case scenarios, which unlike the convex case, may cancel the advantages of second order schemes like SGHMC in theory. We similarly observe that the rates of SOLAIS and SULAIS are the same in the sense that the convergence rates of SGLD and SGHMC are similar in the general non-convex setting.

5 Discussion

In this section, we summarize and discuss the constants in error bounds to provide intuition about the utility of our results. We restrict our attention to SOLAIS and SULAIS (i.e. we do not consider the deterministic scheme). In our discussion, we use c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 to denote constants both in Thm. 7 and 9 as they have the same dependence to problem parameters.

Dimension dependence. Because dissipative non-convex potentials can cover worst case scenarios, the dimension dependence of c_1, c_2 are $\mathcal{O}(e^d)$ and $c_0 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-d})$ (Zhang et al., 2019, Akyildiz and Sabanis, 2020). These bounds are, however, worst case scenarios and reflect the edge cases. In practice, both SGLD and SGHMC perform well with non-convex potentials, leading to well-performing methods. Recall that c_3 is given by

$$c_3 = \frac{d}{2\beta} \log \left(\frac{eL_R(b_R\beta/d + 1)}{m_R} \right). \quad (18)$$

In this case, one can see that $c_3 = \mathcal{O}(d \log(1/d))$, which degrades the bound as d grows.

Dependence of inverse temperature β . We note that c_0, c_1 , and c_2 are $\mathcal{O}(1/\beta)$ whereas β -dependence of c_3 is $\mathcal{O}(\log \beta/\beta)$ as can be seen from (18). This suggests a strategy to set β large enough so that $c_3 = \mathcal{O}(\log \beta/\beta) \leq \epsilon$ to vanish c_3 from the bound. If this is satisfied, then the second term $c_2\eta^{1/4}$ can be controlled by the step-size and the first term $c_1e^{-c_0\eta^k}$ vanishes as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Calibrating step-sizes and the number of particles. The discussion also suggests a possible heuristic to calibrate the step-sizes and the number of particles of the method: For sufficiently large k (so that the first term in (16) is sufficiently small), setting $N = \eta^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha > 0$ provides an overall MSE bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| (\varphi, \pi) - (\varphi, \pi_{\theta_k^N}^N) \right|^2 \right] \leq \mathcal{O}(\eta^\alpha). \quad (19)$$

Therefore, one can trade computational efficiency with the statistical accuracy of the method as manifested by our error bound. For example, a small α would correspond to a low number of particles, but a potentially high MSE.

6 Conclusions

We have provided global convergence rates for optimized adaptive importance samplers as introduced by Akyildiz and Míguez (2021). Specifically, we considered the case of general proposal distributions and described adaptation schemes that globally optimize the χ^2 -divergence between the target and the proposal, leading to uniform error bounds for the resulting AIS schemes. Our approach is generic and can be adapted to several other schemes that are shown to be globally convergent. In other words, our guarantees apply when one replaces the SGLD or SGHMC with other optimizers, i.e., variance reduced variants (Zou et al., 2019), or tamed Euler schemes (Lim et al., 2021) or polygonal schemes (Lim and Sabanis, 2021) which handle even more relaxed assumptions and enjoy improved stability. Our future work plans also include a separate and comprehensive numerical investigation of several different schemes to assess the global optimization performance of these optimizers to be used within the AIS schemes.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Lloyd’s Register Foundation Data Centric Engineering Programme and EPSRC Programme Grant EP/R034710/1 (CoSiNES).

Appendix

A Gradient of $R(\theta)$

We derive the gradient in (7) as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla R(\theta) &= \nabla_{\theta} \int \frac{\Pi^2(x)}{q_{\theta}^2(x)} q_{\theta}(x) dx, \\ &= \nabla_{\theta} \int \frac{\Pi^2(x)}{q_{\theta}(x)} dx, \\ &= - \int \frac{\Pi^2(x)}{q_{\theta}^2(x)} \nabla q_{\theta}(x) dx, \\ &= - \int \frac{\Pi^2(x)}{q_{\theta}^2(x)} \nabla \log q_{\theta}(x) q_{\theta}(x) dx, \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\Pi^2(X)}{q_{\theta}^2(X)} \nabla \log q_{\theta}(X) \right].\end{aligned}$$

References

- S Agapiou, Omiros Papaspiliopoulos, D Sanz-Alonso, and AM Stuart. Importance sampling: Intrinsic dimension and computational cost. *Statistical Science*, 32(3):405–431, 2017.
- Ömer Deniz Akyildiz and Joaquín Míguez. Convergence rates for optimised adaptive importance samplers. *Statistics and Computing*, 31(2):1–17, 2021.
- Ömer Deniz Akyildiz and Sotirios Sabanis. Nonasymptotic analysis of Stochastic Gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo under local conditions for nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05465*, 2020.
- Bouhari Arouna. Adaptive monte carlo method, a variance reduction technique. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 10(1):1–24, 2004a.
- Bouhari Arouna. Robbins-Monro algorithms and variance reduction in finance. *Journal of Computational Finance*, 7(2):35–62, 2004b.
- Yoshua Bengio and Jean-Sébastien Senécal. Adaptive importance sampling to accelerate training of a neural probabilistic language model. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 19(4):713–722, 2008.
- Mónica F Bugallo, Luca Martino, and Jukka Corander. Adaptive importance sampling in signal processing. *Digital Signal Processing*, 47:36–49, 2015.
- Monica F Bugallo, Victor Elvira, Luca Martino, David Luengo, Joaquin Miguez, and Petar M Djuric. Adaptive Importance Sampling: The past, the present, and the future. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 34(4):60–79, 2017.

- Olivier Cappé, Arnaud Guillin, Jean-Michel Marin, and Christian P Robert. Population Monte Carlo. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 13(4):907–929, 2004.
- Olivier Cappé, Randal Douc, Arnaud Guillin, Jean-Michel Marin, and Christian P Robert. Adaptive importance sampling in general mixture classes. *Statistics and Computing*, 18(4):447–459, 2008.
- Ngoc Huy Chau, Éric Moulines, Miklos Rásonyi, Sotirios Sabanis, and Ying Zhang. On stochastic gradient langevin dynamics with dependent data streams: The fully nonconvex case. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 3(3):959–986, 2021.
- Tianqi Chen, Emily Fox, and Carlos Guestrin. Stochastic gradient hamiltonian monte carlo. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1683–1691. PMLR, 2014.
- Julien Cornebise, Éric Moulines, and Jimmy Olsson. Adaptive methods for sequential importance sampling with application to state space models. *Statistics and Computing*, 18(4):461–480, 2008.
- Bernard Delyon and François Portier. Asymptotic optimality of adaptive importance sampling. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3138–3148, 2018.
- Adji Bousso Dieng, Dustin Tran, Rajesh Ranganath, John Paisley, and David Blei. Variational inference via χ -upper bound minimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2732–2741, 2017.
- Randal Douc, Arnaud Guillin, J-M Marin, and Christian P Robert. Convergence of adaptive mixtures of importance sampling schemes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(1):420–448, 2007.
- Víctor Elvira and Émilie Chouzenoux. Langevin-based strategy for efficient proposal adaptation in population monte carlo. In *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 5077–5081. IEEE, 2019.
- Víctor Elvira, Luca Martino, David Luengo, and Mónica F Bugallo. Improving population monte carlo: Alternative weighting and resampling schemes. *Signal Processing*, 131:77–91, 2017.
- Víctor Elvira, Luca Martino, David Luengo, Mónica F Bugallo, et al. Generalized multiple importance sampling. *Statistical Science*, 34(1):129–155, 2019.
- Murat A Erdogdu, Lester Mackey, and Ohad Shamir. Global non-convex optimization with discretized diffusions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12361*, 2018.
- Matteo Fasiolo, Flávio Eler de Melo, and Simon Maskell. Langevin incremental mixture importance sampling. *Statistics and Computing*, 28(3):549–561, 2018.
- Xuefeng Gao, Mert Gürbüzbalaban, and Lingjiong Zhu. Global convergence of stochastic gradient hamiltonian monte carlo for nonconvex stochastic optimization: Nonasymptotic performance bounds and momentum-based acceleration. *Operations Research*, 2021.
- Hilbert Johan Kappen and Hans Christian Ruiz. Adaptive importance sampling for control and inference. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 162(5):1244–1266, 2016.
- Reiichiro Kawai. Adaptive monte carlo variance reduction for lévy processes with two-time-scale stochastic approximation. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 10(2):199–223, 2008.

- Reiichiro Kawai. Acceleration on adaptive importance sampling with sample average approximation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 39(4):A1586–A1615, 2017.
- Reiichiro Kawai. Optimizing adaptive importance sampling by stochastic approximation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(4):A2774–A2800, 2018.
- Bernard Lapeyre and Jérôme Lelong. A framework for adaptive monte carlo procedures. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 17(1):77–98, 2011.
- Dong-Young Lim and Sotirios Sabanis. Polygonal unadjusted langevin algorithms: Creating stable and efficient adaptive algorithms for neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.13937*, 2021.
- Dong-Young Lim, Ariel Neufeld, Sotirios Sabanis, and Ying Zhang. Non-asymptotic estimates for tushnet algorithm for non-convex learning with applications to neural networks with relu activation function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.08649*, 2021.
- Fernando Llorente, E Curbelo, Luca Martino, Victor Elvira, and D Delgado. MCMC-driven importance samplers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.02579*, 2021.
- Romain Lopez, Pierre Boyeau, Nir Yosef, Michael Jordan, and Jeffrey Regier. Decision-making with auto-encoding variational bayes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Luca Martino, Victor Elvira, David Luengo, and Jukka Corander. An adaptive population importance sampler: Learning from uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 63(16):4422–4437, 2015.
- Luca Martino, Victor Elvira, and David Luengo. Anti-tempered layered adaptive importance sampling. In *2017 22nd International Conference on Digital Signal Processing (DSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2017a.
- Luca Martino, Victor Elvira, David Luengo, and Jukka Corander. Layered adaptive importance sampling. *Statistics and Computing*, 27(3):599–623, 2017b.
- Ali Mousavi, Reza Monsefi, and Víctor Elvira. Hamiltonian adaptive importance sampling. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 28:713–717, 2021.
- Melanie F Pradier, Michael C Hughes, and Finale Doshi-Velez. Challenges in computing and optimizing upper bounds of marginal likelihood based on chi-square divergences. *Symposium on Advances in Approximate Bayesian Inference*, 2019.
- Maxim Raginsky, Alexander Rakhlin, and Matus Telgarsky. Non-convex learning via stochastic gradient Langevin dynamics: a nonasymptotic analysis. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1674–1703, 2017.
- Ernest K Ryu. *Convex optimization for Monte Carlo: Stochastic optimization for importance sampling*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2016.
- Ernest K Ryu and Stephen P Boyd. Adaptive importance sampling via stochastic convex programming. *arXiv:1412.4845*, 2014.
- Daniel Sanz-Alonso. Importance sampling and necessary sample size: an information theory approach. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 6(2):867–879, 2018.

- Daniel Sanz-Alonso and Zijian Wang. Bayesian update with importance sampling: Required sample size. *Entropy*, 23(1):22, 2021.
- Max Welling and Yee W Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 681–688, 2011.
- Pan Xu, Jinghui Chen, Difan Zou, and Quanquan Gu. Global convergence of langevin dynamics based algorithms for nonconvex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- Ying Zhang, Ömer Deniz Akyildiz, Theo Damoulas, and Sotirios Sabanis. Nonasymptotic estimates for Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics under local conditions in nonconvex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02008*, 2019.
- Difan Zou, Pan Xu, and Quanquan Gu. Stochastic gradient Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods with recursive variance reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32: 3835–3846, 2019.