

# SPEED UP ZIG-ZAG

G. VASDEKIS AND G. O. ROBERTS

**ABSTRACT.** Zig-Zag is Piecewise Deterministic Markov Process, efficiently used for simulation in an MCMC setting. As we show in this article, it fails to be exponentially ergodic on heavy tailed target distributions. We introduce an extension of the Zig-Zag process by allowing the process to move with a non-constant speed function  $s$ , depending on the current state of the process. We call this process Speed Up Zig-Zag (SUZZ). We provide conditions that guarantee stability properties for the SUZZ process, including non-explosivity, exponential ergodicity in heavy tailed targets and central limit theorem. Interestingly, we find that using speed functions that induce explosive deterministic dynamics may lead to stable algorithms that can even mix faster. We further discuss the choice of an efficient speed function by providing an efficiency criterion for the one-dimensional process and we support our findings with simulation results.

**Keywords:** Piecewise Deterministic Markov Process, Markov Chain Monte Carlo, Exponential Ergodicity, Central Limit Theorem. **MSC2020 subject classifications:** Primary 60J25 ; Secondary 65C05 , 60F05.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMP) have recently emerged as a new way to construct MCMC algorithms. Traditional MCMC algorithms employ discrete time Markov Chains to generate samples from a target distribution which is invariant for the chain, and subsequently using these samples to estimate analytically intractable expectation of function of interest. By construction, standard MCMC algorithms like Random Walk Metropolis [38], MALA [2] etc. are time-reversible with respect to their target distribution. However, there is by now substantial evidence that reversible MCMC methods can be significantly outperformed (in terms of mixing times and variances of estimators) by non-reversible ones (see for example [29, 18, 43, 15, 34, 3, 20]). In this direction Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [19] was proposed as an algorithm that introduces a notion of momentum, which can assist its mixing properties. However, for numerical reasons most implementations of HMC utilise a Metropolis-Hastings step making the algorithm reversible. On the other hand, some PDMPs such as the Bouncy Particle Sampler [13] and the Zig-Zag [6] can be implemented directly and free from numerical error, providing a source of genuinely non-reversible MCMC algorithms.

The one dimensional Zig-Zag algorithm appeared in [10] as a scaling limit of the Lifted Metropolis-Hastings (see [44, 18]) applied to the Curie-Weiss model (see [35]), although a simpler version of the process was introduced in [28] as the telegraph process (see also [31, 26, 25]). The process was later extended in higher dimensions in [6] and has been proposed as a PDMP which can be used as an MCMC algorithm to target posterior distributions (see also [23, 46]). In [6], the authors also introduce some variants of the algorithm that use the technique of sub-sampling, improving computational efficiency when the target distribution is obtained from a Bayesian analysis involving a large data set. Further literature on the topic includes [5, 4, 9, 12, 8, 7].

[11] proves ergodicity and exponential ergodicity of the Zig-Zag process in arbitrary dimension. A crucial assumption required for exponential ergodicity in that work is that the target density has exponential or lighter tails. This paper will demonstrate the converse: the Zig-Zag sampler fails to be exponentially ergodic when the target distribution has tails larger than any exponential distribution, i.e. it is a heavy tailed.

In order to address the problem of slow mixing on heavy tails we introduce a variant of the Zig-Zag process, called Speed Up Zig-Zag (SUZZ). Instead of only permitting the particle to move with unit speed, we allow it to have a positive position-dependant speed. This assists the exploration of tails and subsequent return to the high density areas of the distribution more rapidly. We note that if the speed function is large enough, the solution to the ODEs that governs the behaviour of the SUZZ process may have the capacity to explode in finite time. Large part of the theory in this article focuses on proving that such dynamics are mathematically feasible to be used in an MCMC setting. Furthermore, for carefully chosen speed functions, these ODEs and the induced SUZZ process can be numerically simulated exactly. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first use of explosive dynamics within in the literature of PDMPs for MCMC.

Our main results concern the stability and convergence of the SUZZ process. Theorem 3.1 proves that under certain conditions on the speed function, the process is non-explosive. Theorem 3.2 proves that the process has the distribution of interest as invariant. Theorem 3.3 proves that the process is exponentially ergodic and Theorem 3.4 that it satisfies a Central Limit Theorem. Corollary 3.1 proves exponential ergodicity of the original Zig-Zag on light tailed targets, relaxing the assumptions of [11]. Focusing on the one-dimensional SUZZ process, Theorem 3.5 proves that under explosive deterministic dynamics the process is uniformly ergodic. Finally, Proposition 4.1 characterises the asymptotic variance of the one-dimensional process in terms of the speed function, which allows us to study which speed function will lead to a more efficient algorithm.

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we recall the definition of the Zig-Zag process and we prove its lack of exponential ergodicity on heavy tails. Section 3 defines the Speed Up Zig-Zag (SUZZ) algorithm, describing its main properties, including non-explosivity, exponential ergodicity, the existence of a central limit theorem for ergodic averages and uniform ergodicity in the case of one-dimensional process. In Section 4 we focus on the one-dimensional process and discuss how the choice of the speed function can improve algorithm efficiency. We also introduce a minimisation problem which characterises the optimal speed function for one-dimensional SUZZ within an MCMC context. In Section 5 we describe some numerical results, comparing the efficiency of different algorithms on one-dimensional and five-dimensional distributions. Finally, in Section 6 we provide proofs of all results of the previous sections.

## 2. THE ZIG-ZAG PROCESS


Here we give a brief introduction to the Zig-Zag process, recalling some basic properties and proving it has a sub-exponential convergence rate for heavy-tailed distributions. The  $d$ -dimensional Zig-Zag process  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0} = ((X_t, \Theta_t))_{t \geq 0}$  is a PDMP with state space  $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \{\pm 1\}^d$ . One can think of the process as a particle moving in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  along one of  $2^d$  possible straight lines. When the process is at point  $(x, \theta) \in E$  the particle is at point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and moves with constant velocity  $\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d$ . This means that the process moves according to the ODE

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \frac{d\Phi_{(x,\theta)}(t)}{dt} = \theta \\ \frac{d\Theta}{dt} = 0 \end{cases}$$


To each of the  $d$  coordinates, we let  $T_i$  denote the first event of an inhomogeneous Poisson Process of rate  $m_i(t) = \lambda_i(x + \theta t, \theta)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and for some function  $\lambda_i : E \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ . We assume that all  $m_i$  are locally integrable. let  $j = \operatorname{argmin}_{i \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \{T_i\}$ . The process moves with velocity  $\theta$  until time  $T$  at which time its velocity changes to  $F_j[\theta]$ , where

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} F_j[\theta]_j = -\theta_j \\ F_j[\theta]_i = \theta_i \text{ for } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

and proceeds to move again with constant velocity  $F_j[\theta]$  until it switches again, etc.



(A) T=100



(B) T=10000

FIGURE 1. Trace plots of Zig-Zag process, ran until time  $T$ , targeting one-dimensional Cauchy distribution.

In [6] the goal was to target a probability measure on  $E$  of the form

$$(3) \quad \mu(dx, d\theta) = \frac{1}{2^d Z} \exp\{-U(x)\} dx d\theta$$

for some  $U \in C^1$  with  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\{-U(x)\} dx < \infty$ . It is proven that the Zig-Zag process has  $\mu$  as invariant when the rate functions are chosen according to

$$(4) \quad \lambda_i(x, \theta) = [\theta_i \partial_i U(x)]^+ + \gamma_i(x, \theta_{-i})$$

where we write  $\partial_i$  to denote the operator of the partial derivative on the  $i$  coordinate,  $a^+ = \max\{a, 0\}$  and  $\gamma_i$  is a non-negative function that does not depend on the  $i$  component of  $\theta$ . The special case where  $\gamma_i(x, \theta_{-i}) = 0$  for all  $x, i$  is known as the *canonical Zig-Zag*.

**Remark 2.1.** *We note that in many MCMC applications the goal is to target a measure*

$$(5) \quad \pi(dx) = 1/Z \exp\{-U(x)\} dx$$

in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . *Technically, the Zig-Zag process targets a measure  $\mu$  on  $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \{-1, +1\}^d$ , whose marginal distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is  $\pi$  and whose marginal distribution on  $\{-1, +1\}^d$  is the uniform. One then uses the projection of the process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to generate a sample from the measure of interest  $\pi$ . Throughout this work we shall denote  $\pi$  the measure of interest in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mu$  the measure on  $E$  given by (3).*

[11] demonstrates that under conditions that  $U$  should grow at least linearly in the tails and appropriate smoothness conditions, the Zig-Zag process  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  converges to  $\mu$  with an exponential rate, i.e. there exist  $M : E \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  and  $\rho < 1$  such that for any  $(x, \theta) \in E$

$$(6) \quad \|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq M(V(x, \theta) + 1)\rho^t.$$

However [11] does not cover the case where  $U$  is sub-linear in the tails. In this scenario traditional MCMC algorithms based on random walk or Langevin proposals are known to converge at sub-exponential rates, see for example [30, 42, 37]. We will observe similar behaviour for the Zig-Zag sampler. Figure 2 provides the Q-Q plots of one-dimensional canonical Zig-Zag processes, targeting Student t distributions with three different degrees of freedom. Each algorithm runs until  $N = 10^4$  switches of direction occur. The figure indicates that the process becomes more stable when targeting a Student t distribution with higher degrees of freedom, which has lighter tails. This instability is characterised by infrequent and unstable (heavy-tailed) excursions. The following simple negative result for the Zig-Zag sampler on heavy-tailed distributions was made known to us in personal communication with Anthony Lee.

**Theorem 2.1** (Non-Exponential Ergodicity). *Suppose that the Zig-Zag targets a heavy tailed distribution. Then the process is not exponentially Ergodic.*

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Suppose that the Zig-Zag starts from  $x = 0, \theta = +1$ . Fix a time  $t > 0$ . Let  $A_t = \{x : x > t\}$  be the complement of the ball of radius  $t$ . After time  $t$  has passed, the Zig-Zag will not have hit  $A_t$ . Therefore,


$$\|\mathbb{P}_0(X_t \in \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|_{TV} \geq |\mathbb{P}_0(X_t \in A_t) - \mu(A_t)| = \mu(A_t) = \mu(B(0, t)^c).$$

So if we were to have exponential ergodicity, we would have

$$\mu(B(0, t)^c) \leq M\rho^t$$

for all  $t$  which contradicts,  $\mu$  having heavy tails. □

Note that the same proof can be used for any other algorithm with unit speed function such as the Bouncy Particle Sampler with refreshing velocities taken from the unit sphere. Since these processes move with unit speed, they won't be allowed to explore the tails of the distribution sufficiently, which will result in a bad estimation of a target distribution that has heavy tails. Unit velocities are used mainly for the simplicity of the deterministic paths they provide. However, there are other types of deterministic paths that we can simulate exactly which do not move with unit speed. This raises the question why not allowing for the Zig-Zag process to move with non-unit velocities. We introduce this algorithm in the following section.



(A) Student(1) distribution

(B) Student(8) distribution

(C) Student(500) distribution

FIGURE 2. Q-Q plots Zig-Zag for three Student distributions with increasing degrees of freedom. With Student( $n$ ) we denote the Student distribution with  $n$  degrees of freedom. Each algorithm runs until  $N = 10^4$  switches of direction occur. The closer the curve is to the diagonal line, the better the algorithm approximates the distribution. Clearly, the approximation is better when the target has higher degrees of freedom, i.e. lighter tails.

### 3. SPEED UP ZIG-ZAG

**3.1. Definition of the Algorithm.** In order to address the problem of slow mixing on heavy tails we introduce a variant of the Zig-Zag process. Instead of allowing the process to move with unit velocity, we allow it to have a positive speed depending on the current position. Since in high dimensions this might create a system of ODEs that is non-implementable, we only allow the process to move in directions  $\{\pm 1\}^d$  as the original Zig-Zag does.

The state space will, again, be  $E = \mathbb{R}^d \times \{\pm 1\}^d$ . However, when the process is at point  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , it will move along the path  $\{x + \theta t, t \geq 0\}$  with speed function  $s$  that depends on the current position. Typically, this speed will increase the further the process is from the mode. After a random time that will depend on a Poisson process, as in the original Zig-Zag, the process will stop, one of the coordinates of  $\theta$  will switch sign and the process will start moving again to the new direction. This will create excursions that tend to leave the area of high density and visit the tails quite often. At the same time, when the process is at the tails of the distribution, it can speed up and return to the centre fast enough. We shall call this process **Speed Up Zig-Zag (SUZZ)**, with state space  $E \cup \{\partial\}$  (where  $\partial$  is a graveyard state we need for technical reasons), with  $C^2$  **speed function**  $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and **rate functions**  $\lambda_i : E \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ . In algorithmic terms the process is described as follows.

**Algorithm 3.1** (Speed Up Zig-Zag).

- (1) Set  $t = 0$
- (2) Start from point  $(X_t, \Theta_t) = (x, \theta) \in E$ .
- (3) The process  $(X_u, \Theta_u)$  moves according to the deterministic ODE system

$$(7) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d}{du} X_{t+u} = \frac{d\Phi_{(x,\theta)}(u)}{du} = \theta s(X_{t+u}), u \geq 0 \\ \frac{d}{du} \Theta_{t+u} = 0, u \geq 0 \\ X_t = x, \Theta_t = \theta \end{cases}$$

- (4) For every coordinate  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  construct a Poisson Process with intensity  $\{m_i(s) = \lambda_i(\Phi_{(x,\theta)}(s), \theta), s \geq 0\}$ .
- (5) Let  $\tau_i$  be the first arrival time of the  $i$  Poisson Process, i.e. for all  $s \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\tau_i \geq s) = \exp\{-\int_0^s m_i(u) du\}$ . Let  $j = \operatorname{argmin}\{\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, d\}$  and  $\tau = \tau_j$  the first arrival time of all the processes.
- (6) For  $u \in [t, t + \tau)$  set  $X_u = \Phi_{(x,\theta)}(u - t)$  and  $\Theta_u = \theta$ .
- (7) Set  $t = t + \tau$ ,  $x = \Phi_{(x,\theta)}(\tau)$ ,  $X_t = x$  and  $\Theta_t = F_j[\theta]$ .
- (8) Repeat from the Step 2.

Note that by using the constant speed function  $s(x) = 1$  one recovers the original Zig-Zag process from Algorithm 3.1. This is natural since the Zig-Zag process is a special case of SUZZ when the speed function is constant everywhere.

Formally, the process is constructed as follows.

Let  $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  i.i.d. exponential random variables with mean 1 and  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  i.i.d. uniform in  $[0, 1]$  random variables, independent of the  $E_n$ 's. Suppose that the process starts from  $(x, \theta) \in E$ . Let  $\{\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  be the flow on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  that solves the ODE system

$$(8) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{d\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t)}{dt} = \theta s(\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t)), t \in [0, t^*(x, \theta)) \\ \Phi_{(x, \theta)}(0) = x, \end{cases}$$

where  $t^*(x, \theta) = \sup\{t \geq 0 : \Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$  is the explosion time of the flow, with the convention that if the flow does not explode this is set  $t^*(x, \theta) = +\infty$ . Note that if  $s \in C^1$ , the ODE system (8) has a unique solution. Note also that this solution flow moves in a straight line parallel to  $\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d$ . We define for all  $(y, \eta) \in E$

$$(9) \quad \lambda(y, \eta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(y, \eta).$$

Let

$$\tau_1 = \inf\{t \in [0, t^*(x, \theta)) : \int_0^t \lambda(\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(s), \theta) ds \geq E_1\},$$

where we will always use the convention that  $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$ . Let us also define  $i_1$  to be the a.s. unique  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  that satisfies

$$u_1 \in \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k(\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(\tau_1), \theta), \sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_k(\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(\tau_1), \theta) \right]$$

Let  $T_1 = \tau_1$ . If  $\tau_1 = \infty$  we set  $(X_t, \Theta_t) = (\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t), \theta)$  for all  $t < t^*(x, \theta)$  and  $(X_t, \Theta_t) = \partial$  for  $t \geq t^*(x, \theta)$ . If  $\tau_1 < \infty$  set  $(X_t, \Theta_t) = (\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t), \theta)$  for all  $0 \leq t < T_1$ . Then set  $(X_{T_1}, \Theta_{T_1}) = (\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(T_1), F_{i_1}[\theta])$ , where  $F_{i_1}[\theta] \in \{\pm 1\}^d$  as in (2).

We then continue the construction inductively, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $T_n < \infty$  and assuming that the process is constructed until time  $T_n$ , we then consider the flow  $\{\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  and let

$$(10) \quad \tau_{n+1} = \inf\{t \in [0, t^*(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})) : \int_0^t \lambda(\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(s), \Theta_{T_n}) ds \geq E_{n+1}\}.$$

Let us also define  $i_{n+1}$  to be the a.s. unique  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  that satisfies

$$u_{n+1} \in \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k(\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(\tau_{n+1}), \Theta_{T_n}), \sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_k(\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(\tau_{n+1}), \Theta_{T_n}) \right]$$

Let  $T_{n+1} = T_n + \tau_{n+1}$ . If  $\tau_{n+1} = \infty$ , we set  $(X_{T_n+t}, \Theta_{T_n+t}) = (\Phi_{x, \theta}(t), \Theta_{T_n})$  for all  $t < t^*(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})$  and  $(X_{T_n+t}, \Theta_{T_n+t}) = \partial$  for  $t \geq t^*(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})$ .

If  $\tau_{n+1} < \infty$  set  $(X_{T_n+t}, \Theta_{T_n+t}) = (\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(t), \Theta_{T_n})$  for all  $0 \leq t < T_{n+1} - T_n$ . Then set  $(X_{T_{n+1}}, \Theta_{T_{n+1}}) = (\Phi_{(X_{T_n}, \Theta_{T_n})}(T_{n+1}), F_{i_{n+1}}[\Theta_{T_n}])$ .

This defines the process until time

$$(11) \quad \xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} T_n$$

which is the first time that infinitely many jumps occur. We define  $(X_t, \Theta_t) = \partial$  for all  $t \geq \xi$ .

The process is therefore defined as a Piecewise Deterministic Process in [17] would be. The difference is that we allow the deterministic dynamics to have a finite explosion type, which Davis in [17] does not. We therefore need to be more careful in the analysis of the process. Let  $O_m$  be the ball of radius  $m$  centred around the origin 0. We define

$$(12) \quad \zeta_m = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \notin O_m\}$$

and let

$$(13) \quad \zeta = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_m.$$

These two random variables  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  quantify two types of explosion that can occur for the process. The first is that the process could have infinitely many switches and the second, that the process might diverge to infinity in finite time. Note that the way we have constructed the process, we have  $Z_t = (X_t, \Theta_t) \in E$  only for  $t < \min\{\xi, \zeta\} = \xi \wedge \zeta$ . For formality let us define  $Z_t = \partial$  for  $t \geq \xi \wedge \zeta$ .

**3.2. Stability and Convergence Properties.** In this section we will study the process in more detail and provide some convergence results to the distribution of interest. We will ultimately provide assumptions that ensure exponential ergodicity of the process. We will, also, try to motivate these assumptions by comparing them with the ones made in the context of original Zig-Zag.

Similarly to the normal Zig-Zag case we will assume that we are trying to target the measure  $\mu$  introduced in (3) using a SUZZ with speed function  $s$ . Throughout this article we will assume that the rates are of the form

$$(14) \quad \lambda_i(x, \theta) = [\theta_i A_i(x)]^+ + \gamma_i(x, \theta_{-i})$$

where  $\gamma_i$  is a non-negative, locally bounded, integrable function that does not depend on the  $i$ 'th component of  $\theta$  and

$$(15) \quad A_i(x) = s(x) \partial_i U(x) - \partial_i s(x).$$

Note that if we use the constant speed function  $s \equiv 1$  we retrieve the normal Zig-Zag rates when targeting  $\mu$ . We will later prove that if the rates satisfy (14) and some extra regularity conditions hold, the SUZZ process leaves the measure  $\mu$  in (3) invariant.

Before we focus more on whether the SUZZ process targets the right distribution, we first need to consider some explosivity issues the process might have. Even in one dimension, picking a large enough speed function  $s$  can lead to deterministic dynamics that explode in finite time. On a first glance, following deterministic dynamics that explode in finite time seems to be non-implementable. However, direction changes rule out trajectories actually reaching  $\infty$ . Moreover, since  $\infty$  acts as an exit boundary for the proposed dynamics, it also acts as an entrance boundary (by using reversed velocity). This paves the way for the SUZZ algorithm to be uniformly ergodic.

One can allow the deterministic dynamics to be explosive, as long as a switching Poisson process is also introduced, having a very large intensity that will switch the direction of the process before it reaches the explosion time. We will provide conditions, the rates should satisfy, for the process to be non-explosive.

Before that, we need to properly define how can the process explode.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\zeta$  be as in (13). The process is called non-explosive if  $\zeta = +\infty$  a.s.*

We begin with the most essential assumption for the speed function.

**Assumption 3.1** (Speed Growth).  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \exp\{-U(x)\} s(x) = 0$ .

**Remark 3.1.** *Assumption 3.1 is non-redundant in order to ensure that the process will never reach the explosion time. Consider a one-dimensional SUZZ with speed function  $s$  targeting a distribution that has  $U$  as minus log-likelihood. Assume that there exists a  $x_0$  such that for all  $x \geq x_0$ ,  $(U(x) - \log s(x))' > 0$ , as would typically be the case.*

*Suppose that the process starts from  $(x, +1)$ ,  $x \geq x_0$ . The process evolves under the deterministic dynamics given in (7) until the explosion time  $t^* = t^*(x, +1)$ . Consider the Poisson process with rate  $\{m(t) = \lambda(X_t, \theta), t \geq 0\}$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t^*} m(t) dt &= \int_0^{t^*} \lambda(X_t, +1) dt = \int_x^{+\infty} \lambda(u, +1) \frac{1}{s(u)} du = \int_x^{+\infty} U'(u) - \frac{s'(u)}{s(u)} du \\ &= \lim_{u \rightarrow +\infty} U(u) - \log s(u) - (U(x) - \log s(x)) \end{aligned}$$

*Therefore, assuming that Assumption 3.1 does not hold and let's say that  $s(u) \exp\{-U(u)\} \xrightarrow{u \rightarrow +\infty} a > 0$  we get that*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} U(x) - \log(s(x)) = \log(a^{-1}) < \infty$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{P}_{x,+1}(\text{no switches until time } t^*(x,+1)) = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^{t^*(x,+1)} m(t) dt \right\} > 0.$$

Therefore, if  $t^*(x,+1) < \infty$  then the process has a positive probability to explode. The same situation is experienced in higher dimensions assuming that for all coordinates  $i$ ,  $\partial_i(U(x) - \log s(x)) > 0$  for all  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  for which  $x_i$  is positive and very large. This forces us to adopt assumption 3.1.

We will, also, make the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.2.** Assume that for the refresh rates there exists  $\bar{\gamma}$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,  $\gamma_i(x, \theta_{-i}) = \gamma_i(x) \leq \bar{\gamma}$ .

Furthermore, assume that there exists  $R > 0$  and  $A > 0$  so that for all  $x \notin B(0, R)$

$$(16) \quad \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| > A > \max\{3d\bar{\gamma}, 4d(d-1)\bar{\gamma}\}.$$

**Remark 3.2.** In the setting of original Zig-Zag, [11] assumes that  $\|\nabla U(x)\|_1 \xrightarrow{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \infty$  in order to prove exponential ergodicity. Note that in the setting of the normal Zig-Zag  $\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| = \|\nabla U(x)\|_1$ , therefore Assumption 3.2 can be seen as a more relaxed version of the assumption of [11].

When all refresh rates are zero, then  $\bar{\gamma} = 0$ , (16) means that the overall switching rate is bounded away from zero, which seems essential in order to gain exponential ergodicity. More generally, the  $A_i$ 's describe the intention of the algorithm to switch from a direction leading to lower density areas, while  $\gamma_i$ 's describe the intention of the algorithm to switch direction for a random reason. Large values of  $\gamma_i$  would lead the algorithm to a Random Walk behaviour (see also [5]) and might decrease the convergence rate. Therefore, (16) could be seen as a quantitative upper bound for the refresh rate.

Finally, we make one more assumption.

**Assumption 3.3.** For all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $A_j \in C^1$  and

$$(17) \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x)}{\sum_{k=1}^d |A_k(x)|} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d |\partial_i A_j(x)|}{(1 + |A_j(x)|)(1 + \log(1 + |A_j(x)|))} = 0.$$

Furthermore, if we iteratively define the functions  $f_n : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$f_0(x) = x$$

and for any  $n \geq 1$

$$(18) \quad f_n(x) = \exp\{f_{n-1}(x)\} - 1$$

then there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(19) \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s(x) \|\nabla(U(x) - \log s(x))\|_1}{f_n(U(x) - \log s(x))} = 0.$$

**Remark 3.3.** This assumption, when seen in the setting of normal Zig-Zag where  $s \equiv 1$ , is a more relaxed version of the assumptions made in [11] for the original Zig-Zag. More precisely, in view of Assumption 3.1, in the case of original Zig-Zag, equation (19) writes that there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$(20) \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1}{f_n(U(x))} = 0$$

which is a lot weaker than the assumption made in [11], i.e. that  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1}{U(x)} = 0$ . Indeed, (20) is almost always verified in a practical setting. At the same time, equation (17) is weaker than  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|Hess(U(x))\|_1}{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1} = 0$ , which is also assumed in [11].

The reader can see Example 5.2.9 of [47] for an example where the target has tails asymptotically similar to those of a Student distribution and it is verified that (17) holds.

Our first main result is the following.

**Theorem 3.1** (Non-Explosion). *Assume that  $s \in C^2$ , the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 hold. Then the process is non-explosive, meaning that if  $\zeta$  as in (13), then  $\zeta = +\infty$  a.s. Furthermore, if  $\xi$  as in (11), then  $\xi = +\infty$  a.s.*

Furthermore, if we pick the switching rates according to (14) then our non-explosive process leaves the target distribution of interest invariant. For this we need to make the following assumption in the case where the deterministic dynamics of the process are explosive.

**Assumption 3.4.**

$$(21) \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \|x\|^{d-1} s(x) \exp\{-U(x)\} = 0.$$

**Remark 3.4.** *In the original Zig-Zag for  $s \equiv 1$ , (21) is implied by the following growth condition: there exists  $\varepsilon > 0, c' \in \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $U(x) \geq (d+\varepsilon) \log(\|x\|) - c'$ . This is assumed in [11] to prove non-evanescence of the Zig-Zag process.*

We then have the following.

**Theorem 3.2** (Invariant Measure). *Assume that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 hold. Then, the SUZZ process has the measure  $\mu$  in (3) as invariant.*

Crucially, under some further conditions on the speed function  $s$ , the SUZZ process is exponentially ergodic even when targeting a heavy tailed distribution.

**Theorem 3.3** (Exponential Ergodicity of SUZZ). *Let  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0} = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a SUZZ process with speed function  $s : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ ,  $s \in C^2$ . Suppose that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 hold. Assume further that the function  $U - \log s \in C^3$  and has a non-degenerate local minimum, i.e. there exists an  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  local minimum for  $U - \log s$  such that the Hessian matrix  $\text{Hess}(U - \log s)(x_0)$  is strictly positive definite. Finally, assume that  $\mu$  introduced in (3) is a probability measure. Then the Speed Up Zig-Zag process is exponentially ergodic, i.e. there exists some  $M > 0, \rho < 1$  such that for  $V$  introduced in (48) and any  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,*

$$(22) \quad \|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq MV(x, \theta)\rho^t.$$

As a special case of Theorem 3.3, by using  $s(x) = 1$ , we get the following result for the original Zig-Zag process. This is an improved version of Theorem 2 of [11], since we only ask that  $\|\nabla U(x)\|_1$  is bounded below by a constant at the tails, instead of asking that  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \|\nabla U(x)\|_1 = +\infty$ . Furthermore, as noted in Remark 3.3, the assumption of [11] that  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1}{U(x)} = 0$  can be further weakened to an assumption that will almost always hold in a practical setting.

**Corollary 3.1** (Exponential Ergodicity of Zig-Zag). *Let  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0} = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Zig-Zag process. Assume that  $U \in C^3$ , and has a non-degenerate local minimum. Assume that there exists  $\bar{\gamma}$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,  $\gamma_i(x, \theta_{-i}) = \gamma_i(x) \leq \bar{\gamma}$ . Furthermore, assume that there exists  $R > 0$  and  $A > 0$  so that for all  $x \notin B(0, R)$*

$$(23) \quad \|\nabla U(x)\|_1 > A > \max\{3d\bar{\gamma}, 4d(d-1)\bar{\gamma}\}.$$

Finally, assume that there exists an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that if  $f_n$  is defined as in (18) then

$$(24) \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1}{f_n(U(x))} = 0, \quad \lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|\text{Hess}U(x)\|_1}{\|\nabla U(x)\|_1} = 0.$$

Then the Zig-Zag process is exponentially ergodic, i.e. there exists some  $M > 0, \rho < 1$  such that for  $V$  introduced in (48) and any  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,

$$(25) \quad \|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq MV(x, \theta)\rho^t.$$

An immediate result due to Theorem 2 of [14] is the following CLT.

**Theorem 3.4** (Central Limit Theorem). *Suppose that all the assumptions of Theorem 3.3 hold. Let  $\{Y_n, n \geq 0\}$  any skeleton of the SUZZ process (i.e. for some  $\delta > 0$ ,  $Y_n = Z_{n\delta}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) and let  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f^{2+\varepsilon}] < \infty$ , then there exists a  $\gamma_f^2 \in [0, \infty)$  such that*

$$(26) \quad \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n f(Y_k) - \mu(f)}{\sqrt{n}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{D} Z$$

for some  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma_f^2)$ .

**3.3. Space Transformation and Uniform Ergodicity.** When we focus on the one dimensional process, we can prove that it is a space transformation of an original, one-dimensional Zig-Zag process. We have the following.

**Proposition 3.1** (One Dimensional SUZZ as Space Transformation). *Consider a one-dimensional SUZZ process  $Z_t = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with speed function  $s$ , targeting a measure  $\mu$  as in (3). Assume that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Let*

$$(27) \quad f(x) = \int_0^x \frac{1}{s(u)} du$$

and

$$(28) \quad \pm M^\pm = \lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}.$$

Then, the process  $(Y_t, \Theta)_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $Y_t = f(X_t)$ , is a one-dimensional original Zig-Zag process, defined on  $(-M^-, M^+) \times \{-1, +1\}$  and has measure  $\nu$  invariant where

$$(29) \quad \nu(dy, d\theta) = \frac{1}{Z_0} \exp\{-V(y)\} dy d\theta$$

and

$$(30) \quad V(y) = U(f^{-1}(y)) - \log s(f^{-1}(y)).$$

Using Proposition 3.1, we can prove that the one-dimensional SUZZ process with explosive deterministic dynamics is uniformly ergodic. This means that it is exponentially ergodic and the mixing time can be bounded by a quantity that does not depend on the starting point. This is a consequence of the fact that explosive deterministic dynamics have  $\infty$  as entrance boundary.

**Theorem 3.5** (Uniform Ergodicity in One Dimension). *Consider a one dimensional Speed Up Zig-Zag process  $Z_t = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  with speed function  $s$ , targeting a measure  $\mu$  as in (3). Assume that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Assume further, that for any  $(x, \theta)$  the deterministic flow of the process  $\{\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t), t \geq 0\}$  has a finite explosive time  $t^*(x, \theta)$ . Then the process is non-explosive, has  $\mu$  as invariant measure and is uniformly ergodic, i.e. there exists a  $M > 0$  and  $\rho < 1$  such that for any  $(x, \theta) \in E$  and  $t \geq 0$*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq M\rho^t.$$

We emphasise, however, that the SUZZ algorithm cannot necessarily be written as a space transformation of a simple Zig-Zag in dimension higher than 1. We illustrate this in Figure 3 with  $d = 2$ , where it is presupposed that there does exist such a transformation  $\varphi$ . The left figure represents the movement of a two-dimensional SUZZ process starting from  $x_1$  and ending at  $x_4$ . The right figure represents the movement of the  $\varphi$ -space transformed process, assumed to be a simple Zig-Zag, starting from  $\varphi(x_1)$  and ending at  $\varphi(x_4)$ . There are two paths from  $x_1$  to  $x_4$ , passing through and switching at  $x_2$  or  $x_3$  respectively. If the speed function  $s(x)$  takes smaller values on the path via  $x_2$ , then the process arrives at  $x_4$  faster via the  $x_3$  path rather than via the  $x_2$  path. However, the transformed process moves with constant unit speed, as it is an original Zig-Zag process and the two paths from  $\varphi(x_1)$  to  $\varphi(x_4)$ , passing either via  $\varphi(x_2)$  or via  $\varphi(x_3)$  have the same length. Therefore the time it takes for the transformed process to traverse either of the two paths from  $\varphi(x_1)$  to  $\varphi(x_4)$  is the same. This therefore gives a contradiction.

As a result of this discussion, we can see that we cannot rely on the existence of such a transformation between SUZZ and Zig-Zag, and so results for SUZZ cannot easily be obtained from those for Zig-Zag by simple transformation arguments.

#### 4. CHOICE OF SPEED FUNCTION

A natural objective is to choose the speed function that generates the most efficient algorithm. If we consider the one-dimensional case, from Proposition 3.3, if  $(X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is an one dimensional SUZZ process with speed function  $s$  and  $f$  as in (27), then  $(Y_t, \Theta_t) = (f(X_t), \Theta_t)$  is an original Zig-Zag process, targeting a measure with negative log-likelihood given by  $V(y) = U(f^{-1}(y)) - \log s(f^{-1}(y))$ , defined on a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, instead of using SUZZ, one could equivalently use the original Zig-Zag  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)$ , target the potential  $V$  and then use the path of  $f^{-1}(Y_t)$  as a way to sample from the measure of interest. Therefore, in the one-dimensional case, the goal




FIGURE 3. Figure explaining why a two dimensional SUZZ is not in general a space transformation  $\varphi$  of a normal Zig-Zag process. The figure on the left shows two possible SUZZ paths from  $x_1$  to  $x_4$ , passing via either  $x_2$  or  $x_3$  and switching directions there. Assuming that the SUZZ process was a space transformation of an original Zig-Zag, via a function  $\varphi$ , the figure on the right shows the two paths of the space transformed Zig-Zag process, from  $\varphi(x_1)$  to  $\varphi(x_4)$ , via either  $\varphi(x_2)$  or  $\varphi(x_3)$ . The times,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , to traverse the two paths from  $x_1$  to  $x_4$  on the left figure, depending on the speed function, do not have to be the same. The same times,  $T_1, T_2$ , would also be the times to traverse the two paths from  $\varphi(x_1)$  to  $\varphi(x_4)$  on the  $\varphi$ -transformed right figure. However, if the  $\varphi$ -transformed right figure was an ordinary Zig-Zag, moving with constant unit speed, these two times would had to be the same.

of choosing the most efficient  $s$ , boils down to choosing a space transformation  $f$  so that  $f^{-1}$  can be evaluated pointwise and the potential

$$V(y) = U(f^{-1}(y)) - \log s(f^{-1}(y)) = U(f^{-1}(y)) + \log f'(f^{-1}(y))$$

leads to an efficient normal Zig-Zag algorithm. If we view SUZZ in that sense and ignoring Assumption 3.1 for the moment, then in order to target  $\pi(dx) = \exp\{-U(x)\}dx$ , the choice of  $s(x) = \exp\{U(x)\}$  seems reasonable. This is because the space transformation is

$$f(x) = \int_0^x \exp\{-U(x)\}dx = F(x) - \pi((-\infty, 0]),$$

where  $F$  is the CDF of  $\pi$ , and running this SUZZ is equivalent to run a normal Zig-Zag on the measure with negative log-likelihood  $V \equiv 0$  (i.e. the Lebesgue measure) and then transform the values back according to the function  $f^{-1}(y)$ . This is almost equivalent to inverse sampling.

We do note, however, that this choice of  $s$  is not admissible in our setting as it violates Assumption 3.1 and leads to explosive algorithms. This can also be seen in terms of the transformed original Zig-Zag process, when the deterministic dynamics are explosive. The process will have state space  $(-M^-, M^+) \times \{\pm 1\}$  where  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) = \pm M^\pm < \infty$ , so we would need a mechanism to ensure that the process will not hit the boundary  $\{\pm M^\pm\}$  in order for the algorithm not to explode. Furthermore, even if Assumption 3.1 was not violated, assuming that one can simulate directly the deterministic dynamics induced by a speed function  $s(x) = \exp\{U(x)\}$  is not a realistic assumption.

The fact, however, that the choice of speed function  $s(x) = \exp\{U(x)\}$  would be attractive, motivates us to pick a speed function  $s$  such that  $s(x)\exp\{-U(x)\}$  decays to zero as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  (so that Assumption 3.1 holds), but does so as slowly as possible. For example, if the non-normalised invariant distribution  $\exp\{-U(x)\}$  decays like  $|x|^{-(1+k)}$  at the tails, it seems reasonable to pick a speed function  $s$  that grows at the tails like  $(1 + |x|)^{1+\varepsilon}$  for some  $\varepsilon$  very close to  $k$ , but slightly less than  $k$ . Note that this speed function induces deterministic dynamics that can be simulated exactly. This idea of picking a speed function so that  $s(x)\exp\{-U(x)\}$  decays as slowly as possible could serve as a motivation in higher dimensions as well, even though, as argued earlier, the SUZZ process is no longer a Zig-Zag space transformation.

In the case of one dimension, we present a criterion of algorithmic performance over different speed functions.

**4.1. A Computational Efficiency Criterion.** Computational efficiency goes far beyond qualitative convergence results such as exponential ergodicity. The actual cost of implementing MCMC algorithms is largely controlled by the number of computational operations that need to be performed to obtain a sample of desired

accuracy. In our setting this cost comes largely from evaluating the switching rates which involves evaluating the gradient of the log-likelihood of the target. Therefore, in order to compare algorithm efficiency, we need to compare the number of the gradient log-likelihood evaluations need to be performed until we get a good approximation of the quantity of interest of comparable accuracy. In the SUZZ setting, these evaluations appear in the implementation of the algorithm when one uses Poisson thinning (see [36]) to simulate the switching times. In an ideal setting, using Poisson thinning, the number of gradient log-likelihood evaluations would be equal to the number of switches of direction. The actual number of gradient log-likelihood evaluations depends on the tightness of the bounds used in this Poisson thinning operation and is therefore difficult to consider objectively. Therefore we shall instead use the number of direction switches as a unit for measuring the implementation cost of the algorithm.

For the remainder of this section, we focus on dimension one and closely follow [5].

Let  $N_T$  be the expected number of switches until time  $T$ . Then  $N_T = \mathbb{E}[\int_0^T \lambda(X_s, \Theta_s) ds]$ . Since the process is Harris recurrent, we have a Law of Large numbers and

$$(31) \quad N_0 := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_T}{T} = \int \lambda(x, \theta) d\mu(x, \theta) = \frac{1}{2Z} \sum_{\theta=\pm 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-U(x)\} \lambda(x, \theta) dx = \frac{1}{2Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{-U(x)\} |s(x)U'(x) - s'(x)| dx.$$

Consider a functional of interest  $g \in L^2(\mu)$  and let  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a SUZZ process targeting  $\mu$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $\mu(g) = 0$  and consider the estimator

$$(32) \quad g_T = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T g(Z_s) ds.$$

If the process satisfies a CLT then there exists an asymptotic variance  $\gamma_g^2 \in [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(33) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} T \cdot \text{Var}(g_T) = \gamma_g^2$$

A way to measure the efficiency of the algorithm is the Effective Sample Size (ESS) (see [45]) which measures how many independent samples the algorithm has generated until time  $T$  and is defined as

$$(34) \quad ESS(T) = \frac{\text{Var}_{\mu}(g)}{\text{Var}(g_T)}.$$

Our main cost of implementing the algorithm is the average number of switches. Overall, if we view ESS as a function of the number of switches, it seems natural to consider the quantity of ESS per average number of direction switches in order to evaluate the efficiency of the algorithm. Combining (31), (33) and (34) we get

$$(35) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{ESS(T)}{N_T} = \frac{\text{Var}_{\mu}(g)}{\gamma_g^2 N_0}.$$

Therefore, in order to choose the optimal  $s$  that makes the algorithm the most efficient we need to minimize the quantity  $\gamma_g^2 N_0$  over different speed functions. The following proposition, describes the asymptotic variance  $\gamma_g^2$  in terms of  $s$ . Before that, we need to make an assumption. Let

$$(36) \quad V(x, \theta) = \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x) + \frac{1}{2} \delta |A_i(x)| f_n^{-1}(|A_i(x)|)\}$$

where  $f_n$  as in (18) and  $a, \delta > 0$  small enough so that if  $\mathcal{L}$  is the operator defined for all  $f \in C^1(E)$  as

$$(37) \quad \mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) = \theta s(x) f'(x, \theta) + ([\theta U'(x)]^+ + \gamma(x)) (f(x, -\theta) - f(x, \theta)).$$

then there exist  $c, b > 0$  such that for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,

$$(38) \quad \mathcal{L}V(x, \theta) \leq -cV(x, \theta) + b1_{(x, \theta) \in C},$$

The fact that (38) holds for  $a, \delta$  small enough will be later proved in Section 6, in the proof of Theorem 3.1. We now assume the following.

**Assumption 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the operator in (37) for all  $f \in C^1(E)$ . Let  $V$  defined as in (36) for  $a, \delta > 0$  small enough such that (38) holds. Assume that there exists a  $C > 0$  such that for all  $g \in L^1(E)$  satisfying  $g(x, \theta) \leq V(x, \theta)$  for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , there exists a  $\varphi$  such that*

$$-\mathcal{L}\varphi = g$$

and such that for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$

$$\varphi(x, \theta) \leq C V(x, \theta).$$

This assumption is a result proven in [27] in the case where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the extended generator of a process, in the sense that for any  $f \in C^1(E)$  the process

$$M_t = f(X_t) - f(X_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}f(X_s) ds$$

is a martingale. However, since we allow the process to have explosive deterministic dynamics, we can only guarantee that  $M_t$  is a local martingale. We note here that in [27] the authors claim that Assumption 4.1 holds in our case as well, i.e. when  $\mathcal{L}$  only induces a local martingale. However, to the best of our knowledge this is not something proven in the literature. Therefore, we make this assumption here and we present the following result under Assumption 4.1.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Assume that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Let  $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the domain of  $\mathcal{L}$ , with  $\mu(g) = 0$  and assume that  $g(x, \theta) \leq V(x, \theta)$  for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , where  $V$  is the function defined in (36) for some  $a < 1, \delta > 0$  small enough such that (38) holds. Finally, assume that Assumption 4.1 holds. Then, if  $Z_t = (X_t, \Theta_t)$  is the one dimensional SUZZ process with speed function  $s$ , starting from the invariant measure  $\mu$ , then we have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T g(Z_s) ds \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} N(0, \gamma_g^2)$$

in distribution where

$$(39) \quad \gamma_g^2 = \frac{1}{2Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |s(x)U'(x) - s'(x)| \frac{1}{s^2(x) \exp\{-U(x)\}} k^2(x) dx$$

and

$$(40) \quad k(x) = \int_x^{+\infty} (g(y, +1) + g(y, -1)) \exp\{-U(y)\} dy.$$

Proposition 4.1 and equations (31) and (35) indicate that for a given function  $g : E \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  with  $\mu(g) = 0$ , such that for all  $a \in (0, 1)$  we have  $g(x, \theta) \leq \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x)\}$  for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 4.1, we need to pick a speed function  $s$  in order to minimize the quantity

$$(41) \quad J[r] := \gamma_g^2 N_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |r'(x)| dx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|r'(x)|}{r^2(x)} k^2(x) dx$$

where

$$r(x) = s(x) \exp\{-U(x)\}$$

and we need to impose the condition

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = 0$$

so that Assumption 3.1 holds.

We will call the functional  $J$  the **inverse algorithmic efficiency**. Note that  $J$  is invariant under constant scaling of function  $s$ . This is in accordance to the fact that we don't gain or loose any efficiency by speeding up Zig-Zag with a constant speed, for example by having velocities of the form  $\{\pm 2\}^d$ .

**Remark 4.1.** *The result of Proposition 4.1 can be generalised in the case where  $\mu(g)$  is not necessarily zero. In the general case, the function  $k$  in (40) used to define  $J[r]$  would be*

$$k(x) = \int_x^{+\infty} \left( g(y, +1) + g(y, -1) - \frac{1}{2} \mu(g) \right) \exp\{-U(y)\} dy.$$

*In practice,  $\mu(g)$  is not a known quantity. Then one can use the asymptotically unbiased estimator  $g_T$  in (32) instead of  $\mu(g)$  to calculate an approximation of the inverse efficiency  $J$ .*

Algorithms	Algorithmic Inverse Efficiency					
	Normal	Exponential	$t(1)$	$t(2)$	$t(10)$	$t(100)$
Zig-Zag	4	20	$+\infty$	51025.26	31.04	16.1935
SUZZ(0)	1.2454	1.2454	23.1865	61.2736	9.4975	5.0451
SUZZ(0.2)	0.9517	0.9517	13.0671	40.9789	6.9797	3.8502
SUZZ(0.5)	<b>0.8097</b>	<b>0.8097</b>	3.9415	22.4808	<b>5.1503</b>	<b>3.2658</b>
SUZZ(0.9)	0.9998	0.9998	<b>0.7474</b>	<b>13.4862</b>	5.2632	4.0182

TABLE 1.  $J$  values, as introduced in (41), for various SUZZ algorithms targeting various distributions; SUZZ( $\varepsilon$ ) denotes the SUZZ algorithm with speed function of the form  $s(x) = (1 + x^2)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}$ ; Smallest value for every column in bold

Note that minimising (41) is not a well-posed problem. Indeed, let  $r_0$  be a function such that  $J[r_0] < \infty$  and  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} r_0(x) = 0$ . For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let

$$(42) \quad \begin{cases} r_n(x) = 1, |x| \leq n \\ r_n(x) = r_0(x - n), x > n \\ r_n(x) = r_0(x + n), x < -n \end{cases} .$$

Then  $J[r_n] \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ . At the same time, the only functions that satisfy  $J[r] = 0$  are the constant ones and since we impose the condition that  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = 0$  the only function  $r$  that satisfies  $J[r] = 0$  is the function  $r \equiv 0$ .

Note, however, that the  $n$ 'th term of the minimising sequence  $r_n$  is equal to 1 on  $[-n, n]$  and this means that  $s(x) = \exp\{U(x)\}$  for  $x \in [-n, n]$ . Heuristically, and as discussed in the beginning of Section 4, one could expect good performance in the ideal case where  $s(x)$  could be set equal to  $\exp\{U(x)\}$  for  $x \in [-n, n]$  for some large  $n$ .

In Table 1 we present some examples, comparing the efficiency of different algorithms. As target distribution we consider a Normal with mean zero and variance one, an exponential with parameter one, symmetrically extended to the negative reals and Student distributions with  $\nu = 1, 2, 10, 100$  degrees of freedom. For each of these densities, except for the Cauchy distribution ( $t(1)$ ), we are estimating the expectation of the distribution, so the function is  $g(x) = x$ , whereas for the Cauchy distribution, since the expectation does not exist, we are estimating the expectation of the function  $g(x) = \text{sgn}(x) \log(1 + |x|)$ . As regards the speed function, we use  $s(x) = (1 + x^2)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}$  for various values of  $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$  and we compare the efficiencies over different values of  $\varepsilon$ . In order to numerically estimate the integrals arising in the definition of  $J[r]$  we use the `integrate` function of R. We should emphasize that since we do not take into account any normalisation constant and since in the case of Cauchy distribution we are estimating a different observable, the comparison in Table 1 should only be made column-wise (i.e. for a given distribution compare different algorithms).

On the light tailed (normal and exponential) distributions, the algorithm with optimal performance seems to be the one when  $\varepsilon$  is close to the value of 0.5. The inverse efficiency function seem to be "quadratic" with respect to  $\varepsilon$ . On the other hand, for Cauchy distribution the performance of the algorithm tends to get better as we increase the values of  $\varepsilon$ . As the degrees of freedom increase and the target distribution tends to approximate a normal, the "quadratic" behaviour with respect to  $\varepsilon$  seems to arise.

It is worth noting that for any target distribution and any form of speed function, any of the SUZZ algorithms provides better results than the original Zig-Zag algorithm.

## 5. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section we will present some computational results that aim to highlight the behaviour of SUZZ and compare it with Zig-Zag. We will present results in one and five dimensions. As already suggested in Section 4.1, the one dimensional Speed Up Zig-Zag can vastly outperform the original Zig-Zag. However, it will be seen that there are significant advantages in using a speed function in higher dimensions as well.

We begin by considering an one-dimensional target and we use SUZZ with five different speed functions. We shall be referring to the SUZZ process with speed function

$$(43) \quad s(x) = (1 + x^2)^{(1+\varepsilon)/2}$$

Algorithms	Effective Sample Size (Cauchy target)	Effective Sample Size (Normal target)
Zig-ZaZ	1007.8 (603.25)	16138.5 (834.23)
SUZZ(0)	6355.4 (312.68)	26646.8 (1965.74)
SUZZ(0.5)	<b>13422.4</b> (1343.59)	<b>29337.9</b> (2174.77)

TABLE 2. Three different algorithms (original Zig-Zag and two speed-up algorithms) targeting one-dimensional Cauchy and Normal distributions. Each SUZZ algorithm is denoted as  $SUZZ(\varepsilon)$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is the parameter value of the speed function, which is of the form of (43). We present the average ESS of each algorithm over 22 independent realisations, along with the standard deviation in a parenthesis. All algorithms run until  $N = 10^4$  number of switches occur. The samples generated from these algorithms are the  $\delta$ -skeletons of the processes, for  $\delta = 0.1$ .




FIGURE 4. Q-Q plots of various one-dimensional Speed Up algorithms targeting a Cauchy distribution. The algorithms have ran until  $N = 10^4$  switches of direction have happened. The sample is created using the  $\delta$ -skeleton of the process for  $\delta = 0.1$ . As  $SUZZ(\varepsilon)$  we denote the SUZZ algorithm with speed function of the form (43) and  $\varepsilon$  the parameter appearing in the equation.

as  $SUZZ(\varepsilon)$  and we will run simulations for different values of  $\varepsilon$ . More specifically,  $\varepsilon$  will take the values 0 and 0.5. Note that  $\varepsilon = 0$  induces non-explosive deterministic dynamics, whereas positive values of  $\varepsilon$  induce explosive ones.

We are targeting standard Normal distributions with density  $\pi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\{-1/2x^2\}$ , and Cauchy distributions with density  $\pi(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{1+x^2}$ . For every realisation of a process we create a skeleton with step size  $\delta = 0.1$ .

All the simulated values were produced using MATLAB. To analyse the performance of the algorithms we have used Effective Sample Size (ESS) (see [16]) and Q-Q plots. ESS has been computed using `coda` of R. For the Effective Sample Size we have sampled 22 independent chains and let them ran until  $N = 10^4$  switches of direction occur. For the Normal target the ESS is for estimating the expectation of the distribution. Since the Cauchy does not have a finite expectation, we first transformed the samples via the transformation  $f(x) = \text{sgn}(x) \log(1+|x|)$ , which is smooth, and then we calculated the ESS when estimating the expectation of  $f(Z)$  where  $Z$  follows a Cauchy. In Table 2, we report the average ESS over 22 independent realisations of the process and the standard deviation in parenthesis. For both distributions, the algorithm that maximizes ESS (also highlighted in bold) is the SUZZ with speed function  $s(x) = \max\{1, |x|^{1.5}\}$  (i.e.  $\varepsilon = 0.5$ ), the one with explosive deterministic dynamics.

Finally, in Figure 4 we present some Q-Q plots three different algorithms. All the algorithms target the Cauchy distribution and the Q-Q plots run until the number of switches becomes  $N = 10^4$ . It is clear that the SUZZ algorithms far outperform the Zig-Zag process and the SUZZ algorithm with explosive deterministic dynamics ( $\varepsilon = 0.5$ ) seems to have the optimal performance.

In general, the diagnostic tests show that all the Speed Up algorithms used outperform the Zig-Zag algorithm, for both the Cauchy and the normal distribution. This suggests using SUZZ for light tail distributions as well. It is also interesting to observe the  $SUZZ(0.5)$  is consistently performing better, which is in accordance with Table 1 in the previous section.

5 Dimensional SUZZ on Cauchy

Algorithms	ESS(SD)	Median ESS	$l = 2.2577$	$l = 12.4788$	$l = 125.3256$	$l = 1325.867$
ZZ	1027.4 (1123.58)	676.3	0.4883	0.9019	1	1
SUZZ(0)	<b>4859.53</b> (717.45)	<b>4710.4</b>	<b>0.5026</b>	<b>0.9000</b>	<b>0.9900</b>	<b>0.9996</b>
Actual	-	-	0.5	0.9	0.99	0.999

TABLE 3. *SUZZ and ZZ algorithm targeting a five dimensional Cauchy distribution with minus log-likelihood given by (44). For SUZZ, we use  $s(x) = \sqrt{1 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 + x_5^2}$ . The algorithms ran until  $N = 10^4$  switches occur and the average ESS (with Standard deviation in a parenthesis) along with the median ESS is presented. In both cases, the ESS is applied on the target transformed via the function (45). An estimation of probabilities assigned to various squares of  $\mathbb{R}^5$ , by the five-dimensional Cauchy distribution is, also, presented. The squares are of the form  $[-l, l]^5$  for various values of  $l$ . For these estimations, the algorithms ran until  $N = 10^5$  switches occurred. The actual probabilities are also presented. The best performance is highlighted with bold letters.*

We, also, present some results on a SUZZ process targeting a five dimensional Cauchy distribution, without correlations. This means that

$$(44) \quad U(x) = 3 \log(1 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 + x_5^2)$$

and we use speed function

$$s(x) = \sqrt{1 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 + x_5^2}.$$

We also run an original Zig-Zag and we compare the results. We simulate 25 independent realisations of each process, until  $N = 10^4$  number of switches occurred. As an estimator we use the  $\delta$ -skeletons for  $\delta = 0.1$ . In Table 3, we present the average ESS and standard deviation in a parenthesis along with the median ESS (since the Standard Deviation seems to be large), after we transform the sample via the function

$$(45) \quad f(x) = \text{sgn}(x) \log(1 + |x|),$$

so that the expectation is finite. We also run one more realisation of the algorithms until  $N = 10^5$  switches occur and we use this to estimate the probability the target distribution assigns to various squares in  $\mathbb{R}^5$ . All the squares are of the form  $[-l, l]^5$  for various values of  $l$ . We, also, present the actual probability values, estimated using `mvtnorm` of R. The best performance is highlighted with bold letters. We observe that the SUZZ process clearly outperforms the original Zig-Zag, both in ESS (and in variance of ESS) and in estimation of probabilities.

## 6. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

### 6.1. The generator.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0} = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a SUZZ process with speed function  $s$ . For any function  $f \in C^1(E)$  and any  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,*

$$(46) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(Z_t)] - f(x, \theta)}{t} = \mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) := \sum_{i=1}^d [\theta_i s(x) \partial_i f(x, \theta) + \lambda_i(x, \theta)(f(x, F_i[\theta]) - f(x, \theta))].$$

Before we prove Proposition 6.1 we need the following technical results.

**Definition 6.1.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall that consider we denote with  $O_m$  the ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , centred around 0, having radius  $m$ . Recall that  $\zeta_m = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t \notin O_m\}$  is the first exit time of the  $O_m$  for the SUZZ process,  $\zeta = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_m$  is the explosion time of the the process. Finally, recall that  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  are the switching times of the process and  $\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n$ .*

**Lemma 6.1.** *Assume that the speed function  $s \in C^1$  is strictly positive and the rate functions  $\lambda_i$  are locally bounded for all  $i$ . Then almost surely  $\zeta_m < \xi$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, a.s.  $\zeta < \xi$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 6.1.* Let  $\bar{\lambda}$  an upper bound for all  $\lambda$ , introduced in (9) on  $O_m$  and let  $E_1, E_2, \dots$  be a configuration of the i.i.d. exponential random variables, with expectation 1, used to construct the  $(X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  process such that  $\xi \leq \zeta_m$ . We will show that the event of such a configuration has probability zero. In that configuration, for

all  $t < \xi$ , we have  $t < \zeta_m$ , therefore  $X_t \in O_m$ . By the definition of the switching times  $T_k$  in (10) (and writing  $T_0 = 0$ ) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_{T_{k-1}}^{T_k} \lambda(X_t, \Theta_t) dt \leq \xi \bar{\lambda}.$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\{\xi < \infty\} \cap \{\xi \leq \zeta_m\}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k \leq \xi \bar{\lambda} < \infty\right) = 0.$$

Let  $t_m$  be the maximum time it takes for a flow that starts from inside  $O_m$  and solves (8) to exit  $O_m$ . For any  $m$ , on the event  $\{E_n \geq \bar{\lambda} t_m\}$ , if the process has not escaped the ball  $O_m$  until the  $n-1$ 'th switch, it does so following the dynamics before the  $n$ 'th switch happens. Since  $\mathbb{P}(E_n \geq \bar{\lambda} t_m) = a > 0$  we have for all  $n$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_m > n) \leq (1-a)^n$  and therefore  $\mathbb{P}(\zeta_m = +\infty) = 0$ .

Overall this gives  $\mathbb{P}(\xi \leq \zeta_m) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.2.** *If the speed function  $s \in C^1$  and the rate functions are locally bounded, then for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  there exists a neighbourhood  $U_x$  of  $x$  and a time  $t > 0$  such that for any  $\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d$  if the SUZZ starts from  $(x, \theta)$ , then  $X_s \in U_x$  for all  $0 \leq s \leq t$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 6.2.* For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  we find a small neighbourhood  $U_x$  so that  $s$  is bounded on  $U_x$  by  $\bar{s}$ . Take  $t$  small enough so that  $t\sqrt{d}\bar{s} < \text{dist}(x, \partial U_x)$  so that a path starting from  $x$  and following a straight line with speed function  $s$  in each coordinate for time less than  $t$ , will not have exit  $U_x$ . Then any path moving in directions  $\{\pm 1\}^d$  with speed function  $s(x)$  in each component that switches direction finitely many times will not have exit  $U_x$ . From Lemma 6.1 a.s. the Zig-Zag process will switch direction finitely many times until it exits the bounded set  $U_x$  and this proves that the process a.s. stays inside  $U_x$  until time  $t$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.1.* For given  $(x, \theta)$  we know from Lemma 6.2 that for small  $t$  the quantity  $\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(Z_t)]$  is well-defined so the limit makes sense.

Write  $S_i(t) = \{\text{the } i \text{ coordinate switches before time } t \text{ and is the first coordinate to switch}\}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, d$  and  $S_0(t) = \{\text{no coordinate switches until time } t\}$ . Note that if the process starts from  $(x, \theta)$  and if  $T_i$  is the first arrival time of the Poisson process with intensity  $t \rightarrow \lambda_i(\Phi_t(x, \theta), \theta)$ , then  $\mathbb{P}(T_i \geq t) = \exp\{-\int_0^t \lambda_i(\Phi_u(x, \theta), \theta) du\}$  therefore the density of  $T_i$  is

$$f_{T_i}(t) = \lambda_i(\Phi_t(x, \theta), \theta) \exp\left\{-\int_0^t \lambda_i(\Phi_u(x, \theta), \theta) du\right\}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(S_i(t)) &= \int_0^t \mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(\text{no switches until time } u \text{ for any component } j \neq i) f_{T_i}(u) du = \\ &= \int_0^t \lambda_i(\Phi_u(x, \theta), \theta) \exp\left\{-\int_0^u \lambda_i(\Phi_{u'}(x, \theta), \theta) du'\right\} \prod_{j \neq i} \exp\left\{-\int_0^u \lambda_j(\Phi_{u'}(x, \theta), \theta) du'\right\} du = \\ &\int_0^t \lambda_i(\Phi_u(x, \theta), \theta) \exp\left\{-\int_0^u \lambda(\Phi_{u'}(x, \theta), \theta) du'\right\} du, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda(x, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(x, \theta)$ . Therefore, from L'Hôpital rule

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(S_i(t))}{t} = \lambda_i(x, \theta).$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(S_0(t)) = \exp\left\{-\int_0^t \lambda(\Phi_s(x, \theta), \theta) ds\right\} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 1.$$

For  $f \in C^1(E)$ , conditioning on the coordinate which was the first to switch before  $t$  (or whether no switch occurred)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(X_t, \Theta_t)] - f(x, \theta)}{t} =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_{x,\theta}(S_0(t)) \frac{f(\Phi_t(x, \theta), \theta) - f(x, \theta)}{t} + \sum_{i=1}^d \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{x,\theta}(S_i(t))}{t} (\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[f(X_t, \Theta_t) | S_i(t)] - f(x, \theta)) = \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i s(x) \partial_i f(x, \theta) + \lambda_i(x, \theta) [f(x, F_i[\theta]) - f(x, \theta)].
\end{aligned}$$

□

## 6.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. [Non- Explosivity]

To prove that the process will not explode, we use techniques from [40] which depend on the generator of the process. Although we can define the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  in (46), we cannot immediately conclude that this is the strong generator of the process. This is because the strong generator is defined usually through uniform convergence and we only defined  $\mathcal{L}$  in (46) as a point-wise limit. This complicates the proof. However, the techniques in [40] only require us to use the generator of the process restricted in a bounded domain, which we introduce now.

**Definition 6.2.** Starting from  $(x, \theta) \in E$  we define the stopped  $m$ -process as the restriction of the SUZZ on  $O_m$ , stopped when exiting  $O_m$ , i.e.  $(Z_t^m)_{t \geq 0} = (X_t^m, \Theta_t^m)_{t \geq 0} = (X_{t \wedge \zeta_m}, \Theta_{t \wedge \zeta_m})_{t \geq 0}$ .

Since the switching rate of  $Z^m$  is bounded as the process is defined on a bounded set and  $\lambda_i$  are locally bounded, we have that for any  $T > 0$ , if  $N_T$  is the number of switching events before time  $T$ , then  $\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[N_T] < \infty$  for any  $(x, \theta) \in E_m$ . Therefore  $Z^m$  is a PDMP that can be seen in the setting of [17] and we have the following as a result of Theorem 5.5 of [17].

**Proposition 6.2.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  the operator defined in (46). The extended generator  $\mathcal{L}^m$  for  $Z^m$  has domain  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{L}^m) \supset C^1(E)$  and for any function  $f \in C^1(E)$  we have

$$\mathcal{L}^m f(x, \theta) = \mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) 1_{x \in O_m}.$$

We introduce the following notation. For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  define inductively the function  $h_n : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$h_0(x) = x$$

and for  $n \geq 1$

$$(47) \quad h_n(x) = \log(1 + h_{n-1}(x)).$$

Note that for all  $n$ ,  $h_n = f_n^{-1}$ , where  $f_n$  is introduced in (18). Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that (19) holds. Let  $A_i$  be as in (14). Consider the function

$$(48) \quad V(x, \theta) = \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x) + \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi(\theta_i A_i(x))\}$$

where

$$(49) \quad \varphi(s) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{sgn}(s) h_{n+1}(\delta |s|),$$

for some  $a \in (0, 1)$  and  $\delta > 0$ . The proof of non-explosion relies on the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.3.** Assume that the rates satisfy (14) and Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 hold. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the operator defined in (46). Then, there exist  $a \in (0, 1)$  and  $\delta > 0$  for which  $V$  introduced in (48) is norm-like function, i.e.  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} V(x, \theta) = +\infty$  and there exists a compact set  $C$  and  $b, c > 0$  and for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$

$$(50) \quad \mathcal{L}V(x, \theta) \leq -cV(x, \theta) + b1_{(x,\theta) \in C}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.3.* One can verify that  $V \in C^1$  therefore  $V \in D(\mathcal{L})$ . Note that

$$V(x, F_i[\theta]) - V(x, \theta) = V(x, \theta) (\exp\{\varphi(-\theta_i A_i(x)) - \varphi(\theta_i A_i(x))\} - 1)$$

We then calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
(51) \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}V(x, \theta)}{V(x, \theta)} &= \sum_{i=1}^d \{\theta_i a A_i(x) + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) + \\
&\quad + [(\theta_i A_i(x))^+ + \gamma_i(x)] (\exp\{\varphi(-\theta_i A_i(x)) - \varphi(\theta_i A_i(x))\} - 1)\}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\exp\{\varphi(-s) - \varphi(s)\} = (h_n(\delta|s|))^{-\operatorname{sgn}(s)}$$

and

$$\varphi'(s) = \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{(1 + \delta|s|)} \prod_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{1 + h_k(\delta|s|)} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{1}{(1 + \delta|s|)(1 + \log(1 + \delta|s|))}.$$

Consider the  $i$ 'th component of the sum in the RHS of (51) and the following cases.

**Case 1:**  $\theta_i A_i(x) \geq 0$ . Then the  $i$ 'th component of the sum in the RHS of (51) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & a|\theta_i A_i(x)| + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) + \\ & + [(\theta_i A_i(x))^+ + \gamma_i(x)] \left( \frac{1}{1 + h_n(\delta|A_i(x)|)} - 1 \right) \leq \\ (52) \quad & \leq |A_i(x)| \left[ a - 1 + \frac{1}{1 + h_n(\delta|A_i(x)|)} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\gamma_i(x) \geq 0$ .

**Case 2:**  $\theta_i A_i(x) < 0$ . Then the  $i$ 'th component of the sum in the RHS of (51) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & a\theta_i A_i(x) + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) + [(\theta_i A_i(x))^+ + \gamma_i(x)] \underbrace{\log(1 + \dots \log(1 + \delta|A_i(x)|) \dots)}_n \leq \\ & \leq -a|A_i(x)| + \underbrace{\bar{\gamma} \log(1 + \dots \log(1 + \delta|A_i(x)|) \dots)}_n + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) \leq \\ & \leq |A_i(x)| [-a + \bar{\gamma} \delta] + \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\log(1 + x) \leq x$  for  $x \geq 0$ . Overall, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} (53) \quad \frac{\mathcal{L}V(x, \theta)}{V(x, \theta)} & \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| \max\left\{ a - 1 + \frac{1}{1 + h_n(\delta|A_i(x)|)}, -a + \delta\bar{\gamma} \right\} + \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Let us set  $\varepsilon = \bar{\gamma} > 0$ , if  $\bar{\gamma} > 0$  or  $0 < \varepsilon < A/(2d^2)$ , if  $\bar{\gamma} = 0$ . Since we have assumed that  $A > 3d\bar{\gamma}$  in Assumption 3.2, we get that  $\frac{A}{d} > \bar{\gamma} + 2\varepsilon$ . We will choose  $\delta > 0$  small enough to be specified later and given  $\delta$ , we set  $a = \delta\bar{\gamma} + \delta\varepsilon$ . Then the second part of the maximum of (53) is equal to  $-\delta\varepsilon < 0$ .

Consider the function

$$f(z) = \max \left\{ -\delta\varepsilon, \delta\varepsilon + \delta\bar{\gamma} - 1 + \frac{1}{1 + h_n(\delta z)} \right\}.$$

so that the first term of the RHS of (53) is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| f(|A_i(x)|)$$

Our goal will be to show that  $\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| f(|A_i(x)|) < 0$  for  $\|x\|$  large enough. One can verify that

$$f(A) < 0 \iff A \geq P(\delta) = \frac{1}{\delta} f_n \left( \frac{\delta\varepsilon + \delta\bar{\gamma}}{1 - \delta\varepsilon - \delta\bar{\gamma}} \right)$$

and

$$f(A) = -\delta\varepsilon \iff A \geq M(\delta) = \frac{1}{\delta} f_n \left( \frac{2\delta\varepsilon + \delta\bar{\gamma}}{1 - 2\delta\varepsilon - \delta\bar{\gamma}} \right).$$

Now, from L'Hôpital's rule,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} M(\delta) = \bar{\gamma} + 2\varepsilon, \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} P(\delta) = \bar{\gamma} + \varepsilon$$

so if we choose  $\delta$  small enough, we have  $M(\delta) < A/d$ . Suppose  $k = \operatorname{argmax}\{|A_i(x)| : i = 1, \dots, d\} \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  so that

$$|A_k(x)| \geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|}{d} > \frac{A}{d} > M(\delta).$$

Therefore

$$(54) \quad |A_k(x)|f(|A_k(x)|) \leq -|A_k(x)|\delta\varepsilon \leq -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|}{d}\delta\varepsilon.$$

For any other coordinate  $i$ , the contribution to the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|f(|A_i(x)|)$  will be positive if and only if  $|A_i(x)| \leq P(\delta)$ . Then, using that  $\frac{1}{h_n(\delta|A_i(x)|)} \leq 1$  we can bound

$$f(z) \leq \delta\varepsilon + \delta\bar{\gamma}$$

and therefore

$$(55) \quad \sum_{i \neq k}^d |A_i(x)|f(|A_i(x)|) \leq (d-1)P(\delta)(\delta\varepsilon + \delta\bar{\gamma}).$$

Recall that when  $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ , we have picked  $\varepsilon = \bar{\gamma}$ , so due to (16) we get

$$(56) \quad A > d(d-1)\frac{(\bar{\gamma} + \varepsilon)^2}{\varepsilon}.$$

On the other hand, if  $\bar{\gamma} = 0$  we have picked  $\varepsilon < A/(2d^2)$  so (56) holds in this case as well. Therefore

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|} (d-1)(\bar{\gamma} + \varepsilon)P(\delta) - \frac{\varepsilon}{d} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|} (d-1)(\bar{\gamma} + \varepsilon)^2 - \frac{\varepsilon}{d} < 0$$

Combining this with (54) and (55) we get

$$(57) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|f(|A_i(x)|) &= |A_k(x)|f(|A_k(x)|) + \sum_{i \neq k} |A_i(x)|f(|A_i(x)|) \leq \\ &\leq \delta \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| \left[ -\frac{\varepsilon}{d} + \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)|} (d-1)(\bar{\gamma} + \varepsilon)P(\delta) \right] \leq -c \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| \end{aligned}$$

for some  $c > 0$ , assuming  $\delta$  is small enough.

To finish the proof of the drift condition (50), let us consider the last term of the RHS in (53). Here, due to (17) and assuming that  $x \notin C$  for some compact set large enough, we can write

$$(58) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d \theta_i \theta_j s(x) \partial_i A_j(x) \varphi'(\theta_j A_j(x)) &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^d \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{s(x) |\partial_i A_j(x)|}{(1 + \delta |A_j(x)|)(1 + \log(1 + \delta |A_j(x)|))} = \\ &= \left( \sum_{k=1}^d |A_k(x)| \right) \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{s(x)}{\sum_{k=1}^d |A_k(x)|} \frac{\delta |\partial_i A_j(x)|}{(1 + \delta |A_j(x)|)(1 + \log(1 + \delta |A_j(x)|))} \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| \frac{c}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, combining (53), (57) and (58) we get for  $x \notin C$

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}V(x, \theta)}{V(x, \theta)} \leq -\frac{c}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d |A_i(x)| \leq -\frac{c}{2} A$$

and this proves (50) since  $V$  and  $\mathcal{L}V$  are bounded on  $C$ .

Finally, we need to prove that  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} V(x, \theta) = +\infty$ . Due to (19), we can find  $C, C' > 0$  such that for all  $\|x\|$  large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} V(x, \theta) &\geq C \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x) - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{2} h_{n+1}(\delta|A_i(x)|)\} \geq \\ &\geq C \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x)\} \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + h_n(\delta|A_i(x)|))^{-1/2} \geq \\ &\geq C' \exp\{aU(x) - a \log s(x)\} (1 + f_n^{-1}(\delta s(x) \|\nabla(U(x) - \log s(x))\|_1))^{-d/2} \\ &\xrightarrow{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} +\infty \end{aligned}$$

due to (19) and Assumption 3.1. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Under the assumption of Theorem 3.1, we get from Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.2 that there exists a norm-like function  $V$  and constants  $c, b > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{L}^m V(x, \theta) \leq cV(x, \theta) + b$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . The assumptions of Theorem 2.1 in [40] are satisfied and this proves that the process is non-explosive, i.e. if  $\zeta$  as in (13) then  $\zeta < \infty$  a.s. Finally, from Lemma 6.1 if  $\xi$  as in (11) then  $\xi < \infty$  a.s.  $\square$

### 6.3. Proof of Theorem 3.2. [Invariant Measure]

For this section, we first recall the definition of the strong generator of the process.

**Definition 6.3.** We define  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  to be the set of all the borel functions  $f$  such that the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P^t f - f}{t}$$

exists in the uniform norm (over  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ). We define the strong generator as the operator  $\mathcal{A}$ , acting on any  $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  as

$$\mathcal{A}f(x, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P^t f(x, \theta) - f(x, \theta)}{t}.$$

We begin by formally proving that the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  introduced in (46) is the strong generator of a large class of functions for the SUZZ process.

**Lemma 6.4.** Assume that the rates satisfy (14), Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 hold and that  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a SUZZ process with speed function  $s$ . If  $f \in C_c^1(E)$  then  $f$  is in the domain of the strong generator  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $Z$  and  $\mathcal{A}f = \mathcal{L}f$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the operator defined in (46). This means that

$$\left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta} [f(X_t, \Theta_t)] - f(x, \theta)}{t} - \mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) \right| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

uniformly on  $(x, \theta) \in E$ .

*Proof of Lemma 6.4.* Let  $K$  be a compact set that contains the support of  $f$  and let

$$K' = \{(x, \theta) : \text{there exists a } y, \text{ with } \|x - y\| < \varepsilon, (y, \theta) \in K\} = K + \varepsilon B(0, 1)$$

for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let  $\bar{s}$  be an upper bound on the speed function  $s$  on  $K'$ . Then for all  $t < t_1 = \varepsilon/(\sqrt{d}\bar{s})$ , if the process starts from any  $(x, \theta) \notin K'$ , then the process will not have hit  $K$  until time  $t$ , and since the support of  $f$  is contained in  $K$ ,  $P^t f(x, \theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(X_t)] = 0$ , for all  $(x, \theta) \notin K'$ . Note also that for all  $(x, \theta) \notin K'$ ,  $\mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) = 0$ . Now, let us focus on  $(x, \theta) \in K'$ . Pick

$$K'' = K' + \varepsilon B(0, 1)$$

and let  $\bar{s}$  be an upper bound of  $s$  on  $K''$ . Then for all  $t \leq t_2 = \varepsilon/(\sqrt{d}\bar{s}) < t_1$ , the process starting from  $K'$  will not have exited  $K''$  by time  $t$  and if we cover  $K''$  by some  $O_m$  for some large  $m$ , then a.s.  $Z(t) = Z^m(t)$  for all  $t \leq t_2$  as long as we start from somewhere in  $K'$ . Then, for any  $(x, \theta) \in K'$  and any  $t < t_2$

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(Z_t)] - f(x, \theta)}{t} - \mathcal{L}f(x, \theta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x, \theta}[f(Z_t^m)] - f(x, \theta)}{t} - \mathcal{L}^m f(x, \theta)$$

so overall for all  $t < t_2$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(x,\theta) \in E} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[f(Z_t)] - f(x,\theta)}{t} - \mathcal{L}f(x,\theta) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \sup_{(x,\theta) \in K''} \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[f(Z_t^m)] - f(x,\theta)}{t} - \mathcal{L}^m f(x,\theta) \right| \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0} 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the convergence can be seen to hold using the proof of Proposition 15b of [21].  $\square$

We also have the following.

**Lemma 6.5.** *If  $f \in C_c^1$  then for all  $s > 0$ ,  $P^s f$  is differentiable along the deterministic flow of the SUZZ process, i.e. for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$  there exists a function  $DP^s f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P^s f(\Phi_{(x,\theta)}(t), \theta) - P^s f(x, \theta)}{t} = DP^s f(x, \theta).$$

*Proof of Lemma 6.5.* Due to Lemma 6.4,  $f$  is in the domain of the strong generator of the SUZZ process, therefore, using standard results (see for example [22]), for any  $s > 0$ ,  $P^s f$  is also in the domain of the strong generator of the SUZZ process. From the proof of Proposition 6.1 we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_{x,\theta}(S_0(t)) \frac{P^s f(\Phi_t(x, \theta), \theta) - P^s f(x, \theta)}{t} = \\ & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[P^s f(X_t, \Theta_t)] - P^s f(x, \theta)}{t} - \sum_{i=1}^d \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{P}_{x,\theta}(S_i(t))}{t} (\mathbb{E}_{x,\theta}[P^s f(X_t, \Theta_t) | S_i(t)] - P^s f(x, \theta)) \end{aligned}$$

The first term of the RHS is finite since  $P^s f$  is in the domain of the strong generator of SUZZ and the second term can be seen to be finite using the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 6.1. Since  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}_{x,\theta}(S_0(t)) = 1$ , we get the result.  $\square$

The following Lemma is the stepping stone to prove Proposition 3.2.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Assume that the rates satisfy (14), Assumptions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 hold and the  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a SUZZ process with speed function  $s$ . Let  $(P^t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the transition semi-group of a SUZZ process with speed function  $s$  and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the strong generator of the SUZZ process. If  $f \in C_c^1(E)$  then for all  $s > 0$ ,  $P^s f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  and*

$$(59) \quad \int_E \mathcal{A}P^s f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) = 0.$$

If we could guarantee that for any  $f \in C_c^1(E)$ , for all  $s > 0$ ,  $P^s f \in C_c^1(E)$ , then Lemma 6.6 would be easy to verify, using similar calculations to the proof of Proposition 5 of [10]. In our setting, due to the fact that we allow explosive deterministic dynamics, we cannot guarantee that  $P^s f \in C_c^1$ . However, Lemma 6.5 guarantees that the function  $P^s f$  must have a weak derivative along lines parallel to the vectors  $\{-1, +1\}^d$ . Therefore, the fundamental theorem of calculus and an integration by parts can be used along such lines. When we will integrate  $\mathcal{A}P^s f$  over the ball  $O_m$ , we may do the integration over many different lines parallel to some vector  $\{-1, +1\}^d$  and apply the integration by parts technique in each of these lines to get the result. This is the main idea of the following proof.

*Proof of Lemma 6.6.* We begin by noticing that, from standard techniques, since  $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ ,  $P^s f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$  as well. If  $E_m = O_m \times \{\pm 1\}^d$  then

$$\left| \int_{E_m} \mathcal{A}P^s f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) - \int_E \mathcal{A}P^s f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) \right| \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

since  $E_m \nearrow E$  and  $\mathcal{A}P^s f = P^s \mathcal{A}f = P^s \mathcal{L}f$  is bounded, due to that  $\mathcal{L}f$  is bounded. Therefore, it suffices to prove that

$$(60) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E_m} \mathcal{A}P^s f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) = 0.$$

From now on, let us write  $g = P^s f$  for notation convenience. From Lemma 6.5 we get that  $g$  has a derivative along the deterministic dynamics of the SUZZ process. This means that there exists a function  $Dg : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that if  $X_t$  satisfies ODE (7) with starting point  $(x, \theta)$  then for all  $t \geq 0$

$$g(X_t, \theta) - g(x, \theta) = \int_0^t Dg(X_s, \theta) ds$$

and for all  $(x, \theta) \in E_m$ ,

$$Ag(x, \theta) = Dg(x, \theta) + \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i(x, \theta) (g(x, F_i[\theta]) - g(x, \theta))$$

Our goal is to use an integration by parts technique to control the first part of the sum of the generator. We fix a  $\theta \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ . Use a linear, invertible transformation  $A$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $A\theta = \sqrt{d}e_1$ ,  $AO_m = O_m$  and  $\det A = 1$ . We use the transformation  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) = Ax$ . Also, given  $y_2, y_3, \dots, y_d$  with  $y_2^2 + \dots + y_d^2 < m^2$  we write

$$y_1^* = \sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_d^2} \text{ if } \theta_1 = 1$$

or

$$y_1^* = -\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_d^2} \text{ if } \theta_1 = -1$$

and we omit the dependence on  $y_2, \dots, y_d$  for ease of notation. We write  $x_0 = A^{-1}(-y_1^*, y_2, \dots, y_d)'$ .

We further consider the solution  $X_t$  to the ODE (7) starting from  $(x_0, \theta)$  and we write  $Y_t = (Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^d) = AX_t$  so that  $Y_t$  starts from  $(-y_1^*, y_2, \dots, y_d)$  and solves the ODE  $dY_t/dt = \sqrt{d}s(A^{-1}Y_t)e_1$ , where we denote  $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Also write  $t^*$  such that  $Y_{t^*}^1 = y_1^*$ . Then we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{O_m} Dg(x, \theta) \exp\{-U(x)\} dx &= \int_{O_m} Dg(A^{-1}y, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}y)\} dy = \\ &= \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2}} \dots \int_{-y_1^*}^{y_1^*} Dg(A^{-1}y, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}y)\} dy_1 dy_d \dots dy_2 = \\ &= \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2 - y_1^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2 - y_1^2}} \dots \int_0^{t^*} Dg(A^{-1}Y_t, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}Y_t)\} s(A^{-1}Y_t) \sqrt{d} dt dy_d \dots dy_2 \end{aligned}$$

Having fixed  $y_2, \dots, y_d$ , write  $z_1 = (-y_1^*, y_2, \dots, y_d)$ ,  $z_2 = (y_1^*, y_2, \dots, y_d) \in \partial O_m$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$  and using integration by parts we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{t^*} Dg(A^{-1}Y_t, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}Y_t)\} s(A^{-1}Y_t) \sqrt{d} dt = \\ &= g(A^{-1}z_2, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_2)\} s(A^{-1}z_2) \sqrt{d} - g(A^{-1}z_1, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_1)\} s(A^{-1}z_1) \sqrt{d} \\ &- \int_0^{t^*} g(A^{-1}Y_t, \theta) \frac{d}{dt} [\exp\{-U(A^{-1}Y_t)\} s(A^{-1}Y_t)] \sqrt{d} dt = \\ &= g(A^{-1}z_2, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_2)\} s(A^{-1}z_2) \sqrt{d} - g(A^{-1}z_1, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_1)\} s(A^{-1}z_1) \sqrt{d} \\ &- \int_0^{t^*} g(A^{-1}Y_t, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}Y_t)\} \sum_{i=1}^d \{-\partial_i U(A^{-1}Y_t) \theta_i s(A^{-1}Y_t) + \partial_i s(A^{-1}Y_t) \theta_i\} s(A^{-1}Y_t) \sqrt{d} dt = \\ &= g(A^{-1}z_2, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_2)\} s(A^{-1}z_2) \sqrt{d} - g(A^{-1}z_1, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_1)\} s(A^{-1}z_1) \sqrt{d} \\ &- \int_{-y_1^*}^{y_1^*} g(A^{-1}y, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}y)\} \sum_{i=1}^d (-\partial_i U(A^{-1}y) \theta_i s(A^{-1}y) + \partial_i s(A^{-1}y) \theta_i) dy_1. \end{aligned}$$

Overall

$$(61) \quad \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{O_m} Dg(x, \theta) \exp\{-U(x)\} dx = \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2}} \dots \int_{-\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_{d-1}^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2 - y_2^2 - \dots - y_{d-1}^2}} g(A^{-1}z_2, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_2)\} s(A^{-1}z_2) \sqrt{d} dy_d \dots dy_3 dy_2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}} \cdots \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_{d-1}^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_{d-1}^2}} g(A^{-1}z_1, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_1)\} s(A^{-1}z_1) \sqrt{d} dy_d \dots dy_3 dy_2 \\
& + \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{O_m} g(x, \theta) \exp\{-U(x)\} \sum_{i=1}^d (\theta_i \partial_i U(x) s(x) - \theta_i \partial_i s(x) s(x)) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, rearranging the sum over  $\theta$  (see also the proof of Proposition 5 of [10]), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(62) \quad & \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{O_m} \lambda_i(x, \theta) (g(x, F_i[\theta]) - g(x, \theta)) \exp\{-U(x)\} dx = \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{O_m} g(x, \theta) \exp\{-U(x)\} (\lambda_i(x, \theta) - \lambda_i(x, F_i[\theta])) dx
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that since the rates satisfy (14), we have

$$\lambda_i(x, \theta) - \lambda_i(x, F_i[\theta]) = \theta_i \partial_i U(x) s(x) - \theta_i \partial_i s(x).$$

When we integrate  $\int_{E_m} \mathcal{A} g d\mu$ , we get the sum of the RHS of equations (61) and (62). On this sum, only the boundary parts remain and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| 2^d Z \int_{E_m} \mathcal{A} g(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) \right| = \left| \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{O_m} \mathcal{A} g(x, \theta) dx \right| \leq \\
& \leq \left| \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}} \cdots \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_d^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_d^2}} g(A^{-1}z_2, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_2)\} s(A^{-1}z_2) \sqrt{d} dy_d \dots dy_3 dy_2 \right| + \\
& + \left| \sum_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}^d} \int_{-m}^m \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2}} \cdots \int_{-\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_d^2}}^{\sqrt{m^2-y_2^2-\dots-y_d^2}} g(A^{-1}z_1, \theta) \exp\{-U(A^{-1}z_1)\} s(A^{-1}z_1) \sqrt{d} dy_d \dots dy_3 dy_2 \right| \leq \\
& \leq 2\sqrt{d} \|g\|_\infty \sup_{x \in \partial O_m} \{\exp\{-U(x)\} s(x)\} \int_{x \in \partial O_m} 1 dx \leq \\
& \leq C 2\sqrt{d} \|g\|_\infty \sup_{x \in \partial O_m} \{\exp\{-U(x)\} s(x)\} m^{d-1} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the convergence holds due to Assumption 3.4. Here  $\|g\|_\infty$  is well-defined since  $g = P^s f$  is bounded since  $f$  is bounded. This completes the proof.  $\square$

Now, we can conclude with the proof of invariance.

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* Let  $(P^t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the transition semi-group of the process and  $\mathcal{L}$  the operator defined in (46). Let  $f \in C_c^1(E)$ . From Lemma 6.4,  $\mathcal{L}f = \mathcal{A}f$  is the strong generator of  $f$ . Because of Dynkin's formula,

$$P^t f(x, \theta) - f(x, \theta) = \int_0^t \mathcal{A} P^s f(x, \theta) ds$$

Since  $s$  and  $\lambda$  are bounded on compact sets, for any  $f \in C_c^\infty(E)$  we have that  $\mathcal{L}f$  is bounded and after integrating both sides over  $\mu$  and using Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_E P^t f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) - \int_E f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) = \int_E \int_0^t \mathcal{A} P^s f(x, \theta) ds \mu(dx, d\theta) = \\
& = \int_0^t \int_E \mathcal{A} P^s f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) ds = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 6.6. Therefore, for all  $f \in C_c^\infty$

$$(63) \quad \int P^t f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta) = \int f(x, \theta) \mu(dx, d\theta).$$

Since, as a simple application of Stone-Weierstrass,  $C_c^\infty$  is dense in  $C_c$ , (63) holds for all  $f \in C_c$ . This further extends to all bounded measurable functions  $f$  from Lusin's theorem [24]. This proves the result.  $\square$

**Remark 6.1.** *It can be seen from the proof of Lemma 6.6 that Assumption 21 was only used in order to ensure that the boundary terms appearing in the integration by parts will decay as  $\|x\|$  goes to infinity. If the deterministic dynamics are non-explosive, the path of the process until time  $s$  has a bounded length, therefore the function  $g = P^s f$  has compact support and all the boundary terms disappear as  $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ . This means that when the deterministic dynamics are non-explosive we do not need to make Assumption 3.4, as long as we still impose Assumption 3.1.*

#### 6.4. Proof of Theorem 3.3. [Exponential Ergodicity]

We first recall some stability notions of a Markov process. For more details see [39, 41].

**Definition 6.4.** *A Markov Process  $X$  is  $\varphi$ -irreducible if there exists a non-trivial measure  $\varphi$  such that for any point  $z$  and any set  $A$  of positive  $\varphi$ -measure, there exists a  $t$  with  $P^t(z, A) > 0$ . We call  $\varphi$  irreducibility measure.*

*A set  $C$  is petite if there exists a probability measure  $\nu$ ,  $c > 0$  and a distribution  $a$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  such that for any  $z \in C$  and  $A \in \mathcal{F}$*

$$(64) \quad K_a(z, A) = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}_z(X_t \in A) da(t) \geq c\nu(A).$$

*A set  $C$  is called small for continuous or a discrete time Markov process/chain  $X_t$ , if there exists a probability measure  $\nu$ , a  $c > 0$  and a  $t \geq 0$  such that for any  $z \in C$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$*

$$(65) \quad \mathbb{P}_z(X_t \in A) \geq c \nu(A).$$

*Furthermore, the process is called strongly aperiodic if there exists a petite set  $C$  and a  $T > 0$  such that for any  $z \in C$  and  $t \geq T$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_z(X_t \in C) > 0$ .*

*The process is called  $T$ -process if there exists a probability density  $a$  on  $[0, +\infty)$  and a kernel  $K : E \times \mathcal{B}(E) \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$  the function  $z \rightarrow K(z, A)$  is lower semi-continuous and for all  $z \in E$ ,  $K(z, E) > 0$  and*

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{P}_z(X_t \in \cdot) \geq K(z, \cdot).$$

*Additionally, a  $\varphi$ -irreducible process is Harris recurrent if for all  $z \in E$  and  $A$  such that  $\varphi(A) > 0$  we have  $\mathbb{P}_z\left(\int_0^{+\infty} 1_A(X_t) dt = +\infty\right) = 1$ . If the invariant measure of the process is finite the process is called positive Harris recurrent.*

*Finally the process with invariant measure  $\mu$  is called ergodic if for all  $z \in E$*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_z(X_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

For the proof of Theorem 3.3 we will use the following result (Theorem 6.1 in [40]).

**Theorem 6.1** (Meyn-Tweedie 1993). *Assume that a Markov process  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0}$  on  $E$  is cad-lag, and all compact subset of  $E$  are petite for some skeleton chain of  $Z$ . Assume further that if  $\mathcal{L}^m$  is the extended generator of the process  $(Z_t^m)_{t \geq 0}$ , which is the process  $Z$ , stopped upon exiting  $O_m$ , then there exists a function  $V : E \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  and  $c, b > 0$  and a compact set  $C$  such that for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \in E$ ,*

$$(66) \quad \mathcal{L}^m V(z) \leq -cV(z) + b1_C(z).$$

*Then the process  $Z$  is exponentially ergodic, i.e. there exists a constant  $M$  and  $\rho < 1$  such that for all  $z \in E$*

$$\|\mathbb{P}_z(Z_t \in \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq MV(z)\rho^t.$$

From the proof of non-explosivity we have that the function  $V$  introduced in (48) satisfies the drift condition (66) for some compact set  $C$ . Therefore, in order to prove Theorem 3.3 we need to prove that the SUZZ process has all the compact sets as petite for some skeleton chain. The focus of this section is to prove this property.

In order to do this we need to establish the reachability property which was introduced in [11].

Given a speed function  $s$ , generating the family of deterministic flows  $\{\Phi_t(x, \theta), t \geq 0\}$  for every  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , we define as control sequence an object  $u = (t, \iota)$ , where  $t = (t_0, \dots, t_m) \in (0, +\infty)^{m+1}$ ,  $\iota = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^m$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Starting from  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , a control sequence  $u$  gives rise to a SUZZ trajectory  $(X_t, \Theta_t)$  as follows: Start from  $(x, \theta)$  and follow direction  $\theta$  for  $t_0$  time, i.e. set  $X_t = \Phi_{(x, \theta)}(t)$ ,  $\Theta_t = \theta$  for  $t \in [0, t_0)$ . Then, switch the

$i_1$ 'th component of  $\theta$  to  $F_{i_1}[\theta]$  and follow that direction for  $t_1$  time, i.e. set  $X_t = \Phi_{(\Phi_{(x,\theta)}(t_0), F_{i_1}[\theta])}(t - t_0)$ ,  $\Theta_t = F_{i_1}[\theta]$  for  $t \in [t_0, t_0 + t_1)$ . Continue similarly until time  $t_0 + \dots + t_m$ . Write  $\tau_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i$  for the time of the  $k$ 'th switch and denote the final position  $(X_{\tau_{m+1}}, \Theta_{\tau_{m+1}})$  of the path by  $\Psi_u(x, \theta)$ .

**Definition 6.5.** *Given a starting point  $(x, \theta) \in E$ , a control sequence  $u = (t, \iota)$  is admissible if for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  we have  $\lambda_{i_k}(X_{\tau_k}, \Theta_{\tau_k}) > 0$ .*

*Given two points  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$  we say that  $(y, \eta)$  is reachable from  $(x, \theta)$  and write  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$  if there exists a control sequence  $u$  admissible from  $(x, \theta)$  such that  $\Psi_u(x, \theta) = (y, \eta)$ .*

*We write  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$  if  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$  and for the admissible sequence  $u = (t, \iota)$  connecting the two points, we have that every index of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  appears in  $\iota$ .*

We now focus on proving that for any two points  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$  we have  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$ . Note that we can assume that the SUZZ has minimal rates (i.e.  $\gamma_i \equiv 0$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ) as higher rates make admissible paths more likely. In the case of original Zig-Zag there is the following result (Theorem 4 of [11]).

**Theorem 6.2** (Bierkens-Roberts-Zitt 2019). *Assume that  $U \in C^3$ ,  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} U(x) = +\infty$  and there exists an  $x_0$  local minimum for  $U$  such that  $\text{Hess}(U)(x_0)$  is strictly positive definite. Then the original Zig-Zag process targeting the potential  $U$  satisfies that for all  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$ ,  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$ .*

We can then generalise these results on the SUZZ using the following Lemma.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Suppose  $s \in C^2$  and  $s(x) > 0$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, for any  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$ ,  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$  in a SUZZ with speed  $s$ , targeting a potential  $U$  with minimal rates if and only if  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$  in an original Zig-Zag, targeting a potential  $U - \log s$  with minimal rates.*

*Proof of Lemma 6.7.* Consider an original Zig-Zag process targeting the potential  $U - \log s$  with minimal rates. The rates of this process for the  $i$  coordinate are  $\lambda_i^0(x', \theta') = [\theta'_i \partial_i (U(x') - \log s(x'))]^+$ . On the other hand, a SUZZ process with minimal rates targeting the potential  $U$  has rates for the  $i$  coordinate given by

$$\lambda_i(x', \theta') = [\theta'_i (s(x') \partial_i U(x') - \partial_i s(x'))]^+ = s(x') \lambda_i^0(x', \theta').$$

Therefore for any  $(x', \theta') \in E$  and any  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$(67) \quad \lambda_i(x', \theta') > 0 \iff \lambda_i^0(x', \theta') > 0.$$

Assume  $(x, \theta) \rightarrow (y, \eta)$  with some admissible control sequence  $u = (t, \iota) = (t_0, \dots, t_m, i_1, \dots, i_m)$  for the original Zig-Zag process, targeting the potential  $U - \log s$  with minimal rates. Let  $(X_t, \Theta_t)$  be the configuration of that Zig-Zag path and let  $\tau_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i$  be the times of the switches. We have  $\lambda_{i_k}^0(X_{\tau_k}, \Theta_{\tau_k}) > 0$  for all  $k$ .

Note that since  $s$  is continuous and strictly positive, for any  $(x', \theta') \in E$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\Phi_{(x', \theta')}(t)\| = +\infty$ . Therefore, there exists an  $s_0 > 0$  such that  $\Phi_{(x, \theta)}(s_0) = x + t_0 \theta = X_{\tau_1}$ . Likewise, there exists an  $s_1 > 0$  such that  $\Phi_{(X_{\tau_1}, \Theta_{\tau_1})}(s_1) = X_{\tau_2}$  and via induction we can construct for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  an  $s_k$  such that  $\Phi_{(X_{\tau_k}, \Theta_{\tau_k})}(s_k) = X_{\tau_{k+1}}$ . Then the control sequence  $\tilde{u} = (s, \iota) = (s_0, \dots, s_m, i_1, \dots, i_m)$  is an admissible sequence starting from  $(x, \theta)$  for the SUZZ targeting the potential  $U$  with minimal rates. Furthermore, the ending point of  $\tilde{u}$  starting from  $(x, \theta)$  is  $(y, \eta)$ .

The other way around, i.e. that an admissible path for the SUZZ process targeting  $U$  implies existence of an admissible path for the ZZ process targeting  $U - \log s$  follows using similar arguments.  $\square$

Combining Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 6.7 we can prove the following.

**Proposition 6.3.** *Assume that  $s \in C^2$  is a strictly positive function such that the Speed Growth Assumption 3.1 holds (i.e.  $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} U(x) - \log s(x) = +\infty$ ),  $U - \log s \in C^3$  and there exists an  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $U - \log s$  has a local minimum in  $x_0$  with  $\text{Hess}(U - \log s)(x_0)$  being strictly positive definite. Then, for every  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$ ,  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$ .*

As in [11] we can use this to prove that from any starting point and given any other point  $z \in E$ , the process has a positive probability of visiting a neighbourhood of  $z$ . The following lemma is the same as Lemma 8 in [11].

**Lemma 6.8** (Continuous Component). *If  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$  and the rates  $\lambda_i$  are continuous. Then there exist  $U_x, V_x \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  open with  $x \in U_x, y \in V_x$  and  $\varepsilon, t_0, c > 0$  such that for all  $x' \in U_x, t \in [t_0, t_0 + \varepsilon]$*

$$(68) \quad \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(X_t \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c \text{Leb}(\cdot \cap V_x)$$

where  $\text{Leb}$  is the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

The proof is very similar in spirit to the proof of Lemma 8 (Continuous Component) of [11], therefore we do not present it here but we present it on the Supplementary material. The main idea is that since there is an admissible path from  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$ , the process has a positive probability to follow some path very close to the admissible path. Therefore there is a positive probability that starting from somewhere close to  $(x, \theta)$  the process ends up somewhere close to  $(y, \eta)$ .

Lemma 6.8 allows us to prove stability properties for the process.

We have the following.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $(Z_t)_{t \geq 0} = (X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  a SUZZ process with speed function  $s$ . Assume that for all  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E, (x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta) \in E$ . Then, the process is  $T, \varphi$ -irreducible and strongly aperiodic. If in addition the invariant measure  $\mu$  is a probability measure then all compact sets are petite, they are also small for any skeleton chain and the process is positive Harris recurrent and ergodic.*

*Proof of Proposition 6.4.* The fact that the SUZZ process under the assumptions of Proposition 6.4 is  $T$ -process,  $\varphi$ -irreducible and strongly aperiodic can be proven using the same proof as in Theorem 5 of [11].

Now, we prove that every compact set is petite. A standard argument as in [11] shows that for  $\mu$ -almost all starting points  $(x, \theta)$  we have  $\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|X_t\| = +\infty) = 0$ . Indeed, for any compact set  $K, 1_{\{X_t \text{ eventually leaves } K\}} = \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} 1_{X_t \notin K}$  and by Fatou's lemma

$$\mathbb{P}_\mu(X_t \text{ eventually leaves } K) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}_\mu(X_t \notin K) = 1 - \mu(K)$$

and by exhausting  $E$  with compact sets we get  $\mathbb{P}_\mu(\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|X_t\| = +\infty) = 0$ . More specifically, there exists  $(x, \theta) \in E$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|X_t\| = +\infty) < 1$ . From Theorem 4.1 in [39] all compact sets are petite if and only if the process is  $T$  and  $\varphi$ -irreducible. The result follows.

Furthermore, the process is positive Harris recurrent from an application of Theorem 4.4 of [40].

The proof of the fact that some skeleton of the process is irreducible is the same as in Theorem 5 of [11].

From Theorem 6.1 of [39] we get that the process is ergodic.

Finally, all compacts are small for any skeleton chain from Proposition 6.1 in [39].  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* From Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 we know that the process is non-explosive and  $\mu$  introduced in (3) is invariant for the SUZZ. By Proposition 6.3 for all  $(x, \theta), (y, \eta) \in E$  we have  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$  and therefore, by Proposition 6.4 the process is  $\varphi$ -irreducible, aperiodic and all compact sets are small for some skeleton chain. Also, from Lemma 6.3,  $V$  as in (48) satisfies the drift condition (50). All the conditions of Theorem 6.1 are satisfied and the result follows.  $\square$

### 6.5. Proof of results in Section 3.3.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Introduce the space transformation  $f(x) = \int_0^x 1/s(u)du$  and note that from a separation of variables technique the solution of the ODE

$$(69) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \theta s(x) \\ X_0 = x_0 \end{cases}$$

satisfies

$$(70) \quad X_t = f^{-1}(f(x_0) + \theta t).$$

Therefore, having finite explosive time when  $\theta = +1$  means that for some  $M^+ \in (0, +\infty), \lim_{y \rightarrow M^+} f^{-1}(y) = +\infty$  and for  $\theta = -1$  means that for some  $-M^- \in (-\infty, 0), \lim_{y \rightarrow -M^-} f^{-1}(y) = -\infty$ . This means that  $f$

maps  $\mathbb{R}$  to some finite interval  $(-M^-, M^+)$ . Consider the process  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  where  $Y_t = f(X_t)$ , defined in  $(-M^-, M^+) \times \{-1, +1\}$ . When the process starts from  $(y, \theta) = (f(x), \theta)$ , it follows deterministic dynamics

$$\frac{dY_t}{dt} = f'(X_t) \frac{dX_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{s(X_t)} \Theta_t s(X_t) = \Theta_t$$

and

$$\frac{d\Theta_t}{dt} = 0.$$

Furthermore, the random time  $T$  when the sign of  $\Theta_t$  changes, is the same time when the direction changes for the  $(X_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  process. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(T \geq t) = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \lambda(X_s, \theta) ds \right\} = \exp \left\{ - \int_0^t \lambda(f^{-1}(Y_s), \theta) ds \right\}.$$

This proves that  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a one-dimensional original Zig-Zag with unit speed function and intensity rates  $\lambda_Y$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_Y(y, \theta) &= \lambda(f^{-1}(y), \theta) = [\theta (s(f^{-1}(y))U'(f^{-1}(y)) - s'(f^{-1}(y)))]^+ = \\ &= \left[ \theta \left( (U(f^{-1}(y)) - \log s(f^{-1}(y)))' \right) \right]^+ = [\theta V'(y)]^+ \end{aligned}$$

where  $V(y) = U(f^{-1}(y)) - \log s(f^{-1}(y))$ . The result follows from standard results for the Zig-Zag process (see [6]).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* From Proposition 3.1 we know that if  $f(x) = \int_0^x 1/s(u)du$ , then the process  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0} = (f(X_t), \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is an original Zig-Zag.

We also know that the deterministic flow of  $X_t$ ,  $\{\Phi_{(x, \pm 1)}(t), t \geq 0\}$  will have finite explosive time if and only if  $\left| \int_0^{\pm \infty} 1/s(u)du \right| = M^\pm < \infty$  and in that case the transformed process  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is defined on the space  $(M^-, M^+) \times \{\pm 1\}$ .

Due to Assumption 3.2, we have  $\liminf_{y \rightarrow \pm M^\pm} \lambda_Y(y, \pm 1) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow \pm \infty} \lambda(x, \pm 1) > 0$ . Following the argument for the proof of exponential ergodicity for the one-dimensional original Zig-Zag in [10] we get that there exist  $a^\pm, b^\pm > 0$ ,  $y_1 \in (0, \min\{M^+, M^-\})$  such that the function  $V$  defined on  $(-M^-, -y_1] \cup [y_1, M^+)$  by

$$V(y, \theta) = \begin{cases} \exp\{a^+y + b^+\theta\}, & y \in [y_1, M^+) \\ \exp\{-a^-y - b^-\theta\}, & y \in [-M^-, -y_1] \end{cases}$$

and extended as  $C^1$  and positive in  $[-y_1, y_1]$  satisfies the drift condition for the extended generator  $\mathcal{L}_Y$  of  $(Y_t, \Theta_t)$ , i.e. there exist  $c, b > 0$  such that for all  $(y, \theta) \in (-M^-, M^+) \times \{-1, +1\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_Y V(y, \theta) \leq -cV(y, \theta) + b1_{[-y_1, y_1]}$$

Again restricting the process onto sets  $O_m$  and stopping the process upon hitting  $O_m^c$ , we get that there exists a constant  $C > 0$  and  $\rho < 1$  and a measure  $\nu$  such that for all  $f(x) \in (-M^-, M^+)$  and any  $\theta \in \{\pm 1\}$ ,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{f(x), \theta}((f(X_t), \Theta_t) \in \cdot) - \nu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq CV(f(x), \theta)\rho^t.$$

Since  $f$  is 1-1 we get that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\theta \in \{\pm 1\}$ ,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \nu(f^{-1}(\cdot))\|_{TV} \leq CV(f(x), \theta)\rho^t.$$

Since  $\mu$  is invariant for the process  $Z_t$  due to Proposition 3.2, we get  $\nu(f^{-1}(\cdot)) = \mu(\cdot)$ . Note that  $V$  is bounded on  $(-M^-, M^+)$  so there exists an  $M$  such that  $V(f(x), \theta) \leq M$  for all  $(x, \theta) \in \mathbb{R} \times \{\pm 1\}$ . This means that

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(Z_t \in \cdot) - \mu(\cdot)\|_{TV} \leq CM\rho^t.$$

which proves the Theorem.  $\square$

### 6.6. Proof of Proposition 4.1.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* The existence of  $\varphi$  such that  $\varphi(x, \theta) \leq c_0(V(x, \theta) + 1)$  and such that  $\mathcal{L}\varphi(x, \theta) = -g(x, \theta)$  is guaranteed by Assumption 4.1. Let

$$M_t = \varphi(Z_t) - \varphi(Z_0) + \int_0^t g(Z_s) ds$$

which is a local martingale by Dynkin's formula. Assume that  $Z$  starts from the invariant measure  $\mu$ . Under  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ ,  $M_t$  is also a martingale since for any  $t > 0$  and any  $s \leq t$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[M_s] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu[|\varphi(Z_s)|] + \mathbb{E}_\mu[|\varphi(Z_0)|] + \int_0^s \mathbb{E}_\mu[|-\mathcal{L}\varphi(Z_s)|] ds \leq 2\mathbb{E}_\mu[|\varphi|] + t\mathbb{E}_\mu[g] < \infty.$$

Furthermore  $M_t$  has stationary increments. From Theorem 2.1 of [33] we have

$$\frac{M_t}{\sqrt{t}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} N(0, \mathbb{E}[M_1^2])$$

in distribution under  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ . Also, under  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$

$$\frac{\varphi(Z_t) - \varphi(Z_0)}{\sqrt{t}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} 0$$

since  $\varphi(Z_t)$  has the same law as  $\varphi(Z_0)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\varphi[Z_0]] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\varphi[Z_0]] < \infty$ . Therefore

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T g(Z_s) ds \xrightarrow{T \rightarrow \infty} N(0, \mathbb{E}_{Z_0 \sim \mu}[M_1^2])$$

under  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ . It suffices to prove that  $\mathbb{E}_{Z_0 \sim \mu}[M_1^2]$  admits the expression in (39). Let  $K_t$  be the number of switches before time  $t$  and let  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  the times of the switches. We write

$$\begin{aligned} M_t &= \varphi(Z_t) - \varphi(Z_0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}\varphi(Z_s) ds = \\ &= \int_0^t \Theta_s s(X_s) \varphi'(Z_s) ds + \sum_{i=1}^{K_t} \varphi(Z(T_i)) - \varphi(Z(T_i^-)) - \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \Theta_s s(X_s) \varphi(Z_s) + \lambda(Z_s) (\varphi(X_s, \Theta_s) - \varphi(X_s, -\Theta_s)) ds = \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{K_t} \varphi(X_{T_i}, \Theta_{T_i}) - \varphi(X_{T_i}, -\Theta_{T_i}) + \int_0^t \lambda(Z_s) (\varphi(X_s, \Theta_s) - \varphi(X_s, -\Theta_s)) ds \end{aligned}$$

and therefore (see [32], Theorem 23.6) the predictable quadratic variation of  $M$  is

$$\langle M \rangle_t = \int_0^t \lambda(Z_s) (\varphi(X_s, \Theta_s) - \varphi(X_s, -\Theta_s))^2 ds = 4 \int_0^t \lambda(Z_s) (\psi(X_s))^2 ds$$

where  $\psi(x) = \frac{1}{2} (\varphi(x, +1) - \varphi(x, -1))$ . Therefore, from the definition of predictable quadratic variation, under  $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ ,

$$(71) \quad \gamma_g^2 = \mathbb{E}_{Z_0 \sim \mu}[M_1^2] = \mathbb{E}_{Z_0 \sim \mu} \langle M \rangle_1 = 4 \int_E \lambda(x, \theta) \psi^2(x) d\mu(x, \theta).$$

It remains to write  $\psi$  in terms of  $g$ . This can be done since for all  $(x, \theta) \in E$ ,  $\mathcal{L}\varphi(x, \theta) = -g(x, \theta)$  and therefore

$$\theta s(x) \varphi'(x, \theta) + \lambda(x, \theta) (\varphi(x, -\theta) - \varphi(x, \theta)) = -g(x, \theta).$$

Writing down the two equations for  $\theta = \pm 1$  and adding them up we get

$$s(x) (\varphi'(x, +1) - \varphi'(x, -1)) - (\lambda(x, +1) - \lambda(x, -1)) (\varphi(x, +1) - \varphi(x, -1)) = -(g(x, +1) + g(x, -1))$$

and therefore

$$s(x) \psi'(x) - (s(x)U'(x) - s'(x))\psi(x) = -\frac{g(x, +1) + g(x, -1)}{2}.$$

Solving this first order linear ODE we get

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{2 \exp\{-U(x)\} s(x)} \int_x^{+\infty} (g(y, +1) + g(y, -1)) \exp\{-U(y)\} dy$$

which when combined with (71) gives (39). □

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Professor Anthony Lee for the indication of a simpler proof of Theorem 2.1.

G. Vasdekis was supported by the EPSRC as part of the MASDOC DTC (EP/HO23364/1) and the Department of Statistics at the University of Warwick (EP/N509796/1). G. O. Roberts was supported by EPSRC under the CoSInES (EP/R018561/1) and Bayes for Health (EP/R034710/1) programmes.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Benaïm, S. Le Borgne, F. Malrieu, and P. A. Zitt. Qualitative properties of certain piecewise deterministic markov processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 51(3):1040–1075, 08 2015.
- [2] J. Besag. Comments on "representations of knowledge in complex systems" by ulf grenander and michael i. miller. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 56(4):549–603, 1994.
- [3] J. Bierkens. Non-reversible metropolis-hastings. *Statistics and Computing*, 26, 01 2014.
- [4] J. Bierkens, A. Bouchard-Côté, A. Doucet, A. B. Duncan, P. Fearnhead, T. Lienart, G. O. Roberts, and S. G. Vollmer. Piecewise deterministic markov processes for scalable monte carlo on restricted domains. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 136:148 – 154, 2018. The role of Statistics in the era of big data.
- [5] J. Bierkens and A. Duncan. Limit theorems for the zig-zag process. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 49(3):791–825, 2017.
- [6] J. Bierkens, P. Fearnhead, and G. O. Roberts. The zig-zag process and super-efficient sampling for bayesian analysis of big data. *Ann. Statist.*, 47(3):1288–1320, 06 2019.
- [7] J. Bierkens, S. Grazi, K. Kamatani, and G. O. Roberts. The boomerang sampler. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 908–918, Virtual, 13–18 Jul 2020. PMLR.
- [8] J. Bierkens, S. Grazi, F. van der Meulen, and M. Schauer. A piecewise deterministic monte carlo method for diffusion bridges, 2020.
- [9] J. Bierkens, P. Nyquist, and Schlottke M. C. Large deviations for the empirical measure of the zig-zag process, 2019.
- [10] J. Bierkens and G. O. Roberts. A piecewise deterministic scaling limit of lifted metropolis–hastings in the curie–weiss model. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(2):846–882, Apr 2017.
- [11] J. Bierkens, G. O. Roberts, and P. A. Zitt. Ergodicity of the zigzag process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 29(4):2266–2301, 08 2019.
- [12] J. Bierkens and S. M. Verduyn Lunel. Spectral analysis of the zigzag process, 2019.
- [13] A. Bouchard-Côté, S. J. Vollmer, and A. Doucet. The bouncy particle sampler: A nonreversible rejection-free markov chain monte carlo method. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(522):855–867, 2018.
- [14] K. S. Chan and C. J. Geyer. Discussion: Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.*, 22(4):1747–1758, 12 1994.
- [15] T. L. Chen and C. R. Hwang. Accelerating reversible markov chains. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 83(9):1956 – 1962, 2013.
- [16] M. K. Cowles and B. P. Carlin. Markov chain monte carlo convergence diagnostics: A comparative review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(434):883–904, 1996.
- [17] M. H. A. Davis. Piecewise-deterministic Markov processes: a general class of nondiffusion stochastic models. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 46(3):353–388, 1984. With discussion.
- [18] P. Diaconis, S. Holmes, and R. M. Neal. Analysis of a nonreversible Markov chain sampler. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 10(3):726–752, 2000.
- [19] S. Duane, A. D. Kennedy, B.J. Pendleton, and D. Roweth. Hybrid monte carlo. *Physics Letters B*, 195(2):216 – 222, 1987.
- [20] A. Duncan, T. Lelièvre, and G. Pavliotis. Variance reduction using nonreversible langevin samplers. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 163, 06 2015.
- [21] A. Durmus, A. Guillin, and P. Monmarché. Piecewise deterministic markov processes and their invariant measure, 2018.
- [22] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986.
- [23] P. Fearnhead, J. Bierkens, M. Pollock, and G. O. Roberts. Piecewise deterministic Markov processes for continuous-time Monte Carlo. *Statist. Sci.*, 33(3):386–412, 2018.
- [24] G. B. Folland. *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*. Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Wiley Series of Texts, Monographs and Tracts. Wiley, 2013.
- [25] J. Fontbona, H. Guérin, and F. Malrieu. Quantitative estimates for the long-time behavior of an ergodic variant of the telegraph process. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 44(4):977–994, 12 2012.
- [26] J. Fontbona, H. Guérin, and F. Malrieu. Long time behavior of telegraph processes under convex potentials. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126(10):3077 – 3101, 2016.
- [27] P. W. Glynn and S. P. Meyn. A liapounov bound for solutions of the poisson equation. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(2):916–931, 04 1996.
- [28] S. Goldstein. On Diffusion By Discontinuous Movements, And On The Telegraph Equation. *The Quarterly Journal of Mechanics and Applied Mathematics*, 4(2):129–156, 01 1951.
- [29] C. R. Hwang, S. Y. Hwang-Ma, and S. J. Sheu. Accelerating Gaussian diffusions. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(3):897–913, 1993.
- [30] S. F. Jarner and E. Hansen. Geometric ergodicity of metropolis algorithms. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 85(2):341 – 361, 2000.
- [31] M. Kac. A stochastic model related to the telegrapher’s equation. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 4(3):497–510, 09 1974.

- [32] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Probability and Its Applications. Springer New York, 2002.
- [33] T. Komorowski, C. Landim, and S. Olla. *Fluctuations in Markov processes*, volume 345 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012. Time symmetry and martingale approximation.
- [34] T. Lelièvre, F. Nier, and G. A. Pavliotis. Optimal non-reversible linear drift for the convergence to equilibrium of a diffusion. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 152(2):237–274, 2013.
- [35] D. Levin, M. Luczak, and Y. Peres. Glauber dynamics for the mean-field ising model: cut-off, critical power law, and metastability. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 146:223–265, 2007.
- [36] P. A. W. Lewis and G. S. Shedler. Simulation of nonhomogeneous poisson processes by thinning. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 26(3):403–413, 1979.
- [37] S. Livingstone, M. Betancourt, S. Byrne, and M. Girolami. On the geometric ergodicity of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):3109–3138, 2019.
- [38] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953.
- [39] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes ii: Continuous-time processes and sampled chains. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):487–517, 1993.
- [40] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of markovian processes iii: Foster-lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 25(3):518–548, 1993.
- [41] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2009.
- [42] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. Exponential convergence of langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 12 1996.
- [43] Y. Sun, J. Schmidhuber, and F. Gomez. Improving the asymptotic performance of markov chain monte-carlo by inserting vortices. In J. Lafferty, C. Williams, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, and A. Culotta, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 23, pages 2235–2243. Curran Associates, Inc., 2010.
- [44] K. S. Turitsyn, M. Chertkov, and M. Vucelja. Irreversible monte carlo algorithms for efficient sampling. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 240(4):410 – 414, 2011.
- [45] D. A van Dyk and T. Park. *Partially Collapsed Gibbs Sampling and Path-Adaptive Metropolis–Hastings in High-Energy Astrophysics*. CRC Press, 2011.
- [46] P. Vanetti, A. Bouchard-Côté, G. Deligiannidis, and A. Doucet. Piecewise-deterministic markov chain monte carlo, 2017.
- [47] G. Vasdekis. *On Zig-Zag Extensions and Related Ergodicity Properties*. PhD thesis, University of Warwick, United Kingdom, 2020.

#### SUPPLEMENT A: PROOF OF LEMMA 6.8

The proof is very similar in spirit to the proof of Lemma 8 (Continuous Component) of [11]. The main idea is that since there is an admissible path from  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$ , the process has a positive probability to follow some path very close to the admissible path and therefore starting from somewhere close to  $(x, \theta)$  to end up somewhere close to  $(y, \eta)$ . The difference is that this time we allow explosive deterministic dynamics. Therefore, the process is not guaranteed to stay inside a fixed ball until time  $t_0 + \varepsilon$ , as in the original Zig-Zag. This means that the Poisson thinning construction that the authors propose to get the result cannot be applied here directly. However, in order to get the result, we only need to consider paths that are close to the admissible path. These paths need to lie on a fixed ball where the hazard rates are bounded and therefore we can use Poisson thinning to construct this type of paths. This gives us the result as shown in the next proof.

*Proof of Lemma 6.8.* Since  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$  there exists an admissible control sequence  $u = (t, \iota) = (t_0, \dots, t_m, i_1, \dots, i_m)$  starting from  $(x, \theta)$  with  $\Psi_u(x, \theta) = (y, \eta)$ . Let  $U'$  a small neighbourhood of  $x$  and  $B(0, R)$  a ball large enough to contain the paths induced by  $u$  starting from  $(x', \theta)$  for every  $x' \in U'$ . Also, pick  $\varepsilon$  small enough to ensure that for any  $x' \in U'$ , if the process starts from the end of any path induced by  $u$  and  $(x', \theta)$ , i.e. from  $\Psi_u(x', \theta) = (y, \eta)$ , then the process a.s. stays inside the ball  $B(0, R)$  until time  $\varepsilon$ . Such an  $\varepsilon$  can be picked due to Lemma 6.2. Since the rates of the process are continuous functions, they are bounded above in  $B(0, R)$  say by  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Let  $\tau_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i$  and let  $\underline{\lambda} > 0$  such that

$$\lambda_{\min}(t, \iota) = \min_{k \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}} \lambda_{i_k}(X_{\tau_k}, \Theta_{\tau_k}) > \underline{\lambda},$$

i.e.  $\underline{\lambda}$  be a lower bound on the rates at the switching points of the path. Then from continuity of the rates (and possibly by making  $U'$  smaller) we can find  $(U_k)_{k=0}^{m-1}$  non-intersecting small neighbourhoods of  $\tau_k$  such that for any control sequence  $(s, \iota) = (s_0, \dots, s_m, i_1, \dots, i_m)$  with the property that  $\sum_{j=0}^k s_j \in U_k$  for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$  and for any starting point  $(x', \theta)$  such that  $x' \in U'$ , we have

$$(72) \quad \lambda_{\min}(s, \iota) \geq \underline{\lambda} > 0.$$

Let  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  be the switching times of the process. On the event that there are  $m$  switches before time  $t$ , we introduce the function

$$\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) = x + T_1\theta + (T_2 - T_1)F_{i_1}[\theta] + \dots + (t - T_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta]$$

that is the end point of the path until time  $t$  when the order in which the coordinates change is  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m$ .

The random variable  $\Omega(x, \theta, T_1, \dots, T_m)$  can be simulated using Poisson thinning. As a bounding process we can use the hazard rate  $\Lambda(y, \eta)$ , defined to be equal to  $d\bar{\lambda}$  for all  $x \in B(0, R)$  and defined to be equal to  $\lambda(y, \eta)$  for all  $y \notin B(0, R)$ . Using the exponential representation of Poisson process along with Poisson thinning, we can construct the first  $m$  switches of the process using i.i.d.  $E_1, E_2, \dots \sim \exp(1)$  and i.i.d.  $u_1, u_2, \dots \sim \text{unif}(0, 1)$ . We then simulate  $T_1^{prop}$  from the bounding process  $\Lambda$  such that

$$T_1^{prop} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \int_0^t \Lambda(X_s, \theta) ds \geq E_1\}.$$

We then accept this time on the event that  $Acc_1 = \{u_1 \leq \lambda(X_{T_1^{prop}}, \theta) / \Lambda(X_{T_1^{prop}}, \theta)\}$ . If we accept, we set  $T_1 = T_1^{prop}$ . Else, we start again the process from  $(X_{T_1^{prop}}, \theta)$ , we pick a new  $T_2^{prop}$  according to  $E_2$  and we add it to the previous  $T_1^{prop}$ . We keep doing that until we accept. Suppose that the  $j_1$ 'th proposal was the one that was accepted, then we decide which coordinate of the velocity to change according to the value that  $u_{j_1}$  took and more specifically, we change the  $i_1$  coordinate (which is the first coordinate to be switched according to control sequence  $u$ ) when the event  $B_{j_1}$  occurs, where  $B_{j_1} = \{u_{j_1} \leq \lambda_{i_1}(X_{T_1}, \theta) / \Lambda(X_{T_1}, \theta)\} \subset Acc_{j_1}$ .

Using the same construction, we construct the second switching time  $T_2$  and if  $j_2$  is the time to accept the switch, then we decide which coordinate to switch according to the value  $u_{j_2}$  took and we change the  $i_2$  coordinate (which is the second coordinate to be switched according to control sequence  $u$ ) on the event that  $B_{j_2} = \{u_{j_2} \leq \lambda_{i_2}(X_{T_2}, F_{i_1}[\theta]) / \Lambda(X_{T_2}, F_{i_1}[\theta])\} \subset Acc_{j_2}$ .

Now, let us condition on the event  $B$  that *the first  $m$ ,  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  took values less than  $\underline{\lambda}/d\bar{\lambda}$  and the first  $m$   $E_1, \dots, E_m$  took values such that for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\frac{1}{d\bar{\lambda}} \sum_{i=1}^k E_i \in U_{k-1}$ , where  $U_k$  are the open subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^+$  defined just before equation (72). Furthermore, if  $\tau_m$  is the ending time of the admissible path given by the control sequence  $u$ , then  $E_{m+1}$  took a value larger than  $(\tau_m + \varepsilon - \inf U_{m-1}) d\bar{\lambda}$ , where  $\varepsilon$  was introduced in the beginning of the proof.*

Note that  $B$  has a positive probability  $c$  to occur that does not depend on the starting point of the path. Let us consider what happens if event  $B$  occurs. In the beginning, the process moves in a straight line in direction  $\theta$  and stays inside the ball of radius  $B(0, R)$ . This means that the bounding process is equal to  $d\bar{\lambda}$  by construction. Since  $a_1 = \frac{1}{d\bar{\lambda}} E_1 \in U_1$ , this means that  $E_1 = \int_0^{a_1} d\bar{\lambda} ds = \int_0^{a_1} \Lambda(X_s, \theta) ds$  and therefore  $T_1^{prop} = a_1 \in U_1$ . At the same time  $u_1 \leq \underline{\lambda}/\bar{\lambda}$  therefore the first switch was accepted and the coordinate to be switched was  $i_1$ .

Using the same line of argument and since  $\frac{1}{d\bar{\lambda}} (E_1 + E_2) \in U_2$  we can guarantee that until the second proposal time  $T_2^{prop}$  the process will remain inside the ball  $B(0, R)$  so the bounding rate will be  $d\bar{\lambda}$  and therefore the proposed switching time will occur inside  $U_2$ . Since  $u_2 \leq \underline{\lambda}/\bar{\lambda}$  the switch is accepted and the coordinate to switch is  $i_2$ .

Using induction we see that for all  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  the  $k$ 'th switching time  $T_k$  occurred inside  $U_k$  and the  $i_k$  coordinate was the one to switch.

Furthermore, from time  $T_m$  until  $\tau_m + \varepsilon$ , the process is guaranteed to not leave the ball  $B(0, R)$  by construction of  $\varepsilon$ . Therefore, the bounding process until  $\tau_m + \varepsilon$  is  $d\bar{\lambda}$  and since  $E_{m+1} > (\tau_m + \varepsilon - \inf U_{m-1}) d\bar{\lambda}$  the process is guaranteed to not switch the velocity until time  $\tau_{m+1} + \varepsilon$ .

This means that given event  $B$  occurs and if  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  are the switching events, then for any  $t \in [\tau_m, \tau_m + \varepsilon]$ ,  $X_t = \Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m)$ . Furthermore, conditioning on  $B$  all times  $T_1, \dots, T_m$  are distributed according to first arrival times of the homogeneous bounding Poisson process, conditioned on taking values on the sets  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{m-1}$ . Therefore,  $T_k \sim \text{unif}(U_{k-1})$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Conditioning on event  $B$  occurring, we write

$$\mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(X_t \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c \mathbb{P}_{x, \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta)$$

where  $T_k \sim \text{unif}(U_{k-1})$ . Recall, that  $c$  does not depend on the starting position  $x, \theta$ . We can use the same argument for every starting point  $(x', \theta)$  for any  $x' \in U'$  and get that

$$(73) \quad \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(X_t \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta)$$

Now, since  $(x, \theta) \rightsquigarrow (y, \eta)$  we can assume that  $\{1, \dots, d\} \subset \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ . Therefore, for all  $t \in [\tau_m, \tau_m + \varepsilon]$ , the (up to translation) linear map  $(u_1, \dots, u_m) \rightarrow \Omega(x, \theta, t, u_1, \dots, u_m)$  is of full rank since its matrix has column vectors

$$\{\theta - F_{i_1}[\theta], \dots, F_{i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}}[\theta] - F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta]\} = \{\pm 2e_{i_1}, \dots, \pm 2e_{i_m}\} = \{\pm 2e_1, \dots, \pm 2e_d\}.$$

From Lemma 6.3 of [1] we get that there exists a neighbourhood  $U_t$  of  $x$ , a neighbourhood  $V_t$  of  $y$  and a constant  $c' > 0$ , such that for all  $x' \in U_t$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in \cdot, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c' \lambda(\cdot \cap V_t).$$

Now, since  $\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) = x + T_1\theta + (T_2 - T_1)F_{i_1}[\theta] + \dots + (t - T_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta]$ , a change in  $t$  effects on  $\Omega$  as a translation in direction  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta]$ . This means that for every  $t \in [\tau_m, \tau_m + \varepsilon]$  if we pick a starting point  $(x', \theta)$  with  $x' \in U_{\tau_m}$  we get for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in A, \Theta_t = \eta) &= \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, \tau_m, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in A - (t - \tau_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta], \Theta_t = \eta) \\ &\geq c' \lambda((A - (t - \tau_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta]) \cap V_{\tau_m}) \geq c' \lambda(A \cap (V_{\tau_m} + (t - \tau_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta])). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\varepsilon > 0$  is picked small enough then  $\cap_{t \in [\tau_m, \tau_m + \varepsilon]} (V_{\tau_m} + (t - \tau_m)F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}[\theta])$  is not empty and contains an open set  $V_x$ . Then, for all  $x' \in U_{\tau_m}$ , and all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in A, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c' \lambda(A \cap V_x).$$

Overall, using (73), for all  $x' \in U_{\tau_m} \cap U'$ , for all  $t \in [\tau_m, \tau_m + \varepsilon]$  and all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(X_t \in A, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq c \mathbb{P}_{x', \theta}(\Omega(x, \theta, t, T_1, \dots, T_m) \in A, \Theta_t = \eta) \geq cc' \lambda(A \cap V_x).$$

which proves the result. □