

Infinite-color randomly reinforced urns with dominant colors

Hristo Sariev ^{a*}, Sandra Fortini ^b, Sonia Petrone ^b

^a *Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences*

^b *Department of Decision Sciences, Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi*

Abstract

We define and prove limit results for a class of *dominant Pólya sequences*, which are randomly reinforced urn processes with *color-specific* random weights and *unbounded* number of possible colors. Under fairly mild assumptions on the expected reinforcement, we show that the predictive and the empirical distributions converge almost surely (a.s.) in total variation to the same random probability measure \tilde{P} ; moreover, $\tilde{P}(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ a.s., where \mathcal{D} denotes the set of *dominant* colors for which the expected reinforcement is maximum. In the general case, the predictive probabilities and the empirical frequencies of any δ -neighborhood of \mathcal{D} converge a.s. to one. That is, although *non-dominant* colors continue to be regularly observed, their distance to \mathcal{D} converges in probability to zero. We refine the above results with rates of convergence. We further hint potential applications of dominant Pólya sequences in randomized clinical trials and species sampling, and use our central limit results for Bayesian inference.

Keywords: Reinforced processes, Pólya sequences, Random probability measures, Species sampling, Bayesian nonparametrics

MSC2020 Classification: 60F15, 60B10, 60F05, 60G57

1 Introduction

Let $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ be a measurable space. An \mathbb{X} -valued sequence of random variables $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ whose predictive structure is given by $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in \cdot) = \nu(\cdot)$ and, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} \in \cdot | X_1, W_1, \dots, X_n, W_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{W_i}{\theta + \sum_{j=1}^n W_j} \delta_{X_i}(\cdot) + \frac{\theta}{\theta + \sum_{j=1}^n W_j} \nu(\cdot), \quad (1.1)$$

*Corresponding author: h.sariev@math.bas.bg

for some non-negative random weights $(W_n)_{n \geq 1}$, a probability measure ν on \mathbb{X} , and a constant $\theta > 0$, describes the observation process of any urn scheme where only the color of the observed ball is reinforced. The classical example is the k -color *Pólya urn* with constant reinforcement $W_n = 1$ and finite $|\mathbb{X}| = k$, in which case (1.1) characterizes an exchangeable sequence $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with k -dimensional Dirichlet prior distribution. The important extension of Pólya urns to infinite colors is given by [8] who consider the model (1.1) with $W_n = 1$ and ν possibly diffuse. In that case, the urn scheme is better known as a *Pólya sequence* and it generates an exchangeable process $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ whose directing random measure has a Dirichlet process distribution with parameters (θ, ν) . Because of their simple predictive structure and nonparametric nature, Pólya sequences play a fundamental role in the construction of more complex procedures for nonparametric Bayesian inference (see [13] for a review). In general, an exchangeable process with prediction rule (1.1) is a member of the class of *species sampling sequences* [24], which entails, by [17, Theorem 1], that $W_n / (\theta + \sum_{j=1}^n W_j)$ and (X_1, \dots, X_n) are conditionally independent given the partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ generated by (X_1, \dots, X_n) and the σ -algebra generated by the sets $\{X_i \text{ is an atom of } \nu\}$.

Bassetti and coauthors [3] define a class of *generalized species sampling sequences* that have predictive distributions of the kind (1.1), but the process they generate is *conditionally identically distributed* (c.i.d.). By [6], a stochastic process is c.i.d. if and only if its sequence of predictive distributions is a measure-valued martingale. Thus, any exchangeable process is c.i.d., while the converse is generally not true; indeed, a sequence of random variables is exchangeable if and only if it is stationary and c.i.d. [19]. Nevertheless, c.i.d. processes are *asymptotically exchangeable*, and so preserve main limit features of exchangeable sequences, see [6]. In (1.1), the presence of the random weights W_n can lead to an imbalanced design, which may easily break the condition of stationarity. Then it may be reasonable to assume that the process $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is c.i.d., and a known sufficient condition is that W_n and X_n are conditionally independent given $(X_1, W_1, \dots, X_{n-1}, W_{n-1})$, see [3, 15].

In this paper we consider the predictive scheme (1.1) for which the random reinforcement W_n depends explicitly on the color X_n , and the process $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is in general neither exchangeable nor c.i.d. This case is of interest in many contexts; for example, in problems of species sampling, color-specific random weights capture different levels of species adaptability. Then we expect that the colors which have a higher expected reinforcement will tend to *dominate* the observation process, just as better-adapted species have a greater chance at survival. To the best of our knowledge, existing studies consider only the model with k colors, which is known as a *randomly reinforced urn* (RRU), and show that the probability of drawing a color whose expected weight is maximum goes indeed to one, see, e.g., [4, 21, 22, 26]. We thus explore the extension of RRUs to an *unbounded* set of possible colors, which parallels the extension provided by exchangeable Pólya sequences for k -color Pólya urns.

We study the limit behavior of the proposed class of randomly reinforced Pólya sequences under minimal assumptions on the reinforcement. Let \bar{w} be the sup of the *expected* reinforcement as it varies across colors, and $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{X}$ the set of *dominant* colors whose expected weight is \bar{w} . Let us denote the

predictive and the empirical distributions of $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ by

$$P_n(\cdot) \equiv \mathbb{P}(X_{n+1} \in \cdot | X_1, W_1, \dots, X_n, W_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n(\cdot) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(\cdot).$$

We show in [Theorem 3.3](#) that, under certain conditions of compactness, the probability of observing *non*-dominant colors may not vanish, though their distance to \mathcal{D} converges in probability to zero. However, if \bar{w} is significantly larger than the expected reinforcement of any $x \in \mathcal{D}^c$, then there exists a random probability measure \tilde{P} on \mathbb{X} with $\tilde{P}(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ a.s. such that

$$\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\|\alpha - \beta\| \equiv \sup_{A \in \mathcal{X}} |\alpha(A) - \beta(A)|$ is the total variation distance between two probability measures α, β on \mathbb{X} . The latter implies, in particular, that \tilde{P} is a.s. discrete on the set \mathcal{D} . On the other hand, one can show from (1.2) that $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is asymptotically exchangeable with limit directing random measure \tilde{P} ; that is, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $(X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}, \dots)$ converges in distribution to an exchangeable sequence with directing random measure \tilde{P} , see [\[1, Lemma 8.2\]](#).

In addition, we provide set-wise rates of convergence for P_n and \hat{P}_n in the form of a central limit theorem; namely, [Theorem 4.2](#) gives conditions under which, for every $A \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $A \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A) - P_n(A)) \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n}(P_n(A) - \tilde{P}(A)),$$

converge to non-degenerate Gaussian limits in the sense of stable convergence and a.s. conditional convergence, respectively. We illustrate the statistical use of these results by obtaining marginal asymptotic credible intervals for \tilde{P} under a Bayesian approach.

The paper is organized as follows. The formal definition of the proposed Pólya sequences with dominant colors is given in [Section 2](#). Their first-order convergence properties are derived in [Section 3](#), which also includes examples of their potential use in species sampling and clinical trials. [Section 4](#) contains results on rates of convergence and central limit theorems. The proofs are postponed to [Section 5](#).

2 Pólya sequence with dominant colors

Let (\mathbb{X}, d) be a complete separable metric space endowed with its Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{X} , and let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{X} -valued random variables that are defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \mathbb{P})$ and have predictive distributions (1.1). We assume that the random reinforcement in (1.1) is color-specific in the sense that

$$W_n = h(X_n, U_n),$$

where $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is an independent and identically distributed sequence of real-valued random variables such that U_n is independent of (X_1, \dots, X_n) , and h is a measurable function from $\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ into \mathbb{R}_+ .

Let us define the expected weight of color $x \in \mathbb{X}$ by

$$w(x) = \mathbb{E}[W_n | X_n = x],$$

and denote

$$\bar{w} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} w(x).$$

We further let $\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$, $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(X_1, U_1, \dots, X_n, U_n)$, $n \geq 1$, and

$$\mathcal{D} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : w(x) = \bar{w}\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{X} : d(x, \mathcal{D}) < \delta\},$$

for every $\delta > 0$. The set \mathcal{D} is called the set of *dominant* colors. We make the following assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq W_n \leq \beta \text{ for some constant } \beta; \\ \bar{w} \in \text{supp}(\nu_w); \\ \bar{w} > \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_\delta^c} w(x) \text{ for every } \delta > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where ν_w is the image measure of ν under w , and $\text{supp}(\nu_w)$ is the support of ν_w on \mathbb{R}_+ , defined by

$$\text{supp}(\nu_w) = \{u \geq 0 : \nu_w((u - \epsilon, u + \epsilon)) > 0, \forall \epsilon > 0\}.$$

The assumptions (2.1) essentially require that the colors x for which the expected weight $w(x)$ is arbitrarily close to \bar{w} lie in a compact set that we are able to sample from. Notice that when \mathcal{D} is non-empty and $\nu(\mathcal{D}) > 0$, then $\bar{w} \in \text{supp}(\nu_w)$ is automatically satisfied. In those cases, we will be interested in the relationship between \bar{w} and the next highest value in the support of ν_w , namely,

$$\bar{w}^c = \sup\{u \geq 0 : u \in \text{supp}((\nu|_{\mathcal{D}^c})_w)\},$$

where $\nu|_{\mathcal{D}^c}(\cdot) = \nu(\cdot | \mathcal{D}^c)$. We call any process characterized by (1.1) a *dominant Pólya sequence* (DPS) if it satisfies the assumptions (2.1), and proceed to study its asymptotic properties.

3 First-order convergence

We start by looking at the DPS with a constant expected weight function $w(x) \equiv \bar{w}$. Then all colors are dominant and one can show that W_n and X_n are conditionally uncorrelated given \mathcal{F}_{n-1} . Recall from Section 1 that $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is c.i.d. whenever W_n and X_n are conditionally independent. In that case, the predictive and the empirical distributions evaluated at any set $A \in \mathcal{X}$ converge a.s. to the same random limit, see [6]. Here, $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is generally not c.i.d. because the weights depend on the corresponding colors and $(P_n)_{n \geq 1}$ may not be a measure-valued martingale. Nevertheless, P_n and \hat{P}_n converge to a common random probability measure, and convergence is in total variation as in (1.2).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathbb{X} = \mathcal{D}$. Then there exists a random probability measure \tilde{P} on \mathbb{X} such that*

$$\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

We now consider the opposite extreme case of a strictly increasing w function on $\mathbb{X} = [0, 1]$. Then “1” is the only dominant color and we show that the predictive and the empirical distributions converge weakly on a set of probability one to a probability measure degenerate at “1”. Still, the probability of drawing a *non*-dominant color may not vanish.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathbb{X} = [0, 1]$ and $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a DPS with a continuous and strictly increasing expected weight function w . Then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1)$ and*

$$P_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1 \quad a.s.[\mathbb{P}] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1 \quad a.s.[\mathbb{P}].$$

Moreover, there exists a $[0, 1]$ -valued random variable η such that $P_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta$.

The sampling scheme implied by a strictly increasing w can be described as follows: colors are picked and reinforced until a new color that is closer to “1” is drawn. This color is then increasingly preferred by the model until a better alternative appears, which happens almost surely. In fact, as we will show in [Proposition 4.1](#), *non*-dominant colors are forgotten quicker the more distant they are from the dominant color “1”.

Given [Propositions 3.1](#) and [3.2](#), we are ready to state our main result of this section, which considers a DPS with an arbitrary expected weight function $w(\cdot)$ and a general space of colors \mathbb{X} . We show that, when restricted to \mathcal{D}^c , the process behaves similarly to the case in [Proposition 3.2](#) of a strictly increasing w function. If further $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$, then the probability of observing *non*-dominant colors converges a.s. to zero. Thus, neglecting the occasional *non*-dominant observation, we have asymptotically a constant expected weight function.

Theorem 3.3. *For any DPS $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \xrightarrow{a.s.} \bar{w}$ and*

$$P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{for every } \delta > 0.$$

Moreover, there exists a $[0, 1]$ -valued random variable η such that

$$P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta.$$

If, in addition, it holds that $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$, then $\eta = 0$ and there exists a random probability measure \tilde{P} on \mathbb{X} with $\tilde{P}(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] such that

$$\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

If $\bar{w} = \bar{w}^c$, then $P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ and, by [Theorem 3.3](#), $\liminf_n P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{D})$ can be strictly positive. In that case, *non-dominant* colors continue to be regularly observed yet get closer and closer to \mathcal{D} . In fact, using dominated convergence,

$$d(X_n, \mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (3.1)$$

If $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$, then, in particular, $P_n \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{P}$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and $\hat{P}_n \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{P}$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. It follows from a generalized martingale convergence theorem (see [\[7, Theorem 2\]](#)) that the conditional distribution of X_{n+1} given (X_1, \dots, X_n) converges weakly on a set of probability one to \tilde{P} . Thus, by [\[1, Lemma 8.2\]](#), $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is asymptotically exchangeable with limit directing random measure \tilde{P} .

The reinforced urn scheme [\(1.1\)](#) implies that there will be ties in a sample (X_1, \dots, X_n) of size n with positive probability. Let us denote the number of distinct colors by

$$L_n = \max\{k \in \{1, \dots, n\} : X_k \notin \{X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}\}\}.$$

The next result shows that L_n is approximately $\bar{w}^{-1}\theta \log n$ for large n .

Proposition 3.4. *For any DPS $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$, if ν is diffuse, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{L_n}{\log n} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{\theta}{\bar{w}}.$$

3.1 Examples

We close this section with a few examples and hints of potential areas of application.

Example 3.5 (k -color RRU). Let F_1, \dots, F_k be probability distribution functions on $[0, \beta]$. Denote $m_j = \int t dF_j(t)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and suppose that, for some $k_0 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$m_1 = \dots = m_{k_0} = \bar{m} > \bar{m}^c \equiv \max_{k_0 < j \leq k} m_j. \quad (3.2)$$

The k -color RRU is a DPS that associates $W_n | \{X_n = j\} \sim F_j$ to color $j = 1, \dots, k$. Then $w(j) = m_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, k_0\}$. In [\[21, 22\]](#) the authors look at the case $k_0 = 1$ and $k_0 = k$, whereas [\[4, 26\]](#) consider $1 < k_0 < k$, although [\[4\]](#) assumes [\(3.2\)](#) only asymptotically.

Define by $P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = P_n(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D}) / P_n(\mathcal{D})$ the predictive distribution of X_{n+1} conditional on being in \mathcal{D} . It follows from [Proposition 3.1](#) that $P_n(\{j\} | \mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{p}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, k_0$, for some non-negative random variables $\tilde{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{p}_{k_0}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \tilde{p}_j = 1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. As $P_n(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ by [Theorem 3.3](#), then

$$P_n(\{j\}) = P_n(\mathcal{D})P_n(\{j\} | \mathcal{D}) + P_n(\mathcal{D}^c)P_n(\{j\} | \mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{p}_j.$$

Therefore, $\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ and, similarly, $\|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, where $\tilde{P} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_0} \tilde{p}_j \delta_j$.

Example 3.6 (Unimodal DPS). Suppose that there is a unique dominant color, i.e., $\mathcal{D} = \{x_0\}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{X}$. It follows from (3.1) that

$$X_n \xrightarrow{P} x_0.$$

Moreover,

$$P_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_{x_0} \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}].$$

Indeed, for any open set $G \in \mathcal{X}$, we have that, if $x_0 \in G$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $x_0 \in \mathcal{D}_\delta \subseteq G$; therefore, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(G) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta) = 1 = \delta_{x_0}(G) \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}].$$

As $\delta_{x_0}(G) = 0$ otherwise, a.s. weak convergence of P_n to δ_{x_0} follows.

Unimodal DPSs can be used in the context of response-adaptive randomization procedures for clinical trials (see [25] for a general reference) to provide an ethical design that can deal with an *unbounded* number or even a *continuum* of potential treatments. Consider a stylized trial for determining the optimal dose of a drug. Let X_n represent the dose given to the n th patient who enters the trial, and denote by W_n the patient's response to it. Then the reinforced predictive scheme (1.1) with a unimodal $w(\cdot)$ function provides a response-adaptive rule for selecting the dose for the next patient. It follows from Theorem 3.3 that such a design is ethical in the sense that, for any $\delta > 0$, $P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 1$; that is, even in situations where it is practically impossible to select x_0 exactly (e.g., $\nu(\{x_0\}) = 0$ with ν diffuse), the probability of assigning the next patient a dose that is arbitrarily close to x_0 converges a.s. to one.

Example 3.7 (Species sampling model with dominant species). Exchangeable species sampling models are of interest in many fields and, in particular, in the broad area of Bayesian nonparametrics [24], yet forms of competition between species can easily break the symmetry imposed by exchangeability. Dominant Pólya sequences can thus provide an extension to the framework of species sampling models by addressing situations where exchangeability holds only asymptotically *and* a restricted set of dominant species tends to prevail. The latter is closely related to the notion of sparsity in random graph theory, where conciliating between exchangeability and graph density is a relevant issue, see [9].

Consider again the sampling scheme (1.1). In this case, interest lies on the *categorical* species and X_n plays the role of a label chosen, say, in $\mathbb{X} = [0, 1]$ from a uniform ν . Take $0 < w_1 < w_2 < \infty$ and $p \in (0, 1)$. Let $W_n = w(X_n)$ where

$$w(x) = w_1 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[0,p)}(x) + w_2 \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[p,1]}(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{X}.$$

Then $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a DPS with $\mathcal{D} = [p, 1]$. According to this scheme, when a *new* species appears, it has probability p to be *non*-dominant and $(1 - p)$ to be dominant, independently over n . As $p > 0$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(\mathcal{D}^c)$ diverges a.s. and we discover *non*-dominant species infinitely often. However, by Theorem 3.3, $\hat{P}_n([p, 1])$ converges a.s. to one, so the discovery rate of *non*-dominant species is of order less than n (see also Proposition 4.1).

4 Rates and central limit results

Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a DPS such that $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$, and let \tilde{P} be a random probability measure as in [Theorem 3.3](#). It follows that, for every $A \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$P_n(A) - \tilde{P}(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n(A) - P_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

We proceed to study the rate of convergence of the above quantities by first looking at the convergence rate on $A = \mathcal{D}^c$.

4.1 Rate of convergence for dominated colors

Assume $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$. Then [Theorem 3.3](#) implies that both $\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ and $P_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ converge a.s. to zero. The next result shows that, in fact, $\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ and $P_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ are $O(n^{-(\bar{w}-\bar{w}^c)/\bar{w}})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$. Let $\gamma = 1 - \bar{w}^c/\bar{w}$. Then there exists a random variable ξ with $\xi \in [0, \infty)$ such that*

$$n^\gamma \cdot \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \xi \quad \text{and} \quad n^\gamma \cdot P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{\bar{w}^c}{\bar{w}} \xi.$$

Moreover, $n^\psi \cdot \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ and $n^\psi \cdot P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ for every $\psi > \gamma$.

4.2 Central limit theorem

Let $A \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $A \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. We here give conditions under which

$$C_n(A) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A) - P_n(A)) \quad \text{and} \quad D_n(A) = \sqrt{n}(P_n(A) - \tilde{P}(A)),$$

converge to non-degenerate Gaussian limits. We will denote by $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ a Gaussian law with parameters (μ, σ^2) , where $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 0) = \delta_\mu$. The results are given in terms of stable and almost sure (a.s.) conditional convergence, which we briefly recall.

Almost sure conditional convergence. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a filtration, and \tilde{Q} a random probability measure on \mathbb{X} . A sequence $(Y_n)_{n \geq 1}$ that is *non-necessarily* adapted to \mathcal{G} is said to converge to \tilde{Q} in the sense of *a.s. conditional convergence w.r.t. \mathcal{G}* if

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n) \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{Q}(\cdot) \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}].$$

We refer to [\[11\]](#) for more details.

Stable convergence. Stable convergence is a strong form of convergence in distribution, albeit weaker than a.s. conditional convergence. A sequence $(Y_n)_{n \geq 1}$ converges *stably* to \tilde{Q} if

$$\mathbb{E}[V f(Y_n)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[V \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x) \tilde{Q}(dx)\right],$$

for any continuous bounded function f and any integrable random variable V . The main application of stable convergence is in central limit theorems that allow for mixing variables in the limit. See [18] for a complete reference on stable convergence.

We will assume $\bar{w} > 2\bar{w}^c$; thus, $\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ and $P_n(\mathcal{D}^c)$ are $o(n^{-1/2})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by [Proposition 4.1](#). Let us denote

$$P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{P_n(A \cap \mathcal{D})}{P_n(\mathcal{D})} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n(A|\mathcal{D}) = \frac{\hat{P}_n(A \cap \mathcal{D})}{\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D})}.$$

Then $C_n(A) - \sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - P_n(A|\mathcal{D})) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ and $D_n(A) - \sqrt{n}(P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, so we can work with the sequence $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ conditional on being in \mathcal{D} , in which case the expected weight function is constant.

Lastly, we can show using standard arguments that $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n] \xrightarrow{a.s.} \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\tilde{P}(dx)$ for every $f \in M_b(\mathcal{X})$. Then the following limit exists \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$q_A = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}^2 \delta_{X_{n+1}}(A)|\mathcal{F}_n].$$

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose $\bar{w} > 2\bar{w}^c$. Let $A \in \mathcal{X}$ be such that $A \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$. Define*

$$V(A) = \frac{1}{\bar{w}^2} \{(\tilde{P}(A^c))^2 q_A + (\tilde{P}(A))^2 q_{A^c}\} \quad \text{and} \quad U(A) = V(A) - \tilde{P}(A)\tilde{P}(A^c).$$

Then

$$C_n(A) \xrightarrow{\text{stably}} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A)) \quad \text{and} \quad D_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.\text{cond.}} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A)) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{F}. \quad (4.1)$$

It follows from (4.1) and [5, Lemma 1] that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A) - \tilde{P}(A)) = C_n(A) + D_n(A) \xrightarrow{\text{stably}} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A) + V(A)).$$

Moreover, the a.s. conditional convergence of $D_n(A)$ implies that the distribution of $\tilde{P}(A)$ has no point masses when $0 < \nu(A) < 1$ (see the proof of [2, Theorem 3.2]). Then $0 < \tilde{P}(A) < 1$ a.s. $[\mathbb{P}]$, and so $V(A)$ and $U(A)$ are \mathbb{P} -a.s. strictly positive.

In the case $\mathbb{X} = \mathcal{D}$, the assumptions of [Theorem 4.2](#) are automatically satisfied and (4.1) follows. Then, for any DPS with an arbitrary space of colors \mathbb{X} , we get that, by conditioning on \mathcal{D} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - P_n(A|\mathcal{D})) &\xrightarrow{\text{stably}} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A)), \\ \sqrt{n}(P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) &\xrightarrow{a.s.\text{cond.}} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A)) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

It follows that the assumption $\bar{w} > 2\bar{w}^c$ in [Theorem 4.2](#) cannot be weakened. Indeed, under $\bar{w} \leq 2\bar{w}^c$, [Proposition 4.1](#) implies that

$$D_n(A) - \sqrt{n}(P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) = \sqrt{n} P_n(\mathcal{D}^c)P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty;$$

thus, $D_n(A)$ and, similarly, $C_n(A)$ fail to converge as it is [\(4.2\)](#) that are convergent.

Example 4.3 (k -color RRU (Ctd.)). Consider again the k -color RRU from [Example 3.5](#). It follows that $q_j = \lim_n \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}^2 \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{j\})|\mathcal{F}_n]$, $j = 1, \dots, k_0$ exists a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. Then, arguing as in [\(4.2\)](#), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(\{j\}|\mathcal{D}) - P_n(\{j\}|\mathcal{D})) &\xrightarrow{stably} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\tilde{p}_j}{\bar{w}^2} \left\{ (1 - \tilde{p}_j)^2 q_j + \tilde{p}_j \sum_{i \leq k_0, i \neq j} q_i \tilde{p}_i \right\} - \tilde{p}_j(1 - \tilde{p}_j)\right), \\ \sqrt{n}(P_n(\{j\}|\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{p}_j) &\xrightarrow{a.s.concl.} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\tilde{p}_j}{\bar{w}^2} \left\{ (1 - \tilde{p}_j)^2 q_j + \tilde{p}_j \sum_{i \leq k_0, i \neq j} q_i \tilde{p}_i \right\}\right) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{p}_j = p) = 0$, $p \in [0, 1]$, so that $p_j > 0$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and $\tilde{p}_i \neq \tilde{p}_j$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}], $i \neq j$.

4.3 An application: asymptotic credible intervals for \tilde{P}

We close with an application of [Theorem 4.2](#) to a problem of statistical inference on the limit structure of the process. We assume that the random weights W_n are observable, as it might be the case, for example, in the context of clinical trials (see [Example 3.6](#)). Suppose $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{D} = [a, b]$, $\bar{w} > 2\bar{w}^c$. Define $F_n(x) = P_n((-\infty, x])$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $n \geq 1$. By [Theorem 3.3](#), there exists a random distribution function \tilde{F} on $[a, b]$ such that

$$\|F_n - \tilde{F}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

The process \tilde{F} is \mathcal{F}_∞ -measurable and thus cannot be perfectly predicted. Still, one can do inference on it based on a finite sample $(X_i, W_i)_{i=1}^n$; in particular, under a Bayesian approach, one does so by computing the conditional distribution of \tilde{F} , given $(X_i, W_i)_{i=1}^n$. The latter is usually summarized by a credible band or, in practice, by plotting *marginal* credible intervals around $\tilde{F}(x)$ for x varying on a fine grid. Let $x \in [a, b]$ be such that $0 < \nu((-\infty, x]) < 1$. The following limits exist \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$q_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}^2 \delta_{X_{n+1}}([a, x])|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad q_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}^2 \delta_{X_{n+1}}((x, b])|\mathcal{F}_n]. \quad (4.3)$$

It follows from [Theorem 4.2](#) that

$$\sqrt{n}(F_n(x) - \tilde{F}(x)) \xrightarrow{a.s.concl.} \mathcal{N}(0, V_x) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{F},$$

where $V_x = \bar{w}^{-2}((1 - \tilde{F}(x))^2 q_1 + \tilde{F}(x)^2 q_0)$. In order to obtain asymptotic credible intervals for $\tilde{F}(x)$, we need a convergent estimator of V_x . Let us define, for $n \geq 1$,

$$V_{n,x} = \frac{1}{m_n^2} ((1 - F_n(x))^2 s_{n,1} + (F_n(x))^2 s_{n,0}),$$

$$m_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i, \quad s_{n,1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i^2 \delta_{X_i}([a, x]), \quad s_{n,0} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i^2 \delta_{X_i}((x, b]).$$

By [Theorem 3.3](#), $m_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \bar{w}$. Moreover, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[W_n^2]/n^2 < \infty$, so [\[5, Lemma 2\]](#) implies from [\(4.3\)](#) that $s_{n,1} \xrightarrow{a.s.} q_1$ and $s_{n,0} \xrightarrow{a.s.} q_0$. Thus,

$$V_{n,x} \xrightarrow{a.s.} V_x.$$

A generalized Slutsky's theorem (see also [\[14, Theorem 6\]](#)) implies, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\tilde{F}(x) - F_n(x)}{\sqrt{V_{n,x}/n}} \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)((-\infty, t]).$$

As a consequence, denoting by z_α the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ -quantile of the standard Normal distribution, we get

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(F_n(x) - z_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{V_{n,x}}{n}} \leq \tilde{F}(x) \leq F_n(x) + z_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{V_{n,x}}{n}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right) \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

Thus, an asymptotic marginal credible interval for $\tilde{F}(x)$ at level $1 - \alpha$ is

$$\left[F_n(x) - z_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{V_{n,x}}{n}}, F_n(x) + z_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{V_{n,x}}{n}}\right].$$

5 Proofs

We shall use the following notation throughout this section,

$$N_n(A) = \theta \nu(A) + \sum_{i=1}^n W_i \delta_{X_i}(A), \quad M_n(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(A) + 1, \quad N_n = \theta + \sum_{i=1}^n W_i,$$

so that $P_n(A) = N_n(A)/N_n$ for every $n \geq 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{X}$, with the convention $\sum_{i=1}^0 a_i = 0$, and we will omit the parenthesis when A is an interval for the sake of clarity. In addition, we will denote by $M_b(\mathcal{X}), M_0(\mathcal{X}), M_+(\mathcal{X}), C_b(\mathbb{X})$ the collections of functions $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}$ that are bounded and \mathcal{X} -measurable, simple and \mathcal{X} -measurable, non-negative and \mathcal{X} -measurable, and continuous and bounded, respectively.

The following identity, given for any $A \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \geq 0$, is a consequence of the independence of $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and will be applied repeatedly,

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{n+1} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(A) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \mathbb{E}[w(X_{n+1}) \delta_{X_{n+1}}(A) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]. \quad (5.1)$$

The proof of [Proposition 3.1](#) uses the following general fact for DPSs with $\mathbb{X} = \mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Under the conditions in Proposition 3.1, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{n}{N_n} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\bar{w}} \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}] \text{ and in } L^p \text{ for all } p \geq 1.$$

Proof. By hypothesis, $\mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] = \bar{w}$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[W_n^2]/n^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta^2/n^2 < \infty$, so [5, Lemma 2] implies that $N_n/n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \bar{w}$. Define $N_n^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \{W_i - \mathbb{E}[W_i]\}$, $n \geq 1$. By a classical martingale inequality (see [20, Lemma 1.5] and [5, Lemma 3]), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|N_n^*| > x) \leq 2 \exp\{-x^2/2\beta n^2\} \quad \text{for all } x > 0.$$

Fix $p > 0$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[N_n^{-p}] = p \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t^{p+1}} \mathbb{P}(N_n < t) dt \leq \frac{p}{\theta^{p+1}} \int_{\theta}^{\theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2}} \mathbb{P}(N_n < t) dt + p \int_{\theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{t^{p+1}} dt.$$

Clearly, $p \int_{\theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2}}^{\infty} t^{-p-1} dt = (\theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2})^{-p} = O(n^{-p})$. On the other hand, for $t < \theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(N_n < t) = \mathbb{P}(N_n^* < t - \theta - n\bar{w}) \leq \mathbb{P}(|N_n^*| > \theta + n\bar{w} - t) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{(\theta + n\bar{w} - t)^2}{2\beta^2 n}\right\};$$

thus, $\int_{\theta}^{\theta + \frac{n\bar{w}}{2}} \mathbb{P}(N_n < t) dt \leq n\bar{w} \exp\{-n\bar{w}^2/4\beta^2\}$ and, ultimately, $\mathbb{E}[N_n^{-p}] = O(n^{-p})$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{X}$ and $n \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+1}(A) - P_n(A) &= \frac{W_{n+1}/N_n}{1 + W_{n+1}/N_n} (\delta_{X_{n+1}}(A) - P_n(A)) \\ &\leq \frac{W_{n+1}}{N_n} P_n(A^c) \delta_{X_{n+1}}(A) - \left(\frac{W_{n+1}}{N_n} - \frac{W_{n+1}^2}{N_n^2} \right) P_n(A) \delta_{X_{n+1}}(A^c), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $x - x^2 \leq \frac{x}{1+x} \leq x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$; thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[P_{n+1}(A) - P_n(A)|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \beta^2 P_n(A) P_n(A^c) N_n^{-2}. \quad (5.2)$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.1,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[P_{n+1}(A) - P_n(A)|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^2}{N_{n-1}^2} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}]. \quad (5.3)$$

On the other hand,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(P_{n+1}(A) - P_n(A))^2|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{W_{n+1}^2}{N_{n+1}^2} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n\right] \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^2}{N_{n-1}^2} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}]. \quad (5.4)$$

Given (5.3) and (5.4), there exists by [23, Lemma 3.2] a random variable \tilde{p}_A such that

$$P_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{p}_A.$$

Define $\tilde{Q}(A) = \tilde{p}_A$, $A \in \mathcal{X}$. Then $\tilde{Q}(\mathbb{X}) = 1$, $\tilde{Q}(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\tilde{Q}(A) \geq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{X}$, a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. Moreover, $\omega \mapsto \tilde{Q}(A)(\omega)$ is \mathcal{H} -measurable for every $A \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\tilde{Q}(A_1 \cup A_2) = \tilde{Q}(A_1) + \tilde{Q}(A_2)$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] for disjoint $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{X}$. In addition, the map $A \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}(A)]$ is a probability measure on \mathbb{X} . Indeed, let $\{A_m\}_{m \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be such that $A_m \cap A_n = \emptyset$, $m \neq n$. Put $A = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m$. Using (5.2),

$$\mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[P_i(A_m) - P_{i-1}(A_m)] + \nu(A_m) \leq \beta^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)N_n^{-2}] + \nu(A_m) \equiv M(m).$$

According to the Weierstrass M-test, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)]$, whenever $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} M(m) < \infty$. To that end, Lemma 5.1 implies

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} M(m) = \beta^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)N_n^{-2}] + \nu(A) \leq \beta^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[N_n^{-2}] + \nu(A) < \infty,$$

and, as a consequence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}(A)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(A_m)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Q}(A_m)]. \quad (5.5)$$

By [16, Theorem 3.1], there exists a random probability measure \tilde{P} on \mathbb{X} such that, for every $A \in \mathcal{X}$, we have $\tilde{Q}(A) = \tilde{P}(A)$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}], and so

$$P_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{P}(A).$$

Moreover, using standard arguments, $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}_n] \xrightarrow{a.s.} \int_{\mathbb{X}} f(x)\tilde{P}(dx)$ for every $f \in M_b(\mathcal{X})$, which implies that $P_n \xrightarrow{w} \tilde{P}$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] since \mathbb{X} is separable.

Define $S_n = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, $n \geq 1$. Then $S_n \uparrow \{X_1, X_2, \dots\} \equiv S$ and, by Portmanteau theorem,

$$\tilde{P}(S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{P}(S_n) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} P_m(S_n) \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{\theta}{N_m}\right) = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}],$$

that is, \tilde{P} is \mathbb{P} -a.s. discrete with random support S . On the other hand, proceeding as in (5.3) and (5.4), we can show that $P_n(\{X_m\}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{p}_m$ for some random variables $(\tilde{p}_m)_{m \geq 1}$. By Portmanteau theorem,

$$\tilde{P}(\{X_m\}) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(\{X_m\}) = \tilde{p}_m \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}], \text{ for } m \geq 1.$$

But $1 = \tilde{P}(S) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{P}(\{X_m\}) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_m$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and, using the same arguments as in (5.5),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_m\right] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(\{X_m\})] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[P_n(S)] = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}],$$

so $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tilde{p}_m = 1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}], and thus $\tilde{P}(\{X_m\}) = \tilde{p}_m$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}], $m \geq 1$. As a result, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(P_n(\{x\}) \rightarrow \tilde{P}(\{x\}) \text{ for all } x \in S) = \mathbb{P}(P_n(\{X_m\}) \rightarrow \tilde{P}(\{X_m\}) \text{ for all } m \geq 1) = 1,$$

and, by Scheffe's lemma,

$$\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \leq \sup_{x \in S} |P_n(\{x\}) - \tilde{P}(\{x\})| + P_n(S^c) \leq \sum_{x \in S} |P_n(\{x\}) - \tilde{P}(\{x\})| + \theta_n \nu(S^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Finally, [5, Lemma 2] implies that $\hat{P}_n(\{X_m\}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{P}(\{X_m\})$, $m \geq 1$, and so $\|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. \square

The proof of [Proposition 3.2](#) makes use of the following three preliminary results.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the conditions in [Proposition 3.2](#), as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $N_n(t, 1) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1)$. Denote $A = (t, 1]$. It follows from (2.1) that $P_n(A) \geq \theta \nu(A) / (\theta + n\beta) > 0$, so $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_n(A) = \infty$, and thus $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_{X_n}(A) = \infty$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] by [12, Theorem 1]. Since $N_n(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n (N_i(A) - N_{i-1}(A)) + \theta \nu(A)$, then, by [10, Theorem 1], $N_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ if $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[N_n(A) - N_{n-1}(A) | \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \vee \sigma(X_n)] = \infty$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. Indeed, from the monotonicity of w ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[N_i(A) - N_{i-1}(A) | \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \vee \sigma(X_i)] = \sum_{i=1}^n w(X_i) \delta_{X_i}(A) \geq w(t) \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty.$$

\square

Lemma 5.3. *Under the conditions in [Proposition 3.2](#), for every $t \in (0, 1)$, there exist $s \in (t, 1)$ and $\lambda_t \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $\lambda \in (\lambda_t, 1]$, the ratio $N_n[0, t] / N_n(s, 1)^\lambda$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to a finite limit.*

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1)$. Put $\lambda_t = (w(1) + w(t)) / 2w(1)$. Take $\lambda \in (\lambda_t, 1]$ and $s \in (t, 1)$ such that $w(s) > w(t) / \lambda_t$; such an s exists as $w([0, 1])$ is connected and $w(t) < w(t) / \lambda_t < w(1)$. Then, by (5.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{N_{n+1}[0, t]}{N_{n+1}(s, 1)^\lambda} - \frac{N_n[0, t]}{N_n(s, 1)^\lambda} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] &= \frac{N_n[0, t]}{N_n(s, 1)^\lambda} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{N_{n+1}[0, t]}{N_n[0, t]} \left(1 - \frac{W_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n+1} > s\}}}{N_{n+1}(s, 1)} \right)^\lambda - 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\leq \frac{N_n[0, t]}{N_n(s, 1)^\lambda N_n} \left\{ w(t) - \lambda w(s) \frac{N_n(s, 1)}{N_n(s, 1) + \beta} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $(1+x)^\lambda \leq 1 + \lambda x$ for $-1 \leq x \leq 0$. Let us define, for $n, m \geq 0$,

$$R_n = w(t) - \lambda w(s) \frac{N_n(s, 1)}{N_n(s, 1) + \beta} \quad \text{and} \quad T_m = \inf\{n \geq m : R_n \geq 0\}.$$

Each T_m is a \mathcal{F} -stopping time and $(N_{n \wedge T_m}[0, t] / N_{n \wedge T_m}(s, 1)^\lambda)_{n \geq m}$ a non-negative supermartingale, so it converges to a random limit $L_m < \infty$, say, on $\Omega_m : \mathbb{P}(\Omega_m) = 1$. Put $\Omega^* = \{\liminf_n R_n < 0\} \cap \bigcup_m \Omega_m$. By [Lemma 5.2](#), $\liminf_n R_n < 0$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) = 1$. Take $\omega \in \Omega^*$. There exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $R_n(\omega) < 0$, $n \geq m_0$. Then $T_{m_0}(\omega) = \infty$, so $N_n[0, t](\omega) / N_n(s, 1)^\lambda(\omega) \rightarrow L_{m_0}(\omega)$. Therefore, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n[0, t] / N_n(s, 1)^\lambda < \infty$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. \square

Lemma 5.4. *Under the conditions in Proposition 3.2, if $\nu(t, 1) > 0$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$, then $N_n(\{1\}^c)/M_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1)$.*

Proof. Fix $t \in (0, 1)$. It follows from $\nu(t, 1) > 0$ and a slightly modified version of Lemma 5.3 that $N_n[0, t]/N_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. Then

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{P_n(\{1\}^c)} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c) | \mathcal{F}_n] \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(t) \frac{P_n[t, 1]}{P_n(\{1\}^c)} = w(t) \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}].$$

Since $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c) | \mathcal{F}_n] / P_n(\{1\}^c) \leq w(1)$ a.s. $[\mathbb{P}]$, letting $t \uparrow 1$, we get

$$\frac{1}{P_n(\{1\}^c)} \mathbb{E}[W_{n+1} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c) | \mathcal{F}_n] \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1). \quad (5.6)$$

Define $T_0 = 0$ and $T_n = \inf\{m > T_{n-1} : X_m \neq 1\}$, $n \geq 1$. It follows from $\mathbb{P}(X_n \neq 1 \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ that each T_n is a \mathcal{F} -stopping time such that $T_n < \infty$ a.s. $[\mathbb{P}]$ and $T_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$. We further let, for $n \geq 1$,

$$X_n^* = X_{T_n}, \quad W_n^* = W_{T_n}, \quad P_n^*(\cdot) = \frac{P_{T_{n+1}-1}(\cdot \cap \{1\}^c)}{P_{T_{n+1}-1}(\{1\}^c)}, \quad \mathcal{F}_n^* = \sigma(X_1^*, W_1^*, \dots, X_n^*, W_n^*),$$

which are well-defined on the probability space $(\Omega^*, \mathcal{H}^*, \mathbb{P}^*) \equiv (\Omega^*, \mathcal{H} \cap \Omega^*, \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \Omega^*))$, where $\Omega^* \equiv \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \{T_n < \infty\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) = 1$ from before. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Take $B \in \mathcal{B}[0, 1]$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_n^*$. Then

$$P_n^*(B) = \frac{\theta \nu(B \cap \{1\}^c) + \sum_{i=1}^{T_{n+1}-1} W_i \delta_{X_i}(B \cap \{1\}^c)}{\theta \nu(\{1\}^c) + \sum_{i=1}^{T_{n+1}-1} W_i \delta_{X_i}(\{1\}^c)} = \frac{\theta \nu(B \cap \{1\}^c) + \sum_{k=1}^n W_k^* \delta_{X_k^*}(B)}{\theta \nu(\{1\}^c) + \sum_{k=1}^n W_k^*};$$

thus, $P_n^*(B)$ is \mathcal{F}_n^* -measurable. Since $\mathbb{1}_A = f(X_1^*, W_1^*, \dots, X_n^*, W_n^*)$ for some measurable f , we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^*(A \cap \{X_{n+1}^* \in B\}) &= \mathbb{E}[f(X_{T_1}, W_{T_1}, \dots, X_{T_n}, W_{T_n}) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{T_{n+1}} \in B\} \cap \Omega^*}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[f(X_{T_1}, W_{T_1}, \dots, X_{T_n}, W_{T_n}) \frac{P_{T_{n+1}-1}(B \cap \{1\}^c)}{P_{T_{n+1}-1}(\{1\}^c)} \mathbb{1}_{\Omega^*}\right] = \mathbb{E}^*[\mathbb{1}_A \cdot P_n^*(B)]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, P_n^* is a version of the conditional distribution of X_{n+1}^* given \mathcal{F}_n^* . Then, by (5.1) and (5.6),

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\mathbb{E}^*[w(X_{n+1}^*) | \mathcal{F}_n^*] \rightarrow w(1)) = 1.$$

Moreover, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^*[(W_n^*)^2] / n^2 < \infty$, so $\mathbb{P}^*(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n W_k^* \rightarrow w(1)) = 1$ by [5, Lemma 2]. As a result,

$$\frac{N_n(\{1\}^c)}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} = \frac{\theta \nu(\{1\}^c)}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} + \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{M_n(\{1\}^c)-1} W_{T_k}}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Part I. ($P_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1$, $\hat{P}_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1$, $\frac{N_n}{n} \rightarrow w(1)$, a.s.[\mathbb{P}]). Let $t \in (0, 1)$. Take $s \in (t, 1)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ as in the statement of Lemma 5.3. Then Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 imply that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n[0, t] \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_n[0, t]}{N_n(t, 1]} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N_n(s, 1]^{1-\lambda}} \frac{N_n[0, t]}{N_n(s, 1]^\lambda} = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}];$$

thus, $P_n(t, 1] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$, and so $P_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. By [5, Lemma 2], $\hat{P}_n(t, 1] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ for every $t \in (0, 1)$ and, similarly, $\hat{P}_n \xrightarrow{w} \delta_1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}].

Finally, (5.1) and the a.s. weak convergence of P_n to δ_1 imply that $\mathbb{E}[W_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n] \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1)$. As $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[W_n^2]/n^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta^2/n^2 < \infty$, then, by [5, Lemma 2],

$$\frac{N_n}{n} \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1). \quad (5.7)$$

Part II. ($P_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta$). Suppose $0 < \nu(\{1\}) < 1$; else, if $\nu(\{1\}) = 0$ (or $\nu(\{1\}) = 1$), then $P_n(\{1\}^c) = 1$ ($P_n(\{1\}^c) = 0$), and so $P_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta$ with $\eta = 1$ ($\eta = 0$). In that case, $P_n(\{1\}^c) > 0$ for every $n \geq 0$, so $M_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ by [12, Theorem 1], and hence $\mathbb{P}(X_n \neq 1 \text{ i.o.}) = 1$.

Case 1: $\nu(t, 1) = 0$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$. It follows that $P_n(\{1\}^c) = P_n[0, t]$, so Portmanteau theorem implies $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n[0, t] \leq \delta_1([0, t]) = 0$, and thus $P_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$.

Case 2: $\nu(t, 1) > 0$ for each $t \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma 5.4, $N_n(\{1\}^c)/M_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1)$ and, similarly, $N_n(\{1\})/M_n(\{1\}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} w(1)$. Let $\psi \in (0, 1)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{M_{n+1}(\{1\})^\psi}{M_{n+1}(\{1\}^c)} - \frac{M_n(\{1\})^\psi}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] &= \frac{M_n(\{1\})^\psi}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \frac{\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\})}{M_n(\{1\})} \right)^\psi \frac{M_n(\{1\}^c)}{M_{n+1}(\{1\}^c)} - 1 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\leq \frac{M_n(\{1\})^\psi}{M_n(\{1\}^c)N_n} \left\{ \psi \frac{N_n(\{1\})}{M_n(\{1\})} - \frac{N_n(\{1\}^c)}{M_n(\{1\}^c) + 1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

using that $(1+x)^\psi \leq 1 + \psi x$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$. Since

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\psi \frac{N_n(\{1\})}{M_n(\{1\})} - \frac{N_n(\{1\}^c)}{M_n(\{1\}^c) + 1} \right) < 0 \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}],$$

we can show, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, that $(M_n(\{1\})^\psi/M_n(\{1\}^c))_{n \geq 1}$ converges a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. But ψ is arbitrary, so it holds that

$$\frac{M_n(\{1\})^\psi}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} = M_n(\{1\})^{\frac{\psi-1}{2}} \frac{M_n(\{1\})^{\frac{1+\psi}{2}}}{M_n(\{1\}^c)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Analogously, $M_n(\{1\}^c)^\psi/M_n(\{1\}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. Therefore, for every $\psi < 1$,

$$\frac{n^\psi}{N_n(\{1\})} = \left(\frac{M_n(\{1\}^c) + M_n(\{1\}) - 2}{M_n(\{1\})^{1/\psi}} \right)^\psi \frac{M_n(\{1\})}{N_n(\{1\})} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n^\psi}{N_n(\{1\}^c)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Define $Z_n = \log \frac{N_n(\{1\}^c)}{N_n(\{1\})}$, $n \geq 0$. By [23, Lemma 3.2], $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. in $[-\infty, \infty)$ if

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} - Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}] \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}[\mathbb{P}]. \quad (5.9)$$

In that case, $(N_n(\{1\}^c)/N_n(\{1\}))_{n \geq 0}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. in $[0, \infty)$ and there exists a random variable $\eta \in [0, 1)$ such that

$$P_n(\{1\}^c) = \frac{N_n(\{1\}^c)}{N_n(\{1\}^c) + N_n(\{1\})} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta.$$

To prove (5.9), observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} - Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\log \frac{N_{n+1}(\{1\}^c)}{N_n(\{1\}^c)} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c) - \log \frac{N_{n+1}(\{1\})}{N_n(\{1\})} \delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{W_{n+1}} \frac{\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c)}{N_n(\{1\}^c) + t} dt - \int_0^{W_{n+1}} \frac{\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\})}{N_n(\{1\}) + t} dt \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c) \left(\frac{W_{n+1}}{N_n(\{1\}^c)} - \frac{W_{n+1}^2}{2N_n(\{1\}^c)^2} + k_1 \frac{W_{n+1}^3}{3N_n(\{1\}^c)^3} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}) \left(\frac{W_{n+1}}{N_n(\{1\})} - k_2 \frac{W_{n+1}^2}{2N_n(\{1\})^2} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N_n} \left(k_1 \frac{\beta^3}{3N_n(\{1\}^c)^2} + k_2 \frac{\beta^2}{2N_n(\{1\})} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Taylor series approximation of the function $f(x) = 1/(x+t)$ with some constants $k_1, k_2 \geq 0$. By (5.7) and (5.8), $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[Z_{n+1} - Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$ a.s. $[\mathbb{P}]$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\}^c)}{N_n(\{1\}^c)^2} \left(\int_0^{W_{n+1}} dt \right)^2 + \frac{\delta_{X_{n+1}}(\{1\})}{N_n(\{1\})^2} \left(\int_0^{W_{n+1}} dt \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\leq P_n(\{1\}^c) \frac{\beta^2}{N_n(\{1\}^c)^2} + P_n(\{1\}) \frac{\beta^2}{N_n(\{1\})^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[(Z_{n+1} - Z_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$ a.s. $[\mathbb{P}]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let us define $g(x) = w(x)/\bar{w}$, $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and, for $n \geq 1$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}[0, 1]$,

$$\tilde{X}_n = g(X_n), \quad \tilde{W}_n = W_n, \quad \tilde{P}_n(A) = P_n(g^{-1}(A)), \quad \tilde{\nu}(A) = \nu(g^{-1}(A)).$$

Then $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n|\tilde{X}_n] = \bar{w}\tilde{X}_n$. In addition, we have from (2.1) that, for every $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\tilde{\nu}(t, 1] = \nu(\{x \in \mathbb{X} : w(x) > t\bar{w}\}) = \nu_w(t\bar{w}, \bar{w}) > 0;$$

thus, $1 \in \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu})$. On the other hand,

$$\tilde{P}_n(A) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\tilde{W}_i}{\theta + \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{W}_j} \delta_{\tilde{X}_i}(A) + \frac{\theta}{\theta + \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{W}_j} \tilde{\nu}(A).$$

Therefore, $(\tilde{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is¹ a $[0, 1]$ -valued DPS with the continuous and strictly increasing expected weight function $\tilde{w} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \bar{w}]$, given by $\tilde{w}(t) = \bar{w}t$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Then Proposition 3.2 implies

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{w}(1) = \bar{w}.$$

Part I. ($P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$). Fix $\delta > 0$. Let $\epsilon = (\bar{w} - \sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}_\delta^c} w(x))/2$. Then $\epsilon > 0$ by (2.1), so Proposition 3.2 implies

$$P_n(\mathcal{D}_\delta^c) \leq \mathbb{P}(w(X_{n+1}) < \bar{w} - \epsilon | \mathcal{F}_n) = \tilde{P}_n[0, 1 - \epsilon/\bar{w}] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Part II. ($P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta$). By Proposition 3.2, there exists a random variable η with $\eta \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) = \tilde{P}_n(\{1\}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \eta.$$

Suppose $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$. Then there exists $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $\nu_w(t\bar{w}, \bar{w}) = 0$. But $\tilde{\nu}(t, 1) = \nu_w(t\bar{w}, \bar{w}) = 0$, so $P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) = \tilde{P}_n[0, t] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$.

Part III. ($\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, $\|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$). Suppose $\bar{w} > \bar{w}^c$. It follows from Part II that $P_n(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ and, by [5, Lemma 2], $\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$. Then [12, Theorem 1] implies $\mathbb{P}(X_n \in \mathcal{D} \text{ i.o.}) = 1$.

Let us define $T = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$,

$$T_n = \inf\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m > T_{n-1}, X_m \in \mathcal{D}\} \quad \text{and} \quad P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = P_n(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D}) / P_n(\mathcal{D}).$$

Then T_n is a \mathcal{F} -stopping time such that $T_n < \infty$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and $T_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ from $\mathbb{P}(X_n \in \mathcal{D} \text{ i.o.}) = 1$. Put $\Omega^* = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \{T_n < \infty\}$. Arguing as in Lemma 5.4, one can show that $P_n^*(\cdot) \equiv P_{T_{n-1}}(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ is the conditional distribution of X_{T_n} given $\sigma(X_{T_1}, W_{T_1}, \dots, X_{T_{n-1}}, W_{T_{n-1}})$ on the probability space

¹Strictly speaking, $(\tilde{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ differs from the definition of a DPS in that \tilde{W}_n is a function of (X_n, U_n) but not of (\tilde{X}_n, U_n) , and \tilde{P}_n is the conditional distribution of \tilde{X}_{n+1} given \mathcal{F}_n instead of $\sigma(\tilde{X}_1, U_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n, U_n)$. Nevertheless, the conclusions of Proposition 3.2 continue to hold for the process $(\tilde{X}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ since $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{W}_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \vee \sigma(X_n)] = \bar{w}(\tilde{X}_n)$.

$(\Omega^*, \mathcal{H}^* \mathbb{P}^*) \equiv (\Omega^*, \mathcal{H} \cap \Omega^*, \mathbb{P}(\cdot | \Omega^*))$. Moreover, $(X_{T_n})_{n \geq 1}$ is a DPS such that $\mathbb{E}^*[W_{T_n} | X_{T_n}] = \bar{w}$, $n \geq 1$, so there exists by [Proposition 3.1](#) a random probability measure \tilde{P}^* on \mathcal{D} such that

$$\mathbb{P}^*(\|P_n^* - \tilde{P}^*\| \rightarrow 0) = 1.$$

Define $\tilde{P}(A)(\omega) = \tilde{P}^*(A \cap \mathcal{D})(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega^*$ and $\tilde{P}(A)(\omega) = 0$, $\omega \notin \Omega^*$, $A \in \mathcal{X}$. As $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) = 1$, then \tilde{P} is a random probability measure on \mathbb{X} such that $\tilde{P}(\mathcal{D}) = 1$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}]. On the other hand, $P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) \equiv P_{m_n}^*(\cdot)$ on Ω^* , with $m_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{T_j \leq n\}}$, $n \geq 1$, so

$$\mathbb{P}(\|P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(\cdot)\| \rightarrow 1) = \mathbb{P}^*(\|P_{m_n}^* - \tilde{P}^*\| \rightarrow 1) = 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\|P_n - \tilde{P}\| \leq 2P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) + \|P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(\cdot)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Finally, let $\hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = \hat{P}_n(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D}) / \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D})$, $n \geq 0$, which is well-defined for large n . Then $\hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ denotes the relative frequency of $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ conditional on being in \mathcal{D} , so, arguing as before, we have

$$\|\hat{P}_n - \tilde{P}\| \leq 2\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c) + \|\hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(\cdot)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.4. By [Theorem 3.3](#), $N_n/n \xrightarrow{a.s.} \bar{w}$. Define $\theta_n = \theta/N_n$ and $Z_n = L_n - L_{n-1}$, $n \geq 1$, with $L_0 = 0$ and $\theta_0 = 1$. As ν is diffuse and $Z_n \in \{0, 1\}$, then $L_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i=1\}}$ and $\theta_n = \mathbb{P}(Z_{n+1} = 1 | \mathcal{F}_n)$. Moreover, $\theta_n \geq \theta/(\theta + \beta n)$, so $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(Z_n = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \infty$ a.s.[\mathbb{P}] and, by [[12](#), Theorem 1],

$$\frac{L_n}{\sum_{k=1}^n \theta_{k-1}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i=1\}}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}(Z_k = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{k-1})} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1.$$

On the other hand, $\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{k=1}^n k^{-1} \rightarrow 1$, so $\frac{1}{\log n} \sum_{k=1}^n k^{-1} a_k \rightarrow a$ for any $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $a_n \rightarrow a$, and thus

$$\frac{L_n}{\log n} = \frac{L_n}{\sum_{k=1}^n \theta_{k-1}} \left(\frac{1}{\log n} + \frac{\theta}{\log n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{k}{N_k} \right) \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{\theta}{\bar{w}}.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 4.1. If $\nu(\mathcal{D}^c) = 0$, the result is immediate for $\xi = 0$. Suppose $\nu(\mathcal{D}^c) > 0$. Then $\bar{w}^c \in \text{supp}((\nu|_{\mathcal{D}^c})_w)$. Moreover, $\nu(\{x \in \mathcal{D}^c : w(x) > \bar{w}^c\}) = 0$; otherwise, $(\bar{w}^c, \bar{w}) \cap \text{supp}((\nu|_{\mathcal{D}^c})_w) \neq \emptyset$ and there exists $u > \bar{w}^c$ such that $u \in \text{supp}((\nu|_{\mathcal{D}^c})_w)$, absurd. As a result, \bar{w}^c plays the same role for the subsequence of non-dominant observations as \bar{w} does for $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$; thus, by [Theorem 3.3](#), $N_n(\mathcal{D}^c)/M_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \bar{w}^c$. Then, proceeding as in Part II of the proof of [Proposition 3.2](#), we can show that, for every $\psi < \bar{w}^c/\bar{w}$,

$$\frac{M_n(\mathcal{D})^\psi}{M_n(\mathcal{D}^c)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{M_n(\mathcal{D}^c)^\psi}{M_n(\mathcal{D})} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

which implies $M_n(\mathcal{D}^c)/n^\psi \xrightarrow{a.s.} \infty$ for $\psi < \bar{w}^c/\bar{w}$ and $M_n(\mathcal{D}^c)/n^\psi \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ for $\psi > \bar{w}^c/\bar{w}$. In turn, $\log \frac{N_n(\mathcal{D}^c)}{N_n(\mathcal{D})^{\bar{w}^c/\bar{w}}}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. in $[-\infty, \infty)$, so there exists a random variable $\xi \in [0, \infty)$ such that

$$n^\gamma \cdot \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c) = \frac{M_n(\mathcal{D}^c)}{N_n(\mathcal{D}^c)} \left(\frac{N_n}{n} \frac{N_n(\mathcal{D}^c)^{\bar{w}/\bar{w}^c}}{N_n(\mathcal{D}) + N_n(\mathcal{D}^c)} \right)^{\bar{w}^c/\bar{w}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \xi \quad \text{and} \quad n^\gamma \cdot P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \frac{\bar{w}^c}{\bar{w}} \xi.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2. By Theorem 3.3, $P_n(\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$, so we can proceed as in Theorem 3.3 to derive results for the subsequence of dominant observations. Let us define $T_0 = 0$ and, for $n \geq 1$

$$T_n = \inf\{n > T_{n-1} : X_n \in \mathcal{D}\}, \quad P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = \frac{P_n(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D})}{P_n(\mathcal{D})}, \quad \hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = \frac{\hat{P}_n(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D})}{\hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D})}.$$

Put $m_n = M_n(\mathcal{D}) - 1$ and $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(X_{T_1}, U_{T_1}, \dots, X_{T_{m_n}}, U_{T_{m_n}})$, $n \geq 1$. With a slight abuse of notation, $(X_{T_{m_n}})_{n \geq 1}$ forms a subsequence of dominant observations,

$$P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D}) = \frac{\theta\nu(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} W_{T_k} \delta_{X_{T_k}}(\cdot)}{\theta\nu(\mathcal{D}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} W_{T_k}} \quad (5.10)$$

is the conditional distribution of $X_{T_{m_n+1}}$ given \mathcal{G}_n (see the proof of Theorem 3.3), and $\hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ the relative frequency, which is well-defined for large n . In addition,

$$P_n(A | \mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{P}(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n(A | \mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{P}(A).$$

Observe that $P_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ and $\hat{P}_n(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$ remain unchanged unless $m_n > m_{n-1}$. Then we can prove that

$$\sqrt{m_n}(\hat{P}_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - P_n(A | \mathcal{D})) \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{m_n}(P_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) \quad (5.11)$$

converge to Gaussian limits by applying [5, Theorem 1] and [5, Proposition 1], respectively. In fact, one can easily show that (5.11) satisfy the assumptions of [5, Theorem 1, Proposition 1] using similar techniques to the ones in [4, Theorem 4] and [5, Corollary 3]. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{m_n}(\hat{P}_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - P_n(A | \mathcal{D})) &\xrightarrow{stably} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A)), \\ \sqrt{m_n}(P_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) &\xrightarrow{a.s. cond.} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A)) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{G}. \end{aligned}$$

But $M_n(\mathcal{D})/n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$, so, by a generalized Slutsky's theorem (see also [14, Theorem 6]),

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - P_n(A | \mathcal{D})) &\xrightarrow{stably} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A)), \\ \sqrt{n}(P_n(A | \mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) &\xrightarrow{a.s. cond.} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A)) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{G}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from $\hat{P}_n(A|\mathcal{D}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \tilde{P}(A)$ that the limit $\tilde{P}(A)$ is $\sigma(X_{T_{m_1}}, X_{T_{m_2}}, \dots)$ -measurable. Moreover, using the independence of $(U_n)_{n \geq 1}$, we can show that $(X_{T_{m_{n+1}}}, X_{T_{m_{n+2}}}, \dots)$ and \mathcal{F}_n are conditionally independent given \mathcal{G}_n . Combining both results, we get

$$\sqrt{n}(P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - \tilde{P}(A)) \xrightarrow{a.s.cond.} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A)) \quad \text{w.r.t. } \mathcal{F}.$$

On the other hand, [Proposition 3.2](#) implies that

$$|\sqrt{n}(P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - D_n(A))| = \sqrt{n}|P_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - P_n(A)| \leq 2\sqrt{n} \cdot P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Then, using again the generalized Slutsky's theorem, $D_n(A) \xrightarrow{a.s.cond.} \mathcal{N}(0, V(A))$ w.r.t. \mathcal{F} .

Regarding the second result, we have

$$|\sqrt{n}(\hat{P}_n(A|\mathcal{D}) - P_n(A|\mathcal{D})) - C_n(A)| \leq 2\sqrt{n} \cdot P_n(\mathcal{D}^c) + 2\sqrt{n} \cdot \hat{P}_n(\mathcal{D}^c) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0;$$

therefore, $C_n(A) \xrightarrow{stably} \mathcal{N}(0, U(A))$. □

References

- [1] D. J. Aldous. Exchangeability and related topics. *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII 1983*, 1117:1–198, 1985.
- [2] G. Aletti, C. May, and P. Secchi. A central limit theorem, and related results, for a two-color randomly reinforced urn. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 41(3):829–844, 2009.
- [3] F. Bassetti, I. Crimaldi, and F. Leisen. Conditionally identically distributed species sampling sequences. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 42(2):433–459, 2010.
- [4] P. Berti, I. Crimaldi, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Central limit theorems for multicolor urns with dominated colors. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 120(8):1473–1491, 2010.
- [5] P. Berti, I. Crimaldi, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. A central limit theorem and its applications to multicolor randomly reinforced urns. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 48(2):527–546, 2011.
- [6] P. Berti, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Limit theorems for a class of identically distributed random variables. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(3):2029–2052, 2004.
- [7] D. Blackwell and L. Dubins. Merging of opinions with increasing information. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 33(3):882–886, 1962.
- [8] D. Blackwell and J. B. MacQueen. Ferguson distributions via Pólya urn schemes. *Ann. Stat.*, 1(2):353–355, 1973.

- [9] F. Caron and E. B. Fox. Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures. *J. Royal Stat. Soc., Series B*, 79(5):1295–1366, 2017.
- [10] L. H. Y. Chen. A short note on the conditional Borel-Cantelli lemma. *Ann. Probab.*, 6(4):699–700, 1978.
- [11] I. Crimaldi. An almost sure conditional convergence result and an application to a generalized Pólya urn. *Int. Math. Forum*, 4(23):1139–1156, 2009.
- [12] L. Dubins and D. Freedman. A sharper form of the Borel-Cantelli lemma and the strong law. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 36(3):800–807, 1965.
- [13] S. Fortini and S. Petrone. Predictive construction of priors in Bayesian nonparametrics. *Braz. J. Probab. Stat.*, 26(4):423–449, 2012.
- [14] S. Fortini and S. Petrone. Quasi-Bayes properties of a procedure for sequential learning in mixture models. *J. Royal Stat. Soc., Series B*, 82(4):1087–1114, 2020.
- [15] S. Fortini, S. Petrone, and P. Sporysheva. On a notion of partially conditionally identically distributed sequences. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 128(3):819–846, 2018.
- [16] S. Ghosal and A. van der Vaart. *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2017.
- [17] B. Hansen and J. Pitman. Prediction rules for exchangeable sequences related to species sampling. *Stat. Probab. Letters*, 46(3):251–256, 2000.
- [18] E. Häusler and H. Luschgy. *Stable Convergence and Stable Limit Theorems*. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2015.
- [19] O. Kallenberg. Spreading and predictable sampling in exchangeable sequences and processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 16(2):508–534, 1988.
- [20] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach Spaces*. Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [21] C. May and N. Flournoy. Asymptotics in response-adaptive designs generated by a two-color, randomly reinforced urn. *Ann. Stat.*, 37(2):1058–1078, 2009.
- [22] P. Muliere, A. M. Paganoni, and P. Secchi. A randomly reinforced urn. *J. Stat. Plann. Inference*, 136(6):1853–1874, 2006.
- [23] R. Pemantle and S. Volkov. Vertex-reinforced random walk on \mathbb{Z} has finite range. *Ann. Probab.*, 27(3):1368–1388, 1999.
- [24] J. Pitman. Some developments of the Blackwell-MacQueen urn scheme. In *LNM*, volume 30, pages 245–267. IMS, Hayward, CA, 1996.

- [25] W. F. Rosenberger and J. Lachin. *Randomization in Clinical Trials*. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2 edition, 2016.
- [26] L.-X. Zhang, F. Hu, S. H. Cheung, and W. S. Chan. Asymptotic properties of multicolor randomly reinforced Pólya urns. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 46(2):585–602, 2014.