

# Convergence Rate of Multiple-try Metropolis Independent sampler

Xiaodong Yang<sup>†</sup> and Jun S. Liu<sup>\*‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup>School of Gifted Young, University of Science and Technology of China

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Statistics, Harvard University

August 2021

## Abstract

The Multiple-try Metropolis (MTM) method is an interesting extension of the classical Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. However, theoretical understandings of its convergence behavior as well as whether and how it may help are still unknown. This paper derives the exact convergence rate for *Multiple-try Metropolis Independent sampler* (MTM-IS) via an explicit eigen analysis. As a by-product, we prove that MTM-IS is less efficient than the simpler approach of repeated independent Metropolis-Hastings method at the same computational cost. We further explore more variations and find it possible to design more efficient MTM algorithms by creating correlated multiple trials.

**Keywords:** convergence rate, eigenvalues, Markov chain, Monte Carlo, transition function.

---

\*This paper was done while Xiaodong Yang was working as a remote summer undergraduate intern at Jun Liu's lab at Harvard in the summer of 2021.

# 1 Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods have played an important role in statistical computing and Bayesian inference and have attracted much attention from both theoretical researchers and practitioners. In a nutshell, the set of methods provide general and practical recipes for generating random draws from any given target probability distribution known up to a normalizing constant. Specifically, these algorithms generate a time-homogeneous Markov chain with its stationary distribution being the target one. Under mild assumptions, this chain converges to the target distribution geometrically (Roberts and Tweedie, 1996; Liu et al., 1995). See Liu (2008) and Brooks et al. (2011) for a more complete overview. The scheme first proposed by Metropolis et al. (1953) and then generalized by Hastings (1970) is arguably the most popular and fundamental construction among all MCMC methods. Let  $\pi(\cdot)$  denote the target probability distribution/density function (p.d.f.) on the state space  $\mathcal{X}$ . The *Metropolis-Hastings* (MH) method constructs a Markov chain  $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}, \dots$ , on  $\mathcal{X}$  as follows. At step  $t + 1$ , it proposes a new position  $y$  from a user-given transition function  $T(x, y)$ , i.e.,  $y \sim T(x^{(t)}, \cdot)$ . Then, the proposal is accepted with probability

$$p_a = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)T(y; x^{(t)})}{\pi(x)T(x^{(t)}; y)} \right\}.$$

That is, the next state  $x^{(t+1)}$  is equal to  $y$  with probability  $p_a$  and is equal to  $x^{(t)}$  with  $1 - p_a$ . This special design ensures that the generated Markov chain is reversible with respect to  $\pi$  and satisfies detailed balance, which guarantees valid convergence under mild conditions (Liu, 2008).

## 1.1 Geometric convergence

A Markov chain with transition function  $A$  is said to be geometrically ergodic if the following inequality holds for  $\pi$ -almost everywhere  $x$ :

$$\|A^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \leq C(x)r^n,$$

where  $r$  is a constant between 0 and 1, and  $\|\cdot\|$  is some distance metric between two probability measures, usually taken as the total variation (TV) distance. Establishing

such formulae and deriving sharp bounds on the rate  $r$  serve as a central task in studying MCMC algorithms (Tierney, 1994; Liu et al., 1995; Roberts and Tweedie, 1996). Other modes of convergence, such as convergence in  $\chi^2$ -distance (which implies the convergence in total variation), have also been investigated (Liu et al., 1995; Liu, 2008)

As a generalization of the standard MH algorithm, the *Multiple-try Metropolis* (MTM) scheme as formalized in Liu et al. (2000) allows one to draw multiple trials at each step and select one according to a specially designed probability distribution. Although intuitively the MTM scheme enables one to escape from local optimums more easily, there is little theoretical understanding of the convergence rate of any form of the MTM algorithm, making it a challenging practical concern when deciding whether an MTM approach should be employed for a specific problem. Existing theoretical results on the MH algorithm clearly cannot be easily extended to the MTM. Indeed, getting sharp bounds on the convergence rate of any general-purpose MH algorithm can be extremely challenging, except for the *Independence Metropolis-Hastings* (IMH) algorithm (also called the Metropolised independence sampler by Liu (1996) and the independence Metropolis chain by Tierney (1994)). We are therefore tempted to consider whether IMH’s multiple-try version, which we call the *Multiple-Try Metropolised independent Sampler* (MTM-IS), can be tackled theoretically.

## 1.2 Convergence rate of IMH

Geometrical ergodicity is not guaranteed for a general MH algorithm unless we impose suitable restrictions (Roberts and Tweedie, 1996), and exact convergence rates for MH algorithms are rare to find Diaconis and Saloff-Coste (1998). In practice, geometric ergodicity is often established under the ‘drift-and-minorization’ framework (Diaconis et al., 2008). But this technique usually results in a very conservative bound of the convergence rate, not quite practically useful. Because of the very special structure of the IMH algorithm, explicit eigen-analyses of its transition matrix for the finite-discrete state space case were obtained by Liu (1996), which results in the exact convergence rate of IMH in the discrete state space (and also a very tight bound on the constant in front of the rate) and offers a comparison with classical rejection sampling and importance sampling. Atchadé and Perron (2007) studies the continuous case by determining the full spectrum of the transition operator of IMH. A recent preprint of Wang (2020) combines previous results

and provides a lower bound, hence determining the exact convergence rate. In this paper, we impose similar conditions on MTM-IS and study its exact convergence rate.

### 1.3 MTM and its variants

The original idea of MTM comes from chemical physicists interested in molecular simulations. Its general formulation constructed in Liu et al. (2000) inspires the development of Ensemble MCMC methods by Neal (2011), connects with particle filtering (Martino et al., 2014), and stimulates ideas of parallelizing MCMC (Calderhead, 2014; Yang et al., 2018). We refer interested readers to a review Martino (2018). Intuitively, the MTM approach enables one to explore the sample space more broadly, and thus potentially gains efficiency in avoiding being trapped in local models. The method has been incorporated in some applications such as model selection (Pandolfi et al., 2010) and Bayes factor estimation (Dai and Liu, 2020). Several variants of MTM are worth mentioning: Craiu and Lemieux (2007) propose to use correlated trials to accelerate MTM and introduces antithetic and stratified sampling to bring correlation; Casarin et al. (2013) argue that multiple independent trials from different distributions are worth considering, and connect to interactive sampling algorithms. Theoretically, Bédard et al. (2012) conducts a scaling analysis for MTM. However, to the best of our knowledge, we could not find any existing result on convergence rate analysis of an MTM algorithm.

In this paper, we study the exact convergence rate of MTM-IS for general target  $\pi(\cdot)$  and proposal  $p(\cdot)$ . The result is somewhat surprising as it shows that the MTM-IS algorithm with  $m$  multiple tries is not as efficient as simply repeating the standard IMH algorithm  $m$  times, thus suggesting that the multiple-tries idea may only bring benefits if the  $m$  multiple proposals are mutually (negatively) correlated. The rest of this paper is organized as: Section 2 carries out an eigenvalue analysis; Section 3 offers an inequality which compares MTM-IS with the repeated IMH; Section 4 shows some discussions on several variants and extensions of MTM; and Section 5 gives concluding remarks of this paper.

## 2 Eigen-analysis of MTM-IS

### 2.1 Notations

Throughout this paper, we use  $\mathcal{X}$  to denote the state space, which can be either discrete or continuous. Let  $\pi(\cdot)$  stand for the target distribution and let  $T(x; \cdot)$  denote the proposal distribution (if we omit  $x$  and write  $T(\cdot)$ , this means that the proposal distribution is invariant of the current state).  $A(x; y)$  is the *actual* transition function/probability/density from the current state  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  to a new state  $y$  of the MCMC algorithm. We let  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$  denote the collection of multiple trials of size  $k$ . We consider the total variation distance for any two (signed) measures  $P$  and  $Q$ , which is defined and denoted as  $\|P - Q\| = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{F}} |P(A) - Q(A)|$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  denotes the  $\sigma$ -field common to  $P$  and  $Q$  (e.g., the Borel  $\sigma$ -field for most common uses). In Section 4, we slightly abuse the notation by letting  $T(x; \mathbf{y})$  be the proposal distribution for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k) \in \mathcal{X}^k$ , as we would consider multiple *correlated* trials in this section. Besides, we write  $T(x; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} \mid y_j)$  as the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{y}_{(-j)} \equiv (y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k)$  given  $y_j$  and  $x$ . Lastly,  $T_j(x; y_j) = \int T(x; \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}_{-j}$  denotes the conditional marginal distribution of  $y_j$  given  $x$ .

### 2.2 Description of the algorithms

The general framework of *Multiple-try Metropolis* (MTM) as formulated in Liu et al. (2000) is summarized in Algorithm 1. Let the current state be  $x$ , and let the number of multiple tries be  $k$ . With a proposal transition function  $p(x, y)$  that defines the conditional distribution of  $y$ , we define the *generalized importance weight* as

$$w(y, x) = \frac{\pi(y)}{T(x, y)} \lambda(x, y) \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a symmetric nonnegative function (i.e.,  $\lambda(x, y) = \lambda(y, x) \geq 0, \forall x, y$ ).

In this algorithm,  $x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{k-1}^*$  are called *balancing trials*, which are drawn to guarantee detailed balance (Liu et al., 2000). If we choose  $T(x; y) = T(y)$ , however, we can modify this algorithm to avoid drawing additional balancing trials as the algorithm is still valid if we simply replace the  $x_j^*$  by  $y_j$  in (2.2). This modified version is summarized in Algorithm 2 and named the *Multiple-try Metropolis Independent sampler* (MTM-IS). To emphasize the role of  $k$ , we also denote the method as MTM-IS( $k$ ). In this case, we

---

**Algorithm 1** Multiple-try Metropolis (General): the current state is  $x$ .

---

1. Draw multiple trials  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  independently from  $T(x; \cdot)$ ; compute  $w(y_j, x)$  as defined in (2.1) for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .
2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w(y_j, x)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .
3. Draw  $x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{k-1}^*$  independently from  $T(y; \cdot)$ . And set  $x_k^* = x$ .
4. Accept  $y$  with the following ratio

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\sum_j w(y_j, x)}{\sum_j w(x_j^*, y)} \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

---

further select  $\lambda(x, y) \equiv 1$  then the generalized importance weight (2.1) turns out to be  $w(y, x) = \pi(y)/T(y)$ , coinciding with the standard notation of importance ratio. In order to simplify the notations, we could write

$$w(y) = \pi(y)/T(y). \quad (2.3)$$

---

**Algorithm 2** Multiple-try Metropolis Independent sampler: the current state is  $x$ .

---

1. Draw multiple trials  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  independently from  $T(\cdot)$ ; compute  $w(y_j)$  as defined in (2.3) for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .
2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w(y_j)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .
3. Compute  $W = \sum_{j=1}^k w(y_j)$
4. Accept  $y$  with the following ratio

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{W}{W - w(y) + w(x)} \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

---

In theory, we assume that  $\pi$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $T$ , so that this importance weight can be interpreted as the Radon-Nikodym derivative. In practice, one should always choose  $T$  so that its support covers that of  $\pi$  for the algorithm to work well. The main result of this section is stated in Theorem 2.2, which can be viewed as a generalization of the results in Liu (1996) and Atchadé and Perron (2007) and provides the exact convergence rate of MTM-IS( $k$ ).

### 2.3 Transition distribution decomposition

**Theorem 2.1** The transition distribution of MTM-IS( $k$ ) can be decomposed as

$$A(x, dy) = R(x)\delta_x(dy) + \min\{H_k[w(x)], H_k[w(y)]\}\pi(y)dy, \quad (2.5)$$

where  $R : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  denotes the rejection probability and  $H_k$  is defined as

$$H_k(z) = k \underbrace{\int \cdots \int}_{k-1} \frac{1}{z + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(y_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T(y_i) dy_i, \quad (2.6)$$

which is a strictly decreasing function in  $z$ . Note that  $H_1(z) = z^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \notin B \subset \mathcal{X}$  be measurable, the probability of proposing an element in  $B$  and accepting it is

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, B) &= \mathbb{P} \left[ \bigcup_{j=1}^k \{(y_j \in B) \cap (J = j)\} \right] \\ &= k \mathbb{P} [\{(y_k \in B) \cap (J = k)\}] \\ &= k \underbrace{\int \cdots \int}_{k-1} \int_B T(y) dy \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} T(y_j) dy_j \frac{w(y)}{w(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)} \min \left[ 1, \frac{w(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)}{w(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)} \right] \\ &= k \underbrace{\int \cdots \int}_{k-1} \int_B T(y) dy \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} T(y_j) dy_j \min \left[ \frac{w(y)}{w(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)}, \frac{w(y)}{w(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)} \right] \\ &= \int_B \min \{H_k[w(x)], H_k[w(y)]\} \pi(y) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where  $H_k$  is as defined in (2.6). Then, the overall rejection probability is

$$R(x) = 1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} \min \{H_k[w(x)], H_k[w(y)]\} \pi(y) dy, \quad (2.7)$$

and the prescribed decomposition (2.5) is thus proved.  $\square$

Let  $w^* \triangleq \inf\{u > 0 : \pi(x : w(x) \leq u) = 1\}$  be the *essential supremum* of  $w(x)$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  w.r.t.  $\pi(\cdot)$  (i.e.,  $w^*$  is the smallest value such that  $w(x) \leq w^*$  with  $\pi$ -probability 1). Since

$H_k(w)$  is a monotone decreasing function of  $w$  (Theorem 2.1), we have an upper bound  $R(x) \leq 1 - H_k(w^*)$ . Furthermore, since

$$A(x, dy) = R(x)\delta_x(dy) + \min\{H_k[w(x)], H_k[w(y)]\}\pi(y)dy \geq H_k(w^*)\pi(y)dy.$$

We have the following mixture formulation for the transition function, convenient for comparing with  $\pi$ :

$$A(x, dy) = H(w^*)\pi(y)dy + [1 - H(w^*)]q_{\text{res}}(x, dy), \quad (2.8)$$

where  $q_{\text{res}}(x, B) := \frac{A(x, B) - H(w^*)\pi(B)}{1 - H(w^*)}$ . This representation can be used to do a coupling argument to prove the geometric convergence of the Markov chain (more details in Section 3).

## 2.4 Spectrum of the transition operator

Now we provide the result to fully characterize the spectrum of the transition operator induced by the MTM-IS( $k$ ) algorithm. A similar result was derived for the IMH algorithm by Liu (1996) for the discrete state-space case, and then by Atchadé and Perron (2007) in general. To be concrete, we introduce the following definitions.

**Definition 2.1** Let  $A(x, y)$  be the transition function of a Markov chain with  $\pi$  as its invariant distribution. We define its transition operator  $K : L^2(\pi) \rightarrow L^2(\pi)$  as

$$Kf(x) = \int f(y)A(x, y)dy. \quad (2.9)$$

It is called the forward operator in Liu et al. (1995) and computes the conditional mean.

**Definition 2.2** Let  $K_0$  be the restriction of  $K$  onto  $L_0^2(\pi)$ , the orthogonal complement of the constant function of  $L^2(\pi)$ . Then the *spectrum* of  $K_0$  is

$$\sigma(K_0) \triangleq \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : K_0 - \lambda I \text{ is non-invertible}\}. \quad (2.10)$$

The *essential range* of a function  $R$  is

$$\text{ess-ran}(R) \triangleq \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \pi(x : |R(x) - \lambda| < \epsilon) > 0, \forall \epsilon > 0\}.$$



**Theorem 2.2** Let  $K$  be the transition operator defined by the MTM-IS( $k$ ) algorithm, and let  $K_0$  be similarly defined as in Definition 2.1. Then,  $\sigma(K_0) \subseteq \text{ess-ran}(R)$ , where  $R$  is the function of rejection probability (2.7) defined on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The equality holds if  $\forall \alpha \in \text{ess-ran}(R)$ ,  $\pi\{y : R(y) = \alpha\} = 0$ .

Since the proof is mostly technical, we defer it to the Appendix. From (2.7) and Theorem 2.1, it is obvious to see that an upper bound of  $R(x)$  is  $1 - H_k(w^*)$ . This implies that there is a gap between 1 and the upper edge  $1 - H(w^*)$  of the spectrum  $\sigma(K_0)$ , provided that  $w^* < \infty$ . As observed in Liu (1996) in the study of IMH in the discrete state-space case, in which case  $H(w^*) = 1/w^*$ ,  $1 - H(w^*)$  should be the convergence rate of the Markov chain.

### 3 Convergence Rate and Algorithmic Comparison

#### 3.1 Convergence in $\chi^2$ -distance

The  $\chi^2$ -distance between two probability distribution is defined as

$$d_\chi^2(\pi, q) = \text{var}_\pi[q(x)/\pi(x)]. \quad (3.1)$$

Let  $p_n(x) = A_n(x_0, x)$ , denoting the distribution of the Markov chain after  $n$  steps, i.e.,  $X_n$ . It was shown in Liu et al. (1995) that

$$d_\chi(\pi, p_n) \leq |K_0^n| d_\chi(\pi, p_0).$$

It is easy to show that (Liu et al., 1995)

$$\rho = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |K_0^n|^{1/n} \quad (3.2)$$

is the spectral radius of  $K_0$  (Liu et al., 1995), which is equal to the maximum of  $\sigma(K_0)$  in absolute value. As shown in Theorem 2.2, this is bounded by  $1 - H(w^*)$ . Thus,  $d_\chi(\pi, p_n) \leq (1 - H(w^*))^n d_\chi(\pi, p_0)$ . It also follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} |p_n - \pi|_{L_1} &= \int \frac{|p_n(x) - \pi(x)|}{\sqrt{\pi(x)}} \sqrt{\pi(x)} dx \\ &\leq \left[ \int \frac{(p_n(x) - \pi(x))^2}{\pi(x)} dx \right]^{1/2} \left[ \int \pi(x) dx \right]^{1/2} \\ &= d_\chi(\pi, p_n) \leq (1 - H(w^*))^n d_\chi(\pi, p_0). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the  $L_1$  distance between  $p_n$  and the target also decreases geometrically bounded by the same rate.

## 3.2 Maximal variation distance

**Definition 3.1** Following the terminologies in Wang (2020), we let the transition function of a Markov chain be  $A(\cdot; \cdot)$ , with the corresponding stationary distribution  $\pi(\cdot)$ . The *maximal variation distance* between the Markov chain's  $n$ -step distribution and  $\pi$  is

$$d(n) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|A^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\|. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, the quantity

$$r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \quad (3.4)$$

is called the *exact convergence rate* of the Markov chain.

Since the variation distance is equivalent to the  $L_1$  distance between two probability measures, it is easy to see that rate  $r$  here must be equal to  $\rho$  defined in (3.2). The following result improves the one in Section 3.1 for getting rid of the influence of the initial state  $x_0$ . Before proceeding to our main result, we need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1 (Coupling)** (Levin and Peres, 2017) Suppose  $(\Psi_t, \tilde{\Psi}_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$  are a pair of Markov chains with the same transition rule satisfying: (i) If  $\Psi_i = \tilde{\Psi}_i$  for some  $i$ , then for any  $j \geq i$ ,  $\Psi_j = \tilde{\Psi}_j$ ; and (ii)  $\tilde{\Psi}_0 \sim \pi$ . Then, for  $\tau = \min\{n : \Psi_n = \tilde{\Psi}_n\}$ , we have a bound

$$\|A^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq n).$$

**Lemma 3.2 (Lower bound)** (Wang, 2020) Let  $R(x)$  denote the rejection probability (2.7) given current state  $x$  for an IMH algorithm. That is,

$$R(x) = 1 - \int \min\{H[w(x)], H[w(y)]\} \pi(y) dy.$$

Then, we have a lower bound

$$\|A^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \geq [R(x)]^n.$$

**Theorem 3.1** Consider the MTM-IS( $k$ ) algorithm as defined in Algorithm 2 and let  $w^* < \infty$  be the essential supremum of  $w(x) = \pi(x)/T(x)$ . Then, the maximal variation distance of the algorithm to its target distribution  $\pi$  is

$$d(n) = [1 - H_k(w^*)]^n.$$

Thus, the exact convergence rate of MTM-IS( $k$ ) is  $1 - H_k(w^*)$ .

*Proof.* We will establish that upper and lower bounds of  $d(n)$  are equal in the limit.

**Upper Bound.** An upper bound can be obtained by using the coupling idea of Lemma 3.1. Consider two Markov chains  $\{x_t\}$  and  $\{\tilde{x}_t\}$  defined by MTM-IS. Given the decomposition (2.8), we define the following coupling rule for the two chains. Suppose at time  $t$  with the current states of the two chains are  $x_t$  and  $\tilde{x}_t$ , respectively. If  $x_t = \tilde{x}_t$ , then their sample  $x_{t+1}$  from  $A(x_t, \cdot)$  and set  $\tilde{x}_{t+1} = x_{t+1}$ . Thus, their future paths coalesce into one. If Flip a coin with head prob  $H(w^*)$ . If  $x_t \neq \tilde{x}_t$ , then we toss a coin with head probability  $H(w^*)$ , draw  $x \sim \pi(\cdot)$ , add set  $x_{t+1} = \tilde{x}_{t+1} = x$  if the coin shows head. Otherwise, we sample  $x_{t+1} \sim q_{\text{res}}(x, \cdot)$  and  $\tilde{x}_{t+1} \sim q_{\text{res}}(x', \cdot)$ , independently. Applying Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\|A^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \leq \mathbb{P}(\tau \geq n) \leq [1 - H(w^*)]^n. \quad (3.5)$$

Taking the supremum over  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $d(n) \leq [1 - H(w^*)]^n$ .

**Lower Bound:** For the lower bound, it is essential to consider the worst case as demonstrated in Wang (2020)'s proof of Lemma 3.2. In particular, if we can find some  $x^*$  such that  $w(x^*) = w^*$ , then the proof is over; but sometimes we can't achieve that. The last step is to further employ the continuity of  $H_k$ . For  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  such that  $H(w) < H(w^*) + \epsilon$  once  $w^* - \delta < w \leq w^*$ . By the definition of essential supremum, we can always find some  $x_\delta$  such that  $w^* - \delta < w(x_\delta) \leq w^*$ , thus

$$d(n) \geq \|A^n(x_\delta, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \geq R(x_\delta)^n \geq [1 - H(w^*) - \epsilon]^n,$$

since we know from (2.7) that

$$R(x_\delta) \geq 1 - \int_{\mathcal{X}} H_k[w(x_\delta)]\pi(dy) \geq 1 - H(w^*) - \epsilon.$$

Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we derive the final result. □

### 3.3 Comparison with the IMH sampler

Since one iteration of MTM-IS( $k$ ) is computationally as expensive as  $k$ -iterations of the IMH algorithm, denoted as  $\text{IMH}^k$ , we are interested in knowing which one is more efficient, i.e., which one has a better convergence rate. Previously, we obtain the exact convergence rate of MTM-IS( $k$ ) as  $1 - H_k(w^*)$ . We rewrite (2.6) as an expectation form to gain some insights:

$$H_k(z) = k \underbrace{\int \cdots \int}_{k-1} \frac{1}{z + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(y_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} T(y_i) dy_i = \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \frac{k}{z + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right],$$

where  $X_1, \dots, X_{k-1}$  are independent samples from  $T(\cdot)$ .

Setting  $k = 1$ , the formula reduces to  $H_1(z) = z^{-1}$ , which gives rise to the exact convergence rate  $1 - 1/w^*$  of IMH as shown in Liu (1996) and Atchadé and Perron (2007). The convergence rate of  $\text{IMH}^k$  (i.e., every  $k$  repeats of IMH is counted as one step) is then exactly  $(1 - 1/w^*)^k$ . We have the following main result.

**Theorem 3.2** With the same notations as in Theorem 3.1, we have

$$1 - H_k(w^*) = 1 - \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \frac{k}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w^*} \right)^k \quad (3.6)$$

for any  $k \geq 1$ , where all  $X_i$ 's are taken independently from  $T(\cdot)$ . Thus, MTM-IS( $k$ ) is **less efficient** than  $\text{IMH}^k$ .

This theorem provides the first theoretical guidance on the use of MTM methods. It implies that even in a rather efficient MTM-IS framework (it is more efficient than a general MTM as no balancing proposals are needed) independent multiple proposals are not helpful in improving the IMH algorithm. We speculate that  $k$  independent multiple proposals in a general MTM( $k$ ) framework are also not more efficient than the corresponding  $k$ -step MCMC algorithm. It therefore casts a large doubt on the utility of MTM. Our numerical experiences in the past suggest that the MTM strategy is most helpful in help jumping among multiple modes of the target distribution (Liu et al., 2000; Dai and Liu, 2020). More general correlated multiple proposals may also help (Craiu and Lemieux, 2007).




Figure 1: Convergence rates for a monotone discrete target distribution.

### 3.4 Numerical illustrations

We show some numerical examples to illustrate the discrepancy between convergence rates of  $\text{MTM-IS}(k)$  and  $\text{IMH}^k$ . If the proposal  $T$  is already very close to  $\pi$ , then  $\text{IMH}^k$  should be significantly better than  $\text{MTM-IS}(k)$  since  $w^*$  would have been reasonably small. Their performance difference should become less conspicuous if  $w^*$  itself is large. Here we provide three numerical illustrations. The explicit formula of  $\text{MTM-IS}(k)$ 's convergence rate is still complicated, so we use independent Monte Carlo samples to approximate the expectation in (3.6). Previously, Liu (1996) used Examples 1 and 2 to compare IMH with importance sampling and rejection sampling.

**Example 1.** Let the state space be  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $T(i) = 1/m$  and  $\pi(i) = (2m + 1 - 2i)/m^2$ ,  $p(i) = 1/m$ . In this case,  $w^* = 2 - 1/m$  is close to 2, leading to an approximate convergence rate 0.5 for IMH. Figure 1 displays the convergence rates of  $\text{MTM-IS}(k)$  and  $\text{IMH}^k$  with  $m = 1000$  and  $k$  ranging from 1 to 10 computed from 50000 independent uniform Monte Carlo samples.

**Example 2.** We consider the case where the target distribution is binomial  $\text{Bin}(m, \theta)$ , and  $T(x) = 1/(m + 1)$  is uniform. Then

$$w(x) = (m + 1) \frac{m!}{x!(m - x)!} \theta^x (1 - \theta)^{m - x}.$$

Using the standard normal approximation, we find that

$$w^* \approx \sqrt{\frac{m}{2\pi\theta(1-\theta)}}.$$

Figure 2 is computed from 50000 independent uniform Monte Carlo samples with  $m = 100$  for two  $\theta$  values. We that in the latter case when the distribution is very skewed, the discrepancy between  $\text{MTM-IS}(k)$  and  $\text{IMH}^k$  is much smaller.




Figure 2: Numerical evaluations of convergence rates for a binomial target distribution with (a)  $\theta = 0.5$ , and (b)  $\theta = 0.05$ .

**Example 3.** Here we investigate a one-dimensional continuous case with the standard normal target distribution,  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . The proposal distribution is a scaled t-distribution with 10 degrees of freedom,  $T(x) = ct_{10}(cx)$  with  $cgeq1$ . A larger  $c$  makes the proposal distribution flatter. For practical uses of both importance sampling and IMH-type algorithms, we strongly recommend to choose a proposal distribution that has a heavier than the target. In our case, however, a larger  $c$  leads to a larger discrepancy between the target and proposal distributions. Figure 3 is computed based on 50000 independent Monte Carlo samples with respect to (a)  $c = 2$  (b)  $c = 20$ .

## 4 Variants of MTM

Over the past few years, several variants of MTM have been proposed. We will first propose a general framework to combine them, and then give a condition on whether




Figure 3: Numerical evaluations of convergence rates for a Normal target distribution with sampling distribution  $T(x)$  being a scaled t-distribution  $ct_{10}(cx)$ . (a)  $c = 2$ , (b)  $c = 20$ .

drawing balancing proposals or not. We then dive into some specific variants for which theoretical observations are available.

## 4.1 A general framework

We are inspired from two main variants of MTM: multiple correlated trips (Craiu and Lemieux, 2007) and independent non-identically distributed multiple trials (Casarin et al., 2013). A general framework to combine these two variants is as follows. With  $\pi(\cdot)$  as the target distribution on  $\mathcal{X}$ , we denote  $T(x; \mathbf{y})$  as the transition function (a distribution function of  $\mathbf{y}$  conditional on  $x$ ) for multiple correlated proposals for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k) \in \mathcal{X}^k$ . Set the *generalized importance weight* for each component as

$$w_j(y, x) = \frac{\pi(y)}{T_j(x; y)} \lambda_j(x, y) \quad (4.1)$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ , where  $\lambda_j$  is a symmetric function and  $T_j(x; \cdot) = \int T(x; \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}_{(-j)}$  is the  $j$ -th marginal of  $T(x; \mathbf{y})$ . Assuming the current state is  $x$ , the updating rule is summarized in Algorithm 3.

If we require  $T(x; \mathbf{y})$  to have the same marginals for different  $y_j$ 's, the algorithm reduces to Craiu and Lemieux (2007); if we require  $T(x; \mathbf{y})$  to be independent among the  $y_j$ 's, it reduces to Casarin et al. (2013). Note that the balancing proposals are drawn to facilitate

---

**Algorithm 3** Generalized MTM. Suppose current state is at  $x$ .

---

1. Draw multiple trials  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  jointly from  $T(x; \dots)$ . Then compute  $w_j(y_j, x)$  by (4.1) for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .
2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w_j(y_j, x)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .
3. Draw  $x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{J-1}^*, x_{J+1}^*, \dots, x_k^*$  from the conditional distribution of  $T(y; \dots)$  conditioned on  $J$ -th variable as  $x$ . And set  $x_J^* = x$ .
4. Accept  $y$  with the following ratio

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{w_J(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq J} w_i(y_i, x)}{w_J(x, y) + \sum_{i \neq J} w_i(x_i^*, y)} \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$


---

the computation of (4.2), and this guarantees the detailed balance of the MTM design. The following result is expected and its detailed proof is deferred to the Appendix.

**Theorem 4.1** The Generalized MTM transition rule (Algorithm 3) satisfies the detailed balance condition and hence induces a reversible Markov chain with  $\pi$  as its invariant distribution.

Defining  $\mathbf{x}^*(j) \triangleq (x_1^*, \dots, x_{j-1}^*, x, x_{j+1}^*, x_k^*)$ , one can determine the transition density of the generalized MTM framework via brute force computation:

$$A(x, y) = \pi(y) \sum_{j=1}^k \left[ T_j(x, y) T_j(y, x) \lambda_j(x, y) \times \int u_j(\mathbf{x}^*(j), \mathbf{y}) T(x; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} \mid y_j = y) T(y; \mathbf{x}_{(-j)}^* \mid x_j^* = x) \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i dx_i^* \right],$$

where we write  $u_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \min \left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^k w_i(y_i, x_j) \right)^{-1}, \left( \sum_{i=1}^k w_i(x_i, y_j) \right)^{-1} \right\}$  for any  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ . Roughly speaking, unless more conditions are imposed, we cannot provide a tight bounds for this rather complicated transition function. This is not too surprising as we are so far still unable to provide sharp bounds for the *Random-walk Metropolis-Hastings* algorithm (see conjectures in [Atchadé and Perron \(2007\)](#) and discussions in [Wang \(2020\)](#)).

Here comes a natural question: in what circumstances, the balancing trails could be avoided? We stated the following theorem to answer this question.



**Theorem 4.2** If the joint proposal distribution satisfies

$$T(x; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} \mid y_j = y) = T(y; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} \mid y_j = x) \quad (4.3)$$

for any pair  $(x, y)$  and any  $j$ , then we can still maintain detailed balance by letting  $x_j^* \triangleq y_j$  for any  $j \neq J$  in Algorithm 3.

**Remark 1:** *Correlated multiple trials.* Letting the proposed multiple trials correlated (especially negatively) could be helpful in improving the chain’s convergence. A useful strategy is to use multiple trials as stepping stones to move from one mode of the distribution to another, similar in spirit to Hamiltonian/hybrid Monte Carlo (Qin and Liu, 2001; Liu, 2008) and the griddy Gibbs MTM (Liu et al., 2000). Indeed, it was shown empirically in Qin and Liu (2001) that applying MTM to HMC trajectories may further improve the sampling efficiency. However, an in-depth theoretical analysis as carried out here is much more challenging due to the semi-deterministic nature of aforementioned algorithms.

**Remark 2:** *Different distribution for each trial.* Intuitively, one may hope that using different distributions for each trial would help us explore the whole state space better. Our result in the next Subsection 4.3 demonstrate that it is still not very useful to use different distributions in multiple trials under the IMH framework, if the trials are independent.

## 4.2 Correlated multiple trials

For correlated multiple sampling, developing rigorous theoretical results for the general case appears to be too challenging. We here describe two special cases for finite state spaces under the MTM framework. Although we only study two special cases, implications derived from them seem to apply more generally: designing good correlated multiple-tries, often with a deterministic aspect, is a most fruitful direction to pursue. Their generalizations to continuous state-spaces are also possible.

### 4.2.1 Stratified sampling

Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  is a finite state space. We partition it into a few subgroups,  $\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_B$  so that  $\mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{X}_j = \emptyset, \forall i \neq j$  and  $\cup_j \mathcal{X}_j = \mathcal{X}$ . We begin with a block wise IMH step by

sampling from  $\{\mathcal{X}_1, \dots, \mathcal{X}_B\}$  with weight  $T(\mathcal{X}_j)$  and accept it with  $w(\mathcal{X}_j) = \pi(\mathcal{X}_j)/T(\mathcal{X}_j)$  afterwards. Then draw  $y$  within the sampled block with probability proportional to  $\pi(y)$ . It is easy to see that the chain become stationary once it converges at the subgroup level. Thus, the convergence rate of this algorithm is

$$r_B = 1 - w(\mathcal{X}^*)^{-1},$$

where  $\mathcal{X}^* = \arg \max_j w(\mathcal{X}_j)$ . This is not generally better than the  $\text{IMH}^k$ , which has a convergence rate of  $(1 - 1/w^*)^k > 1 - k/w^*$ . But if the weights  $w$ 's are very uneven and we can partition the states so that the weights  $w(\mathcal{X}_j)$ 's are more balanced, then the stratified IMH can improve upon  $\text{IMH}^k$  significantly. We also note that the computation cost of this block-based MTM-IS( $k$ ) algorithm is no worse than  $\text{IMH}^2$  (the first step of block sampling is no worse than 1-step IMH; and so is the second step of sampling within a block), much better than  $\text{IMH}^k$  when  $k$  is large.

**Example 1** (continued). Let  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , and suppose that the target  $\pi(x) \propto x$  and  $T(x) \propto 1$ . Then, the original weights are  $w(x) \propto x$  and  $w^* = \frac{2N}{1+N} \approx 2$ . Let  $k = 2$ , then  $\text{IMH}^2$  has a rate of  $(1 - 1/w^*)^2 \approx 0.25$ , which is quite good. Assume that  $N$  is an even number and we partition the space as  $\mathcal{X}_j = \{j, N - j + 1\}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N/2$ . Then  $w(\mathcal{X}_j) \propto 1$ , and the resulting MTM-IS(2) converges in one step. More generally, for an arbitrary distribution  $\pi(x)$  and the uniform proposal  $T(x) = (2N)^{-1}$ , we have  $w^* = \pi(x^*)$  with  $x^* = \arg \max_x \pi(x)$ . Thus, if we can partition the state space so that  $\pi(\mathcal{X}_j)$  are approximately equal for  $j = 1, \dots, B$ , the algorithm can be much improved.

#### 4.2.2 Sampling without replacement

Another obvious way of introducing correlations for multiple proposals is to do sampling without replacement. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ . To simplify the discussion, we here focus on the simple random sampling without replacement (SRSWOR, i.e.,  $T(\mathbf{y}) \propto 1$ ), although it is possible to extend the method to do sampling without replace with unequal probabilities using one of the schemes in [Chen et al. \(1994\)](#). After verifying (4.3), we may conduct MTM without needing balancing trials to maintain the detailed balance. The detailed algorithm is as follows.

---

**Algorithm 4** MTM-SRSWOR( $k$ ): Suppose that the current state is at  $x$ .

---

1. Draw  $(y_1, \dots, y_k)S \in (\mathcal{X} \setminus \{x\})$  jointly via SRSWOR. Then compute  $w(y_j, x) = (N - 1)\pi(y_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k$ .
2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w(y_j)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .
3. Accept  $y$  with the following ratio

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{w(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq J} w(y_i, x)}{w(x, y) + \sum_{i \neq J} w_i(y_i, y)} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y) + \sum_{j \neq J} \pi(y_j)}{\pi(x) + \sum_{j \neq J} \pi(y_j)} \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$


---

The actual transition probability from  $x$  to  $y \neq x$  for this scheme is

$$A(x, y) = \sum_{S_y^{(k-1)}} \frac{1}{\binom{N-1}{k}} \pi(y) \min \left[ \frac{1}{\pi(y) + \sum_{i < k} \pi(y_i)}, \frac{1}{\pi(x) + \sum_{i < k} \pi(y_i)} \right], \quad (4.5)$$

where  $S_y^{(k-1)} \subset \mathcal{X} \setminus \{x, y\}$ ,  $|S_y^{(k-1)}| = k - 1$ , and  $y_j \in S_y^{(k-1)}$ ,  $\forall j < k$ . Doing an exact eigenvalue decomposition of matrix  $A$  would have brought us a tight bound on the convergence rate. But  $A$  does not possess a nice low-rank property as that for the IMH sampler [Liu \(1996\)](#) or the MTM-IS sampler.

For a set  $S \subset \mathcal{X}$ , we define  $\pi(S) = \sum_{x \in S} \pi(x)$ . Set  $S^* = \arg \max_{\{S: |S|=k\}} \pi(S)$  and denote  $x^* = \arg \max_x \pi(x)$ . We find the following inequality to hold:

$$A(x, y) \geq \frac{k\pi(y)}{(N - 1)\pi(S^*)}, \quad x \neq y.$$

During each iteration, the chain stays at the current state if and only if the new proposal is rejected since in our construction of Algorithm 4, the proposal set is not allowed to contain the current state. From (4.4), we observe that  $\rho \equiv 1$  whenever  $x = x_* \triangleq \arg \min_x \pi(x)$ , leading to  $A(x_*, x_*) = 0$ . This fact prevents us from using the previous coupling arguments directly. However, as we specify to some circumstances, we could still obtain satisfactory results.

**Example 4.** Choosing  $k = 2$  and  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , we set

$$\pi_1 = 1 - p, \quad \pi_2 = \dots = \pi_N = \frac{p}{N - 1}, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $0 \leq p \leq (N - 1)/N$ , which guarantees that  $x^* = 1$  and  $\{2, \dots, N\} \in \arg \min_x \pi(x)$ . As a result, we know that  $A(2, 2) = \dots = A(N, N) = 0$ . Furthermore, matrix  $A$  can be

completely determined by the following four quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= A(1, 2) = \frac{2\pi_2}{(N-1)(\pi_1 + \pi_2)}, \\
a_2 &= A(1, 1) = \frac{\pi_1 - \pi_2}{\pi_1 + \pi_2}, \\
a_3 &= A(2, 1) = \frac{2\pi_1}{(N-1)(\pi_1 + \pi_2)}, \\
a_4 &= A(2, 3) = \frac{(N-3)}{(N-1)(N-2)} + \frac{2\pi_2}{(N-1)(N-2)(\pi_1 + \pi_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can then write out  $A$  as follows:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a_2 & a_1 & a_1 & a_1 & \cdots & a_1 \\ a_3 & 0 & a_4 & a_4 & \cdots & a_4 \\ a_3 & a_4 & 0 & a_4 & \cdots & a_4 \\ a_3 & a_4 & a_4 & 0 & \cdots & a_4 \\ \cdots & & & & & \cdots \\ a_3 & a_4 & a_4 & a_4 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.7)$$

Now this matrix admits a useful low-rank decoupling:  $A = G + ep^T$ , where  $e = [1, \dots, 1]^T$ ,  $p = [a_3, a_4, \dots, a_4]^T$  and

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} a_2 - a_3 & a_1 - a_4 & a_1 - a_4 & a_1 - a_4 & \cdots & a_1 - a_4 \\ 0 & -a_4 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -a_4 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -a_4 & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & & & & & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -a_4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.8)$$

Note that  $e$  is a common right eigenvector for both  $A$  and  $A - G$ , corresponding to the largest eigenvalue 1. Since  $A - G$  is of rank 1, the remaining eigenvalues of  $A$  and  $G$  have to be the same. Hence the eigenvalues for  $K$  are  $1, a_2 - a_3, -a_4, \dots, -a_4$ . This decoupling trick has also been used in [Liu \(1996\)](#) for IMH. Given the convergence rate  $(1 - 1/(N\pi_1))^2$  of IMH<sup>2</sup>, it suffices to show

$$|a_2 - a_3| \leq (1 - 1/(N\pi_1))^2, \quad a_4 \leq (1 - 1/(N\pi_1))^2, \quad (4.9)$$

to prove that MTM-SRSWOR is faster than IMH<sup>2</sup>. At last, we commented that this holds for  $p = \frac{N-1}{2N}$  in which  $\pi_1 = 1/2 + 1/(2N)$ ,  $\pi_2 = 1/(2N)$ . In this case,

$$a_2 - a_3 = 1 - \frac{4N}{(N+2)(N-1)} < 1 - \frac{4}{N+1} < \left(1 - \frac{2}{N+1}\right)^2 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\pi_1}\right)^2,$$

$$a_4 = \frac{(N-3)}{(N-1)(N-2)} + \frac{2}{(N-1)(N-2)(N+2)} < \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\pi_1}\right)^2.$$

We note that when proposing multiple trials, we may also choose not to exclude  $x$  from the proposal set. In this case, we will need to modify Algorithm 4.2.2 slightly to have the following variant:

---

**Algorithm 5** MTM-SRSWOR2( $k$ ): the current state is  $x$ .

---

1. Draw a subset  $S \subset \mathcal{X}$  of size  $k$  at random, denoted as  $S = (y_1, \dots, y_k)$ .
2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w(y_j) = N\pi(y_j)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .
3. If  $x \in S$ , accept  $y$  with probability 1. If  $x \notin S$ , accept  $y$  with probability

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{w(y) + \sum_{j \neq J} w(y_j)}{w(x) + \sum_{j \neq J} w(y_j)} \right\}.$$


---

### 4.3 Independent non-identical proposals

If the joint proposal distribution is independent and independent of the current state (as in IMH), we can also avoid drawing extra balancing proposals by directly verifying equation (4.3). Specifically, if

$$T(x; y_1, \dots, y_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k T_i(y_i), \tag{4.10}$$

Algorithm 3 can be modified by simply replacing  $x_j^*$  by  $y_j$ . Choosing  $\lambda_j(x, y) \equiv 1$ , we have  $w_i(x) = \pi(x)/T_i(x)$ , again coinciding with the standard importance ratio. By exactly the same arguments, the convergence rate of the modified algorithm is determined as

$$r = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \frac{1}{w_j^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w_i(X_i)} \right], \tag{4.11}$$

where  $w_i^* = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} w_i(x) < \infty$  and  $X_i$  is taken independently from  $T_i(\cdot)$ .

**Theorem 4.3** With notations defined as before, the following inequality is true:

$$1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}_T \left[ \frac{1}{w_j^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w_i(X_i)} \right] \geq \prod_{i=1}^k \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w_i^*} \right). \quad (4.12)$$

Both a detailed description of the modified algorithm and proof of Theorem 4.3 are deferred to the Appendix. The theorem implies that using different distributions for each trial of the MTM attempt also cannot outperform the simple strategy of composing these IMH steps sequentially.

## 5 Concluding Remarks

In this article, we provide a complete eigen-analysis and convergence rate theory for the *Multiple-try Metropolis Independent sampler* (MTM-IS), and compare it with the repeated *Independent Metropolis-Hastings* (IMH) sampler (of the same computational cost). With the exact form of the eigenvalues of MTM-IS, we proved rigorously that MTM-IS is not as efficient as the simpler repeated IMH approach. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first exact rate result known for an MTM-type algorithm, although its implication is less than encouraging.

In a quest for finding advantages MTM may offer, we consider a slightly modified MTM framework that encompasses a few variants of MTM published in the literature. We found that even under the IMH framework, it is possible to construct an MTM algorithm, either via stratified sampling or by sampling without replacement, to gain efficiency. A key to such efficiency gain is to allow multiple trials to be negatively correlated so that they can be more spread. Detailed theoretical understanding and guiding principles, however, are still lacking and awaiting further endeavors.

## References

- Atchadé, Y. F. and Perron, F. (2007). On the geometric ergodicity of metropolis-hastings algorithms. *Statistics*, 41(1):77–84.
- Bédard, M., Douc, R., and Moulines, E. (2012). Scaling analysis of multiple-try mcmc methods. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 122(3):758–786.

- Brooks, S., Gelman, A., Jones, G., and Meng, X.-L. (2011). *Handbook of markov chain monte carlo*. CRC press.
- Calderhead, B. (2014). A general construction for parallelizing metropolis- hastings algorithms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(49):17408–17413.
- Casarin, R., Craiu, R., and Leisen, F. (2013). Interacting multiple try algorithms with different proposal distributions. *Statistics and Computing*, 23(2):185–200.
- Chen, X.-H., Dempster, A. P., and Liu, J. S. (1994). Weighted finite population sampling to maximize entropy. *Biometrika*, 81(3):457–469.
- Craiu, R. V. and Lemieux, C. (2007). Acceleration of the multiple-try metropolis algorithm using antithetic and stratified sampling. *Statistics and computing*, 17(2):109–120.
- Dai, C. and Liu, J. S. (2020). Monte carlo approximation of bayes factors via mixing with surrogate distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–16.
- Diaconis, P., Khare, K., and Saloff-Coste, L. (2008). Gibbs sampling, exponential families and orthogonal polynomials. *Statistical Science*, 23(2):151–178.
- Diaconis, P. and Saloff-Coste, L. (1998). What do we know about the metropolis algorithm? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 57(1):20–36.
- Hastings, W. K. (1970). Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications.
- Levin, D. A. and Peres, Y. (2017). *Markov chains and mixing times*, volume 107. American Mathematical Soc.
- Liu, J. S. (1996). Metropolized independent sampling with comparisons to rejection sampling and importance sampling. *Statistics and computing*, 6(2):113–119.
- Liu, J. S. (2008). *Monte Carlo strategies in scientific computing*. Springer Science & Business Media.

- Liu, J. S., Liang, F., and Wong, W. H. (2000). The multiple-try method and local optimization in metropolis sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(449):121–134.
- Liu, J. S., Wong, W. H., and Kong, A. (1995). Covariance structure and convergence rate of the gibbs sampler with various scans. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):157–169.
- Martino, L. (2018). A review of multiple try mcmc algorithms for signal processing. *Digital Signal Processing*, 75:134–152.
- Martino, L., Leisen, F., and Corander, J. (2014). On multiple try schemes and the particle metropolis-hastings algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0051*.
- Metropolis, N., Rosenbluth, A. W., Rosenbluth, M. N., Teller, A. H., and Teller, E. (1953). Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The journal of chemical physics*, 21(6):1087–1092.
- Neal, R. M. (2011). Mcmc using ensembles of states for problems with fast and slow variables such as gaussian process regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1101.0387*.
- Pandolfi, S., Bartolucci, F., and Friel, N. (2010). A generalization of the multiple-try metropolis algorithm for bayesian estimation and model selection. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 581–588. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- Qin, Z. S. and Liu, J. S. (2001). Multipoint metropolis method with application to hybrid monte carlo. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 172(2):827–840.
- Roberts, G. O. and Tweedie, R. L. (1996). Geometric convergence and central limit theorems for multidimensional hastings and metropolis algorithms. *Biometrika*, 83(1):95–110.
- Tierney, L. (1994). Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *the Annals of Statistics*, pages 1701–1728.
- Wang, G. (2020). Exact convergence analysis of the independent metropolis-hastings algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.02455*.



Yang, S., Chen, Y., Bernton, E., and Liu, J. S. (2018). On parallelizable markov chain monte carlo algorithms with waste-recycling. *Statistics and Computing*, 28(5):1073–1081.

## 6 Appendixes

### 6.1 Omitted Materials for Section 2 and Section 3

#### 6.1.1 Proof of Theorem 2.2

An operator  $K$  is defined associated with the Markovian transition kernel  $A$  introduced by our algorithm. Specifically, for measurable function  $f$  defined on  $\mathcal{X}$ , its right multiplication  $Kf$  is a function on  $\mathcal{X}$  defined by

$$Kf(x) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(y)A(x, dy).$$

We will require the function  $f \in L^2(\pi)$ , so  $Kf \in L^2(\pi)$  as well. Henceforth,  $K$  defines a linear bounded operator on the Hilbert space  $L^2(\pi)$  with operator norm 1. Besides, the constant function 1 is automatically an eigenfunction of eigenvalue 1, and we actually want to find the spectral gap, so we should then focus on the restriction  $K_0$  on the orthogonal complement

$$L_0^2(\pi) = \left\{ f \in L^2(\pi) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x)dx = 0 \right\}.$$

Given (2.8), we divide the operator  $K_0$  into two parts

$$K_0f(x) = R(x)f(x) + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \min [H[w(x)], H[w(y)]] f(y)\pi(y)dy =: M_Rf(x) + Uf(x).$$

for any  $f \in L_0^2(\pi)$ . Before presenting the formal proof, we remark that this decomposition has the same nature as that in Section 2.1 Liu (1996), in which the multiplication operator  $M_R$  is a low-rank component and the integral-like operator  $U$  mimics the upper triangular matrix in the discrete case. This proof is analogous to that in Atchadé and Perron (2007). *Proof.* The proof is divided into these parts.

- We firstly prove that the operator  $U$  is compact. Under the following condition,

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \min \{H[w(x)], H[w(y)]\}^2 \pi(x)\pi(y)dxdy < \infty,$$

the operator  $U$  is Hilbert-Schmidt, and therefore compact. Henceforth, by Weyl's perturbation theorem,

$$\sigma_{ess}(K_0) = \sigma_{ess}(M_R) \subset \text{ess-ran}(R).$$

- Given this, combined with the decomposition

$$\sigma(K_0) = \sigma_{ess}(K_0) \cup \sigma_d(K_0),$$

we know that it suffices to prove that  $\sigma_d(K_0) \subset \text{ess-ran}(R)$ , i.e. all eigenvalues of  $K_0$  are in the essential range of  $R$ . To proceed, we assume that there exists  $f_0 \in L_0^2(\pi)$  and  $\lambda \notin \text{ess-ran}(R)$ , but  $K_0 f_0 = \lambda f_0$ .

Direct computations yield that for any  $f \in L_0^2(\pi)$

$$\begin{aligned} Uf(x) &= \int \min \{H[w(x)], H[w(y)]\} f(y) \pi(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\{y:w(y) \geq w(x)\}} H[w(y)] f(y) \pi(y) dy + \int_{\{y:w(y) < w(x)\}} H[w(x)] f(y) \pi(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\{y:w(y) \geq w(x)\}} \{H[w(y)] - H[w(x)]\} f(y) \pi(y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\lambda \notin \text{ess-ran}(R)$ , then  $\kappa = \text{ess inf} (|R(x) - \lambda|) > 0$ . We rewrite the previous equation  $K_0 f_0 = \lambda f_0$  into

$$\int_{\{y:w(y) \geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y) \pi(y) dy = f_0(x). \quad (6.1)$$

And we denote the right operator as  $N$ , therefore  $Nf_0 = f_0$ . Here  $N$  is actually well-defined on  $L^2(\pi)$ , rather than  $L_0^2(\pi)$  in which  $K_0$  is defined. Then we aim to derive a contradiction about the spectral radius  $\text{radii}(G) \triangleq \sup\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(G)\}$  for some linear operator  $G$  on  $L^2(\pi)$  induced by  $N$ .

- Since  $f_0$  is not identically vanishing, so we can find  $u < w^*$  so that  $f_0$  is not null on  $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : u < w(x) \leq w^*\}$ . For any partition  $I_n = (u = u_n \leq u_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq u_0 = w^*)$ , we denote  $D_i = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : u_i < w(x) \leq u_{i-1}\}$  and  $L_i^2(\pi) = \{h \in L_0^2(\pi) : h(x) = 0, \forall x \notin D_i\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then  $L_i^2(\pi)$  is a closed subspace of  $L_0^2(\pi)$ , thus a

Hilbert space. Moreover, we introduce  $M_{D_i}$  as the restriction operator onto  $D_i$  on  $L^2(\pi)$ , by letting  $M_{D_i}g(x) = \chi_{D_i}(x)g(x)$  for any  $g \in L^2(\pi)$ .

We know that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{D_1}Nf_0(x) &= \int_{\{y:w(y)\geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y)\chi_{D_1}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &= \int_{\{y:w(y)\geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} \chi_{D_1}(y)f_0(y)\chi_{D_1}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &= M_{D_1}NM_{D_1}f_0, \end{aligned}$$

where the second ineuqlity follows from the fact that  $y \notin D_1$  and  $w(y) \geq w(x)$  would together imply  $x \notin D_1$ . Obtaining from  $Nf_0 = f_0$  and  $M_{D_1}^2 = M_{D_1}$ , we then have  $f_{0,D_1} \triangleq M_{D_1}f_0 = M_{D_1}Nf_0 = M_{D_1}NM_{D_1}f_0 = M_{D_1}NM_{D_1}f_{0,D_1}$ .

In the same manner, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{D_i}Nf_0(x) &= \int_{\{y:w(y)\geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y)\chi_{D_i}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \int_{\{y \in D_k\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y)\chi_{D_i}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\{y:u_{i-1} > w(y) \geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y)\chi_{D_i}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &= M_{D_i}h_i(x) + \int_{\{y:u_{i-1} > w(y) \geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} \chi_{D_i}(y)f_0(y)\chi_{D_i}(x)\pi(y)dy \\ &= M_{D_i}h_i(x) + M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}f_{0,D_i}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_{0,D_i} \triangleq M_{D_i}f_0$  and

$$h_i(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \int_{\{y \in D_k\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} f_0(y)\pi(y)dy.$$

Rearrange these formulae, we know

$$M_{D_1}NM_{D_1}f_{0,D_1} = f_{0,D_1}, \tag{6.2}$$

$$M_{D_2}NM_{D_2}f_{0,D_2} = f_{0,D_2} - M_{D_2}h_2, \tag{6.3}$$

$$\dots \tag{6.4}$$

$$M_{D_n}NM_{D_n}f_{0,D_n} = f_{0,D_n} - M_{D_n}h_n. \tag{6.5}$$

Now, we shall prove that (6.2) would imply that  $\text{radii}(M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}) \geq 1$  for at least one index  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

In details, assume the converse, then  $M_{D_1}NM_{D_1}f_{0,D_1} = f_{0,D_1}$  implies  $f_{0,D_1} = 0$ . Consequently,  $h_2 = 0$ , then  $M_{D_2}NM_{D_2}f_{0,D_2} = f_{0,D_2}$  which deduce  $f_{0,D_2} = 0$ . This procedure could go on until  $n$ , and thus indicate that  $f_0$  is vanishing on  $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : u < w(x) \leq \bar{w}\}$ , resulting contradiction!

- Finally, we would show that for sufficiently small increments, we can make all

$$\text{radii}(M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}) < 1.$$

Firstly, the mapping

$$H : v \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto k \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{X}}}_{k-1} \frac{1}{v + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(y_j)} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} p(x) dx$$

is continuous, at least on  $[u, \bar{w}]$ .

For  $g \in L_i^2(\pi)$  with  $\|g\| = 1$ , and using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}g\|^2 &= \int_{\{y \in D_i\}} \left\{ \int_{\{y: w(y) \geq w(x)\}} \frac{H[w(x)] - H[w(y)]}{R(x) - \lambda} g(y) \chi_{D_i}(x) \pi(y) dy \right\}^2 \pi(x) dx \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\max_{[u_i, u_{i-1}]} H - \min_{[u_i, u_{i-1}]} H}{\kappa} \right)^2 \int_{\{y \in D_i\}} g^2(y) \pi(y) dy \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\max_{[u_i, u_{i-1}]} H - \min_{[u_i, u_{i-1}]} H}{\kappa} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\|M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}\| \leq \text{osc}_{[u_i, u_{i-1}]} H / \kappa$ . At last, if we choose the partition to be sufficiently small, we would have  $\text{radii}(M_{D_i}NM_{D_i}) < 1$  for all  $i$ .

- Up to now, we derive a final contradiction to assert that  $\sigma_d(K_0) \subset \text{ess-ran}(R)$ , ending the proof.

□

### 6.1.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

*Proof.* In this proof, every random variable  $X$  is taken independently from  $T$ . This inequality is proved by induction. First, for  $k = 1$ , the inequality reduces to equality due to a previous result of Liu (1996) and Atchadé and Perron (2007). For  $k = 2$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{2}{w^* + w(X)} \right] - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w^*} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{w^*} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{2w(X)}{w^* + w(X)} - \frac{1}{w^*} \right] \geq \frac{1}{w^*} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{2w(X)}{2w^*} - \frac{1}{w^*} \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For  $k \geq 3$ , we will prove the following recursive inequality, which leads to the conclusion of the theorem:

$$1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] \geq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w^*} \right) \left( 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right] \right). \quad (6.6)$$

We prove by simply computing the difference between the two sides:

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w^*} \right) \left( 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right] \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right] + \frac{1}{w^*} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)]} \right] \\ &= (k-1) \underbrace{\left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] \right)}_{(i)} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\frac{1}{w^*} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)]} \right]}_{(ii)}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that (i) can be modified as

$$\begin{aligned} (i) &= (k-1) \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w(X_i)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w(X_j)}{[w^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w(X_i)][w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)]} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For (ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(ii) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} w(X_j)}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)]} \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)]} \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w(X_j)}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)]} \right\} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w(X_j)}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w(X_i)]} \right\} \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w(X_j)^2}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)][w^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w(X_i)]} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)} \right] - \left(1 - \frac{1}{w^*}\right) \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{k-1}{w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-2} w(X_i)} \right]\right) = (i) + (ii) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w(X_j)[w^* - w(X_j)]}{w^*[w^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} w(X_i)][w^* + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1, i \neq j} w(X_i)]} \right\} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus derive the final result (3.6) for arbitrary  $k \geq 1$ .  $\square$

## 6.2 Omitted Materials for Section 4

### 6.2.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

This theorem verifies that the general framework we proposed, satisfies the detailed balance condition.

*Proof.* To make our notations more explicit, we assume every distribution mentioned here has density with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Denote  $A(x, y)$  as the actual transition density, we compute directly that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi(x)A(x, y) \\
&= \pi(x) \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{P}(y_j = y, J = j) \\
&= \pi(x) \sum_{j=1}^k \int T(x; y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k) \frac{w_j(y, x)}{w_j(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y, x)} \\
&\quad \rho T(y; x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{j-1}^*, x_{j+1}^*, \dots, x_k^* | x) \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i dx_i^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging in the formula (4.2) of  $\rho$ , we use the notations  $\mathbf{x}^*(j) \triangleq (x_1^*, \dots, x_{j-1}^*, x, x_{j+1}^*, x_k^*)$  and  $u_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^k w_i(y_i, x_j)}, \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^k w_i(x_i, y_j)} \right\}$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(x)A(x, y) \\
&= \pi(x) \sum_{j=1}^k \int T(x; y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k) \frac{w_j(y, x)}{w_j(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, x)} \\
& \quad \min \left\{ 1, \frac{w_j(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, x)}{w_j(x, y) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(x_i^*, y)} \right\} \\
& \quad T(y; x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_{j-1}^*, x_{j+1}^*, \dots, x_k^* | x) \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i dx_i^* \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \pi(x) w_j(y, x) T_j(x, y) \int u_j(\mathbf{x}^*(j), \mathbf{y}) T(x; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} | y_j = y) T(y; \mathbf{x}_{(-j)}^* | x_j = x) \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i dx_i^*.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above formula, we use the identity

$$T(x; y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k) = T_j(x; y) \times T(x; y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k | y).$$

At last, note that  $\pi(x)w_j(y, x)T_j(x, y) = \pi(x)\pi(y)T_j(x, y)T_j(y, x)\lambda_j(x, y)$  is symmetric by our constructions, finally implying that  $\pi(x)A(x, y)$  is symmetric in  $x$  and  $y$ , proving the detailed balance condition.  $\square$

### 6.2.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

*Proof.* If we simply set  $x_j^* := y_j$  for any  $j \neq J$  in Algorithm 3, the conditional probability would be

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x)A(x, y) &= \pi(x) \sum_{j=1}^k \left[ \int T(x; y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_k) \right. \\
& \quad \left. w_j(y, x) \min \left[ \frac{1}{w_j(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, x)}, \frac{1}{w_j(x, y) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, y)} \right] \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i \right] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^k \left[ \int \pi(x) T_j(x; y) w_j(y, x) T(x; \mathbf{y}_{(-j)} | y_j = y) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \min \left[ \frac{1}{w_j(y, x) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, x)}, \frac{1}{w_j(x, y) + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i(y_i, y)} \right] \prod_{i \neq j} dy_i \right].
\end{aligned}$$

And as we noted that  $\pi(x)w_j(y, x)T_j(x; y)$  is symmetric for  $x$  and  $y$ , this theorem follows easily from the condition (4.3) prescribed.  $\square$

### 6.2.3 Supplemental Materials for Section 4.2

By selecting

$$T(x; y_1, \dots, y_k) = \prod_{i=1}^k T_i(y_i),$$

and choosing  $\lambda_j(x, y) \equiv 1$ , we have  $w_i(x) = \pi(x)/T_i(x)$  and a modified algorithm as follow.

---

**Algorithm 6** Generalized MTM (Independent non-identical proposals)

---

1. Draw multiple trials  $y_i$  from  $p_i(\cdot)$  and compute  $w_i(y_i) = \frac{\pi(y_i)}{T_i(y_i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ .

Moreover, denote  $W = \sum_{i=1}^k w_i(y_i)$ .

2. Select index  $J$  with probability proportional to  $w_i(y_i)$  and define  $y = y_J$ .

3. Accept  $y$  with the following ratio

$$\rho = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{W}{W - w_J(y) + w_J(x)} \right\}.$$


---

*Proof.*[Theorem 4.3] In this proof,  $X_i$  is taken independently from  $T_i(\cdot)$ . For  $k = 2$ , we can still get an inequality implying that MTM is less efficient.

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_1^* + w_2(X_2)} \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_1(X_1) + w_2^*} \right] - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w_1^*} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w_2^*} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{w_1(X_1)}{w_2^*(w_1(X_1) + w_2^*)} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{w_2(X_2)}{w_1^*(w_1^* + w_2(X_2))} \right] - \frac{1}{w_1^*w_2^*} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{w_1^*(w_1^* + w_2^*)} + \frac{1}{w_2^*(w_1^* + w_2^*)} - \frac{1}{w_1^*w_2^*} = 0. \end{aligned}$$



For larger  $k$ , details should be stressed to prove the same conclusion. For arbitrary  $l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_j^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^k w_i(X_i)} \right] - \left( 1 - \frac{1}{w_l^*} \right) \left\{ 1 - \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_j^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j, i \neq l}^k w_i(X_i)} \right] \right\} \\
&= \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{w_j(X_j)}{w_l^* [w_l^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq l}^k w_i(X_i)]} \right] + \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{w_l(X_l)}{[w_j^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^k w_i(X_i)] [w_j^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j, i \neq l}^k w_i(X_i)]} \right] \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_l^* [w_j^* + \sum_{i=1, i \neq j, i \neq l}^k w_i(X_i)]} \right] \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1, j \neq l}^k \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{w_l^* (w_l^* + w_j^* + B_{jl})} + \frac{1}{(w_l^* + w_j^* + B_{jl})(w_j^* + B_{jl})} - \frac{1}{w_l^* (w_j^* + B_{jl})} \right] = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote  $B_{jl} = \sum_{i=1, i \neq j, i \neq l}^k w_i(X_i)$  for simplicity. The key idea in deriving these inequalities, are essentially the same.  $\square$