

# Provable Convergence of Variational Monte Carlo Methods

Tianyou Li\*, Fan Chen†, Huajie Chen‡, Zaiwen Wen§

March 21, 2023

## Abstract

The Variational Monte Carlo (VMC) is a promising approach for computing the ground state energy of many-body quantum problems and attracts more and more interests due to the development of machine learning. The recent paradigms in VMC construct neural networks as trial wave functions, sample quantum configurations using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) and train neural networks with stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method. However, the theoretical convergence of VMC is still unknown when SGD interacts with MCMC sampling given a well-designed trial wave function. Since MCMC reduces the difficulty of estimating gradients, it has inevitable bias in practice. Moreover, the local energy may be unbounded, which makes it harder to analyze the error of MCMC sampling. Therefore, we assume that the local energy is sub-exponential and use the Bernstein inequality for non-stationary Markov chains to derive error bounds of the MCMC estimator. Consequently, VMC is proven to have a first order convergence rate  $O(\log K/\sqrt{nK})$  with  $K$  iterations and a sample size  $n$ . It partially explains how MCMC influences the behavior of SGD. Furthermore, we verify the so-called correlated negative curvature condition and relate it to the zero-variance phenomena in solving eigenvalue functions. It is shown that VMC escapes from saddle points and reaches  $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{1/4})$  approximate second order stationary points or  $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -variance points in at least  $O(\epsilon^{-11/2} \log^2(1/\epsilon))$  steps with high probability. Our analysis enriches the understanding of how VMC converges efficiently and can be applied to general variational methods in physics and statistics.

## 1 Introduction

Solving many-body quantum problems at a manageable cost is a central aspect in many fields of physics and chemistry. A fundamental difficulty is the complexity of the problem grows exponentially fast with respect to the number of particles in the system. An efficient numerical algorithm is the key to reducing the computational cost and promoting accuracy. The variational Monte Carlo (VMC) methods in particular can produce highly accurate predictions provided that (i) a sufficiently flexible trial wavefunction is available and (ii) the variational parameters of this wavefunction can be optimized.

A rapidly developing approach for trial wavefunctions is based on machine learning techniques. These techniques typically rely on the ability of artificial neural networks (ANNs) to represent

---

\*School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, CHINA (tianyoli@stu.pku.edu.cn).

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University, CHINA (chern@pku.edu.cn).

‡School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, CHINA (chen.huajie@bnu.edu.cn).

§Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, CHINA (wenzw@pku.edu.cn).

complex high-dimensional functions, which have already been explored in many fields of physics and chemistry. The restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM) is first proposed by Carleo and Troyer [3] as a variational ansatz for many-body quantum problems. Furthermore, a large number of deep neural networks, such as feed forward neural networks [27, 2], deep RBMs [5, 11, 23, 15], convolutional neural networks [17, 4], variational autoencoders [26], have been applied to capture the physical features and improve the accuracy of the ground state. Motivated by the traditional Slater-Jastrow-backflow ansatzes, PauliNet [13] and FermiNet [25] use the permutation equivariant and invariant construction of networks and many determinants to approximate a general antisymmetric wavefunction. Both of them achieve a great success in electronic structure calculations. With an efficient ansatz that has strong ability to represent high-dimensional quantum states, the VMC method provides the route to obtain the best possible solution to the problem based on the variational principle.

A main issue in optimizing parameterized quantum states is that the total scale of configurations grows exponentially with the system size. It is prohibitive to perform direct sampling for exceptionally large configuration spaces. However, the VMC approach recasts the variational eigenvalue problem into a stochastic optimization problem that is solvable under the curse of dimensionality. To compute the expectation, Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is employed to sample from the unnormalized probability. In contrast to the ordinary unbiased Monte Carlo methods, the MCMC method requires some time for mixing and produces the desired samples biasedly and non-independently. There are several common MCMC algorithms, such as Gibbs sampling, Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm, Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) etc. The efficiency of the VMC algorithm relies on the error of the stochastic sampling, which has not been well investigated in the VMC literatures.

The VMC framework is solved by stochastic optimization algorithms. With the MCMC samples, we minimize the objective function using the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method. The vanilla SGD method is to sample independently from a uniform distribution on the finite sum, and has been extensively studied. Moulines & Bach [20] first show linear convergence of SGD non-asymptotically for strongly convex functions. Needell et al. [21] improve these results by removing the quadratic dependency on the condition number in the iteration complexity results. Among these convergence results, the gradient noise assumptions for i.i.d samples are of vital importance to establish an  $O(1/\sqrt{nK})$  convergence rate for general non-convex cost functions, where  $n$  is the sample size per iteration and  $K$  is the total number of iterations. However, stochastic sampling is not always independent or unbiased. The convergence of SGD with Markovian gradients has been studied in [7, 29], and SGD with biased gradient estimators is considered in [1]. But the VMC method, which produces MCMC samples from varying distributions, has been seldomly considered. More practical settings of many-body quantum systems make it harder to deal with theoretical properties in sampling and optimization.

The goal of this paper is to provide a rigorous analysis of the VMC method from an aspect of stochastic optimization, which has not been studied in pervious literatures according to our limited knowledge. MCMC constructs a Markov chain to sample quantum configurations from an unnormalized distribution. Since it reduces the computational cost of sampling, the biasness and dependency lead to a distinct analysis of the vanilla SGD method. Moreover, the local energy may be unbound due to the unbound operator and untrained trial wave functions. In our settings, the local energy is assumed sub-exponential and differentiable with respect to parameters. By a uniform spectral gap of Markov operators, we give a Bernstein inequality for Markov chains and present non-asymptotic error bounds of the MCMC estimator with unbound functions. We establish

the first-order convergence of VMC depending on a few related factors, such as step sizes, sample sizes and the length of burn-in time. It may help us to set suitable hyperparameters and promote algorithm efficiency in practice. Due to the particularity of eigenvalue problems, we further discuss how VMC escapes from saddle points. A positive lower bound of MCMC variance is constructed to satisfy a correlated negative curvature condition. It is shown that the intrinsic noise contributes to make a slight perturbation to get rid of saddle points. We make a convergence analysis of VMC escaping from saddle points. The VMC method returns  $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{1/4})$  approximate second order stationary points or  $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -variance points after at least  $O(\epsilon^{-11/2} \log^2(1/\epsilon))$  steps in high probability. Our analysis explains how VMC escapes from saddle points and why it may converge to other excited states.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the many-body quantum system and the variational optimization problem to obtain the ground state energy. In Section 3, the MH algorithm and the VMC method are introduced. In Section 4, we first give our assumptions for the Hamiltonian and the ansatz. Then, the sampling error is analyzed asymptotically by the concentration inequality for Markov chains. We prove that the VMC method converges to stationary points and estimate the convergence rates. In Section 5, we provide the convergence guarantee to avoid saddle points with high probability by the stochastic error of MCMC.

## 2 Many-body quantum problems

Consider a many-body system with  $N$  particles. We denote the  $N$ -particle configuration by  $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathcal{X} := \mathcal{A}^N$ , with  $\mathcal{A}$  being the one-particle configuration space, which can be continuous or discrete. The wavefunction  $\Psi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  (or  $\mathbb{R}$ ) describes the quantum state of the many-body system, and is often required to satisfy some symmetric/anti-symmetric conditions. We denote the Hilbert space for the wavefunction by  $\mathcal{H}$ . The Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$  is a self-adjoint operator on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , which determines the dynamics and the ground state of the quantum system.  $\mathcal{H}$  can always be written as the sum of local operators acting only on one or two coordinates.

Our goal is to compute the ground state energy and wavefunction of the system, which corresponds to the lowest eigenvalue  $E_0$  and its corresponding eigenfunction of

$$\mathcal{H}\Psi_0 = E_0\Psi_0. \quad (2.1)$$

To obtain the ground state solution, one can either solve the eigenvalue problem (2.1) directly, or alternatively minimize the following Rayleigh quotient

$$E_0 = \min_{\Psi \in \mathcal{H}, \Psi \neq \mathbf{0}} \frac{\langle \Psi, \mathcal{H}\Psi \rangle}{\langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle}, \quad (2.2)$$

where the bracket means

$$\langle \Psi, \mathcal{H}\Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathcal{H}\Psi)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \langle \Psi, \Psi \rangle = \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\Psi(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x}. \quad (2.3)$$

When  $\mathcal{X}$  is a discrete configuration space (see Example 1), the above integrals in (2.3) is regarded as summations over all configurations.

We will then give two examples of the most popular many-body problems in the following.

**Example 1.** (Heisenberg model) The Heisenberg model is a spin model with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}_2 := \{-1, 1\}$ . The  $N$ -body spin configuration is denoted by  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  with  $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ . The corresponding  $N$ -body wavefunction  $\Psi : (\mathbb{Z}_2)^N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  belongs to the discrete space  $\mathcal{H} = (\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$ . The Hamiltonian of the spin system is more conveniently expressed as in the linear space  $(\mathbb{C}^2)^{\otimes N}$  as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{(j,k) \in G} \left( J_x \cdot H_{jk}^x + J_y \cdot H_{jk}^y + J_z \cdot H_{jk}^z \right). \quad (2.4)$$

In (2.4),  $G$  denotes the given interacting pairs within the  $N$  particles,  $J_x, J_y, J_z \in \mathbb{R}$  are the coupling coefficients and the local operator are defined by

$$H_{jk}^\alpha := I_2^{\otimes j-1} \otimes \sigma^\alpha \otimes I_2^{\otimes k-j-1} \otimes \sigma^\alpha \otimes I_2^{\otimes N-k-1} \quad \text{for } \alpha = x, y, z, \quad (2.5)$$

with  $\otimes$  denoting the kronecker product,  $I_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$  being an identity matrix and  $\sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z \in \mathbb{C}^{2 \times 2}$  representing the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.6)$$

**Example 2.** (Schrödinger equation) For a many-electron system in 3 dimension,  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ , and the  $N$ -electron configuration is  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  with  $x_i = (r_i, \sigma_i) \in \mathcal{A}$ . Here  $r_i$  represents the spatial coordinate and  $\sigma_i$  is the spin coordinate. Noting that the  $N$ -electron wavefunction is required to be anti-symmetric, we have the space

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigwedge_{i=1}^N L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{C}),$$

where the symbol  $\bigwedge$  means the usual tensorial product  $\otimes$  with the additional requirement that one keeps only the permutational anti-symmetrized products.

The Hamiltonian of the electron system is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta_{r_i} + \sum_{i=1}^N v_{\text{ext}}(r_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} v_{\text{ee}}(r_i, r_j), \quad (2.7)$$

where  $v_{\text{ext}} : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the ionic potential and  $v_{\text{ee}} : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  represents the interaction between electrons

$$v_{\text{ext}}(r) = -\sum_I \frac{Z_I}{|r - R_I|}, \quad v_{\text{ee}}(r, r') = \frac{1}{|r - r'|}, \quad r, r' \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad (2.8)$$

with  $R_I \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $Z_I \in \mathbb{N}$  being the position and atomic number of the  $I$ -th nuclear.

## 3 Variational Monte Carlo

### 3.1 Problem formulation

The VMC method is well known in electronic structure calculations [9] by evaluating the Rayleigh quotient (2.2). However, the complexity of many-body quantum systems grows exponentially with respect to  $N$ . To search for the optimum in an infinite dimensional function space,

VMC approximates the wavefunction by a suitable ansatz  $\Psi_\theta$ ,  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$  within a finite parameter space. There are plenty of common variational ansatzes in VMC, including Jastrow ansatz, restricted Boltzmann machine (RBM), feed forward neural networks (FFNN) and a variety of other neural networks. We solve the optimization problem:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = \frac{\langle \Psi_\theta, \mathcal{H}\Psi_\theta \rangle}{\langle \Psi_\theta, \Psi_\theta \rangle} = \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi_\theta^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathcal{H}\Psi_\theta)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi_\theta^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}. \quad (3.1)$$

In the VMC framework, the Rayleigh quotient in (2.2) can be rewritten in terms of a statistical expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta) &= \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \underbrace{\frac{\Psi_\theta^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi_\theta^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}}_{\pi_\theta(\mathbf{x})} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{\mathcal{H}\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})}{\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})}}_{E_\theta(\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_\theta} [E_\theta(\mathbf{x})], \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  and  $E_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  represent the probability and the local energy at configuration  $\mathbf{x}$ .

We derive the gradient and the Hessian of (3.2) in the real settings for convenience. A similar statement holds true for the complex settings, according to Appendix E in [18].

**Theorem 1.** *Let the map  $\theta \rightarrow \Psi_\theta$  from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $L^2(\mathcal{X}; \mathbb{R})$  be smooth. The gradient of  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$  has the following form*

$$g(\theta) := \nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta) = 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})], \quad (3.3)$$

with  $\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = E_\theta(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_\theta} [E_\theta(\mathbf{x})]$ . The Hessian of  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$  takes the form of

$$H(\theta) := \nabla_{\theta}^2 \mathcal{L}(\theta) = H_1(\theta) + H_2(\theta) + H_3(\theta) + H_4(\theta) + H_4(\theta)^T, \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(\theta) &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} E_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T], \quad H_2(\theta) = 4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T], \\ H_3(\theta) &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \Psi_\theta], \quad H_4(\theta) = -4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta] \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T]. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Using the definition of  $E_\theta$  and  $\pi_\theta$  in (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(\theta) &= \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} 2\nabla_{\theta} \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathcal{H}\Psi_\theta)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x}} - \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathcal{H}\Psi_\theta)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x}} \frac{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} 2\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla_{\theta} \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x}} \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) E_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - 2 \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) E_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \pi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by differentiating the gradient (3.3), the Hessian is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\theta) &= 2\nabla_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})] \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_\theta(\mathbf{x})^T] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta} \bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x})^T] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})] \\ &= 4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T] - 4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta] \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} E_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T] - 4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta] \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_\theta^T] + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\theta} [\bar{E}_\theta \nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \Psi_\theta]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the derivation.  $\square$

### 3.2 Sampling algorithm

The exact loss function and the gradient can be hardly calculated in practice as the dimension of the Hilbert space grows exponentially on the number of particles. We can hardly compute the high-dimensional integral  $\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \Psi_{\theta}^*(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \Psi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$  to sample directly. However, the VMC method uses the MCMC sampling to estimate the expectation with a unnormalized probability. The MH algorithm is a common MCMC algorithm which constructs a Markov chain with proposal and acceptance steps.

The MH algorithm generates samples from a Markov chain whose stationary distribution is desired. As more and more samples are produced, the Markov chain converges to some equilibrium, which means that it becomes stationary over time. We can construct a Markov chain with a transition probability  $Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})$ , which is also called proposal distribution. For the Schrödinger equation, the simplest proposal distribution is a normal distribution with a mean of zero. At the  $i$ -th step, the MH algorithm produces a Markov chain with the stationary distribution  $\pi$  as follows. We first draw a sample  $\mathbf{x}'$  from  $Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the previous sample. Then, the acceptance probability is computed by

$$a(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(\mathbf{x}')Q(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{x}')}{\pi(\mathbf{x}_i)Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|\Psi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}')|^2 Q(\mathbf{x}_i|\mathbf{x}')}{|\Psi_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_i)|^2 Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

We accept the new sample  $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}'$  with probability  $a(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)$  or remain  $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i$ . After  $n_0 + n$  iterations, we discard first  $n_0$  samples for a better estimate, which is called a burn-in period. Finally,  $n$  samples  $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_{n_0+1}, \mathbf{x}_{n_0+2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n_0+n}\}$  is obtained by to estimate the expectation. We avoid computing the high-dimensional integral by the cancellation of terms in the numerator and denominator in (3.5). The MH algorithm is summarized as Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Metropolis-Hasting algorithm

---

**Require:** Any initial configuration  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , the proposal distribution  $Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x})$ .

- 1: **for**  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
  - 2:   Draw a sample  $\mathbf{x}'$  from  $Q(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)$ .
  - 3:   Generate  $u \sim U[0, 1]$  and compute the acceptance probability  $a(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)$  defined by (3.5).
  - 4:   **if**  $u \leq a(\mathbf{x}'|\mathbf{x}_i)$  **then**
  - 5:     Accept the proposal sample and set  $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}'$ .
  - 6:   **else**
  - 7:     Reject it and set  $\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i$ .
  - 8:   **end if**
  - 9: **end for**
-

### 3.3 Stochastic gradient descent using MCMC estimator

The objective function and its gradient is estimated by the MCMC samples  $\mathbf{S}$  generated by the MH Algorithm 1:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{S}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) = \frac{2}{|\mathbf{S}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}} (E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{|\mathbf{S}|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{S}} E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (3.7)$$

The MCMC methods provide a tractable and efficient way of approximating expectation in the objective function and its gradient. Nevertheless, MCMC estimators are not generally unbiased for a finite sample size and the samples generated by MCMC are non-independent. The existence of bias implies that the expectation of our stochastic gradient is not equal to the exact gradient. A sufficiently large sample size should be applied for reducing the bias, while the size should not be too large to lose randomness and computability. It suggests that we should pay attention to the influence of sampling methods in optimization. The MCMC method enables us to apply the SGD to update the parameters:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_k - \alpha_k \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \mathbf{S}_k), \quad (3.8)$$

where  $\alpha_k$  are chosen stepsizes and  $\mathbf{S}_k$  can be obtained by the MH algorithm with  $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k}$ .

---

#### Algorithm 2 Variational Monte Carlo

---

**Require:** The Hamiltonian  $\mathcal{H}$ , the initialized parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ , the sample size  $n$  and the length of the burn-in period  $n_0$ .

- 1: **for**  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  **do**
  - 2:   Draw  $n$  samples  $\mathbf{S}_k = \{\mathbf{x}_{n_0+1}^{(k)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n_0+n}^{(k)}\}$  by MH algorithm after a burn-in period of  $n_0$ .
  - 3:   Compute the estimated gradient  $\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k, \mathbf{S}_k)$  by (3.7).
  - 4:   Update the parameter by (3.8) with the stepsize  $\alpha_k$ .
  - 5: **end for**
- 

## 4 Convergence analysis of VMC

In this section, we study the convergence of optimization in the VMC method. Some assumptions are imposed to ensure indispensable properties in the objective function and sampling. Then, we analyze the MCMC estimator by the concentration inequality for Markov chains, which is essentially different from the ordinary SGD. Finally, our convergence theorems for VMC are presented through the gradient norm in expectation.

### 4.1 Assumptions

We first give the definition of sub-exponential random variables to introduce our assumptions.

**Definition 1.** *The sub-exponential norm of a random variable  $X$  is*

$$\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{|X - \mathbb{E}[X]|}{t} \right) \right] \leq 2 \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

If  $\|X\|_{\psi_1}$  is finite, we say that  $X$  is sub-exponential with the parameter  $\|X\|_{\psi_1}$ .

We introduce some regularity conditions on the trial wavefunction  $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ , in order to guarantee Lipschitz continuity of the gradient  $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . In practice, we usually substitute  $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$  by  $\log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$  to avoid potential numerical instability. The following assumptions can be satisfied in most of ansatzes.

**Assumption 1.** Let  $\log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$  be differentiable with respect to the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . There exist constants  $B, L_1 > 0$  such that

- (1)  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq B,$
- (2)  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \left[ \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2 \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \right] \leq L_1^2.$

There are also some assumptions on the local energy  $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ . Noticing that the local energy may be unbounded for trial function, we give the sub-exponential assumption of the local energy under the distribution  $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ .

**Assumption 2.** Let the local energy  $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$  defined in (3.2) satisfy the following conditions. There exist constants  $M, L_2 > 0$  such that

- (1)  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\psi_1} \leq M,$
- (2)  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \left[ \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 \right] \leq L_2^2.$

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we are able to analyze the objective function  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Since the wavefunction  $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  appears in the denominator of the local energy expression (3.2), and there are unbounded potentials in the many-electron Hamiltonian (2.7), the above two assumptions seem not easy to be satisfied. For instances, when solving the many-electron Schrödinger equations, people often use the so-called Jastrow factor [12] to enable the network to efficiently capture the cusps and decay of the wavefunction. By exploiting physical knowledge in the construction of the wavefunction ansatz can make the local energy  $E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  smooth with respect to the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , such that Assumption 2 is satisfied in practical VMC calculations.

## 4.2 Analysis of the MCMC error

We introduce following notations which are used frequently throughout this paper. For any function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and any distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , we write its expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f] := \int f(x)\pi(dx)$  and  $p$ -th central moment  $\sigma_p^p[f] := \mathbb{E}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f])^p]$ . The second central moment, called the variance, is denoted by  $\text{Var}_{\pi}[f] = \sigma_2^2[f] := \mathbb{E}[(f - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f])^2]$ .

Before the analysis of MCMC methods, we provide several general definitions about Markov chains. Within our consideration, the state space  $\mathcal{X}$  is Polish and equipped with its  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a time-homogeneous Markov chain defined on  $\mathcal{X}$ . The distribution of the Markov chain is uniquely determined by its initial distribution  $\nu$  and its transition kernel  $P$ . For any Borel set  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , let

$$\nu(A) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A), \quad P(X_i, A) = \mathbb{P}(X_{i+1} \in A | X_i).$$



A distribution  $\pi$  is called stationary with respect to a transition kernel  $P$  if

$$\pi(A) = \int P(x, A)\pi(dx), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}.$$

When the initial distribution  $\nu = \pi$ , we call the Markov chain stationary.

Our analysis starts from the perspective of operator theory on Hilbert spaces. Let  $\pi$  be the stationary distribution of a Markov chain and  $L^2(\pi) = \{f : \mathbb{E}_\pi[f^2] < \infty\}$  be the Hilbert space equipped with the norm  $\|f\|_\pi = (\mathbb{E}_\pi[f^2])^{1/2}$ . And for any  $f \in L^2(\pi)$ , we define  $\|f\|_{\psi_1}$  by  $\|f(X)\|_{\psi_1}$  with  $X \sim \pi$ . Each transition kernel can be viewed as a Markov operator on the Hilbert space  $L^2(\pi)$ . The Markov operator  $P : L^2(\pi) \rightarrow L^2(\pi)$  is defined by

$$P f(x) = \int f(y)P(x, dy), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \forall f \in L^2(\pi).$$

It is easy to show that  $P$  has the largest eigenvalue 1. Intuitively but not strictly, the gap between 1 and other eigenvalues matters to the Markov chain from non-stationarity towards stationarity. Hence, we introduce the definition of the absolute spectral gap.

**Definition 2** (absolute spectral gap). *A Markov operator  $P : L^2(\pi) \rightarrow L^2(\pi)$  admits an absolute spectral gap  $\gamma$  if*

$$\gamma(P) = 1 - \lambda(P) := 1 - \|P - \Pi\|_\pi > 0,$$

where  $\Pi : f \in L^2(\pi) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]1$  is the projection operator with 1 denoting the identity operator and  $\|\cdot\|_\pi$  is the operator norm induced by  $\|\cdot\|_\pi$  on  $L^2(\pi)$ .

We consider the MCMC samples generated by the MH algorithm  $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n}$  from the desired distribution  $\pi_\theta$ . The Markov operator in the Metropolis way, denoted by  $P_\theta$ , determines the convergence rate of the Markov chain. We assume that there exists a uniform lower bound of the spectral gap.

**Assumption 3.** *Let  $P_\theta$  be the Markov operator induced by the MH algorithm with the absolute spectral gap  $\gamma(P_\theta)$ . For any  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , there is a positive lower bound of absolute spectral gaps, that is,*

$$\gamma := \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \gamma(P_\theta) > 0.$$

This lemma excludes the situation that  $\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \gamma(P_\theta) = 0$ , which means the spectral gap might converge to zero in the iteration. The spectral gap  $\gamma$  ensures the Markov chains to mix well enough, by which the gradient is approximated correctly.

The spectral gap of the MH algorithm has been studied for some specific examples. On finite-state spaces,  $P$  becomes a transition matrix while  $1 - \gamma(P)$  relates to its eigenvalue. A survey of spectrums for Markov chains on discrete state-spaces is in [28]. This develops amounts of analytic techniques and [6] has further applications to the MH algorithm. For the continuous spaces, there are few examples of sharp rates of convergence for the MH algorithm. In [16, 19], it is claimed that the spectral gap  $\gamma \sim O(h^2)$  for the Gaussian proposal  $Q(x'|x) \sim \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2h^2} \|x' - x\|^2\right)$ .

MCMC provides an approach to estimate the expectation in VMC by averaging Markov chain samples after a burn-in period. A Bernstein inequality for general Markov chains is proposed by Jiang and Fan [14] and beneficial to our analysis. The following lemma is a direct corollary of [14, Theorem 2]

**Lemma 1.** Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a Markov chain with stationary distribution  $\pi$  and absolute spectral gap  $\gamma$ . Suppose the initial distribution  $\nu$  is absolute continuous with respect to the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and its derivative  $\frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \in L^2(\pi)$ . Consider a bounded function  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-c, c]$  with  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f] = 0$  and variance  $\sigma_2^2[f]$ . Then, when  $\nu = \pi$ , that is,  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is stationary, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) \geq s \right) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{\gamma n s^2}{4\sigma^2 + 5cs} \right), \quad \forall s \geq 0. \quad (4.2)$$

The Bernstein inequality (4.2) shows how the average of MCMC samples concentrates at the expectation. However, the Markov chain is not always non-stationary. We define  $\chi^2(\nu, \pi) := \left\| \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} - 1 \right\|_\pi^2$  represents the chi-squared divergence between  $\nu$  and  $\pi$ , by which we can extend the Bernstein inequality into a non-stationary one. We abbreviate  $\chi = \chi(\nu, \pi)$  and  $C = (1 + \chi^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Then we give the tail bound of the MCMC estimator for sub-exponential functions in the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a non-stationary Markov chain with stationary distribution  $\pi$  and absolute spectral gap  $\gamma$ . Suppose the initial distribution  $\nu$  is absolute continuous with respect to the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and its derivative  $\frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \in L^2(\pi)$ . We consider a function  $f \in L^2(\pi)$  satisfying  $\|f\|_{\psi_1} \leq M$ . If  $s \geq \frac{20M(\log n)^2}{n}$ , the following tail bound holds,

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu \left( \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right| \geq s \right) \leq 2C \exp \left( -\frac{\gamma n s^2}{64\sigma_2^2[f]} \right) + 2C \exp \left( -\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{80M}} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

In other words, for  $\delta > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , it holds that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right| \leq 8\sigma_2[f] \sqrt{\frac{\log(4C/\delta)}{n\gamma}} + 80M \frac{[\log(4Cn/\delta)]^2}{n\gamma}. \quad (4.4)$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f] = 0$  in the following proof. To deal with a possibly unbounded  $f$ , we firstly fix a  $M' > 0$  and consider the truncation function  $\bar{f} = \max\{\min\{f, M'\}, -M'\}$  and  $\hat{f} = f - \bar{f}$ . The basic property of  $\hat{f}$  is that, as  $\|f(X)\|_{\psi_1} \leq M$ , the Markov's inequality implies

$$\mathbb{P}_\pi(|f| > s) \leq \exp \left( -\frac{s}{M} \right) \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \exp \left( \frac{|f|}{M} \right) \right] \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{s}{M} \right). \quad (4.5)$$

Notice that for any event  $A \in \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , it holds from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\nu(A) &= \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(A|X_1 = x) \nu(dx) = \int_A \mathbb{P}(A|X_1 = x) \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \pi(dx) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\int_{\mathcal{X}} \left( \frac{d\nu}{d\pi} \right)^2 \mathbb{P}(A|X_1 = x) \pi(dx)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}(A|X_1 = x) \pi(dx) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_\pi(A)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we only consider the case  $\nu = \pi$ , i.e., the case  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is stationary. We first fix a large  $M' > 0$ . For any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|f(X_i)| > M') \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{M}\right). \quad (4.6)$$

It follows from the inclusion of events that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)\right| \geq s\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(X_i)\right| \geq s\right) + \mathbb{P}(\exists 1 \leq i \leq n, |f(X_i)| > M') \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]\right| \geq s - |\mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]|\right) + 2n \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{M}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Notice that  $|\mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]| = |\mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{f}]| \leq 2M \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{M}\right)$ . Therefore, when  $s \geq 2|\mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{f}]|$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(X_i)\right| \geq s\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]\right| \geq s - |\mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]|\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{f}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]\right| \geq \frac{s}{2}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{16\sigma_2^2[\bar{f}] + 10M's}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{16\sigma_2^2[\bar{f}] + 10M's}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where the third inequality is due to (4.2), and the last inequality uses  $\sigma_2^2[\bar{f}] \leq \sigma_2^2[f]$ . Finally, for any fixed  $s \geq \frac{20M(\log n)^2}{n}$ , we take  $M' = \sqrt{\gamma n M s / 5}$  and then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)\right| \geq s\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{16\sigma_2^2[f] + 10M's}\right) + 2n \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{M}\right) \\ &= 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{16\sigma_2^2[f] + 10s\sqrt{\gamma n M s / 5}}\right) + 2n \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{5M}}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{2 \max\{16\sigma_2^2[f], 10s\sqrt{\gamma n M s / 5}\}}\right) + 2n \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{5M}}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{32\sigma_2^2[f]}\right) + 2 \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{20M}}\right) + 2n \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{5M}}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma n s^2}{32\sigma_2^2[f]}\right) + 4 \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{20M}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where the last inequality holds from  $n \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{5M}}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\gamma n s}{20M}}\right)$  as long as  $s \geq \frac{20M(\log n)^2}{n}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In the above lemma, we establish the tail bound of the MCMC estimator for unbounded Markov chains. To the best of our knowledge, this result has not appeared in the literatures of Bernstein inequality for Markov chains.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that the condition of Lemma 2 holds. Then, error bounds for the MCMC estimator are given as follows.*

(1) *The bias satisfies that*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) \right] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right| \leq \frac{c_1}{n\gamma}, \quad (4.10)$$

where  $c_1 = \sigma_2[f] \min\{1, \chi\} + 4M [\log \chi]_+^2 + 4M [\log \chi]_+$  and  $\chi = \chi(\nu, \pi)$ . In particular, when  $\chi \leq 1$ ,  $c_1 = \sigma_2[f]\chi$ .

(2) *The variance satisfies that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{c_2}{n\gamma} \sigma_2^2[f] + \frac{c_3 + c_4 \log^4 n}{n^2 \gamma^2} M^2, \quad (4.11)$$

where  $c_2 = 64(1 + \log 2C)$ ,  $c_3 = 6400(4 + \log 2C)^4$ ,  $c_4 = 800$ , and  $C = (1 + \chi^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

*Proof.* We follow the notations in the proof of Lemma 2.

**Bias bound** Clearly, we only need to bound  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]|$ , where  $\nu_i = \nu P^{i-1}$  is the distribution of  $X_i$ . For the distribution  $\pi'$  whose derivative  $\frac{d\pi'}{d\pi} \in L^2(\pi)$ , it holds from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\pi'}[f] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]| = \left| \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \left( \frac{d\pi'}{d\pi} - 1 \right) (f - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]) \right] \right| \leq \left[ \mathbb{E}_\pi \left( \frac{d\pi'}{d\pi} - 1 \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \sigma_2[f] = \chi(\pi', \pi) \sigma_2[f]. \quad (4.12)$$

Besides, noticing that  $\left( \mathbb{E}_\pi |f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2M \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{2M}\right)$ , we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi'}[\hat{f}] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{f}] \right| \leq \chi(\pi', \pi) \left( \mathbb{E}_\pi |f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2M \chi(\pi', \pi) \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{2M}\right). \quad (4.13)$$

Then (4.12) implies that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[\bar{f}] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\bar{f}]| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[\hat{f}] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{f}] \right| \leq 2M' + 2M \chi(\nu_i, \pi) \exp\left(-\frac{M'}{2M}\right), \quad (4.14)$$

and as long as  $\chi(\nu_i, \pi) \geq 1$ , we can choose  $M' = 2M \log \chi(\nu_i, \pi)$  in (4.14) to derive  $|\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]| \leq 4M(1 + \log \chi(\nu_i, \pi))$ . Combining (4.12) and (4.14) yields that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]| \leq \begin{cases} \chi(\nu_i, \pi) \sigma_2[f], & \text{always,} \\ 4M(1 + \log \chi(\nu_i, \pi)), & \text{if } \chi(\nu_i, \pi) \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

Now, by the definition of  $\gamma$ , it holds that  $\chi(\nu_i, \pi) \leq (1 - \gamma)^{i-1} \chi(\nu_1, \pi) = (1 - \gamma)^{i-1} \chi$ . Let us consider the smallest  $k \geq 1$  such that  $\chi(\nu_k, \pi) \leq 1$ . Then clearly  $k \leq 1 + \left\lceil \frac{[\log \chi]_+}{\gamma} \right\rceil$ , and for  $i \geq k$ ,

$\chi(\nu_i, \pi) \leq (1 - \gamma)^{i-1} \min\{1, \chi\}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f]| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f]| + \sum_{i=k}^n |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f]| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 4M (1 + \log \chi(\nu_i, \pi)) + \sum_{i=k}^n \chi(\nu_i, \pi) \sigma_2[f] \\ &\leq 4M(k-1) (1 + \log \chi) + \sigma_2[f] \min\{1, \chi\} \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is the triangle inequality and the second uses (4.15). Therefore, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbb{E}_{\nu_i}[f] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[f]| \leq \frac{1}{n\gamma} \left( \sigma_2[f] \min\{1, \chi\} + 4M [\log \chi]_+^2 + 4M [\log \chi]_+ \right). \quad (4.16)$$

**Variance bound** In the following proof, we provide an upper bound on all higher-order moments of  $\Delta$  simultaneously. Denote  $A = \log(2C)$ ,  $R_1 = 8\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_2^2[f]}{\gamma n}}$ ,  $R_2 = \frac{80M}{\gamma n}$ ,  $s_0 = \frac{20M(\log n)^2}{n}$ . Then, we only need to bound  $\mathbb{E}[|\Delta|^m]$  for even  $m$  under the condition

$$\mathbb{P}(|\Delta| \geq s) \leq \exp(A - s^2/R_1^2) + \exp(A - \sqrt{s/R_2}), \quad \forall s \geq s_0.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}[|\Delta|^m] &= \int_0^\infty s^{m-1} \mathbb{P}(|\Delta| \geq s) ds \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty s^{m-1} \min\{1, \exp(A - s^2/R_1^2) + \exp(A - \sqrt{s/R_2})\} ds \\ &\leq \underbrace{\int_0^\infty s^{m-1} \min\{1, \exp(A - s^2/R_1^2)\} ds}_{I_1} + \underbrace{\int_0^\infty s^{m-1} \min\{1, \exp(A - \sqrt{s/R_2})\} ds}_{I_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we further denote  $s_1 = \max\{s_0, R_1\sqrt{A}\}$ ,  $s_2 = \max\{s_0, R_2A^2\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_0^{s_1} s^{m-1} ds + \int_{s_1}^\infty s^{m-1} \exp(A - s^2/R_1^2) ds \\ &= \frac{s_1^m}{m} + \frac{R_1^m}{2} \int_{s_1}^\infty \left(\frac{s}{R_1}\right)^{m-2} \exp(A - s^2/R_1^2) d\left(\frac{s^2}{R_1^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{s_1^m}{m} + \frac{R_1^m}{2} \int_{s_1^2/R_1^2}^\infty t^{(m-2)/2} \exp(A - t) dt \\ &\leq \frac{s_1^m}{m} + \frac{R_1^m}{m} \left( (A + m/2)^{m/2} - A^{m/2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact  $\int_A^\infty t^{k-1} \exp(A-t) dt \leq (A+k-1)^{k-1} \leq ((A+k)^k - A^k)/k$  for any integer  $k \geq 1$ . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \int_0^\infty s^{m-1} \min\{1, \exp(A - \sqrt{s/R_2})\} ds \\
&= \int_0^{s_2} s^{m-1} ds + \int_{s_2}^\infty s^{m-1} \exp(A - \sqrt{s/R_2}) ds \\
&= \frac{s_2^m}{m} + \int_{\sqrt{s_2/R_2}}^\infty 2R_2^m t^{2m-1} \exp(A - t) dt \\
&\leq \frac{s_2^m}{m} + \frac{R_2^m}{m} ((A + 2m)^{2m} - A^{2m}).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two cases, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|\Delta|^m] &\leq mI_1 + mI_2 \leq s_0^m + s_1^m + R_1^m \left( (A + m/2)^{m/2} - A^{m/2} \right) + R_2^m ((A + 2m)^{2m} - A^{2m}) \\
&\leq 2s_0^m + R_1^m A^{m/2} + R_2^m A^{2m} + R_1^m \left( (A + m/2)^{m/2} - A^{m/2} \right) + R_2^m ((A + 2m)^{2m} - A^{2m}) \\
&= 2s_0^m + R_1^m (A + m/2)^{m/2} + R_2^m (A + 2m)^{2m}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Through Lemma 3, we are able to characterize the sampling error in VMC. For any fixed  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let the MH algorithm generate  $n$  samples  $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n}$ , and the stochastic gradient calculated by (3.7). Then, we give the error bounds of the stochastic gradient with the MCMC estimator in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *Let Assumption 1, 2 and 3 hold. For a fixed parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we generate the MCMC samples  $\mathbf{S} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n}$  with the stationary distribution  $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  by the MH algorithm 1. Suppose we start the MH algorithm from the initial distribution  $\nu$  and let  $\chi = \chi(\nu, \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) < +\infty$ . The stochastic gradient  $\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})$ , defined by (3.7) has the following error bounds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})] - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| &\leq B_{n, n_0} := \frac{4c_1 B}{n\gamma}, \\
\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2 \right] &\leq V_{n, n_0} := \frac{16c_2 B^2 \sigma_2^2 [E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]}{n\gamma} + \frac{40(c_3 + c_4 \log^4 n) B^2 M^2}{n^2 \gamma^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where with  $\chi_{n_0} = (1 - \gamma)^{n_0} \chi$  and  $C = (1 + \chi_{n_0})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , these factors are defined by  $c_1 = \chi_{n_0} \sigma_2 [E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] + 4M[\log \chi_{n_0}]_+^2 + 4M[\log \chi_{n_0}]_+$ ,  $c_2 = 64(1 + \log 2C)$  and  $c_3 = 6400(4 + \log 2C)^4$ ,  $c_4 = 800$ .

*Proof.* The error of the stochastic gradient can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})] - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| &= \sup_{\|v\|=1} |\mathbb{E}[v^T \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})] - v^T g(\boldsymbol{\theta})|, \\
\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2 \right] &= \text{tr} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})) (\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T \right] \right), \\
&\leq d \sup_{\|v\|=1} \mathbb{E}[(v^T \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - v^T g(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2].
\end{aligned}$$

For any given  $v$  such that  $\|v\| = 1$ ,  $v^\top g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is approximated by  $v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})$ . We denote the stationary variables  $E = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $Y = v^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\bar{E} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})]$  with  $\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  and the empirical variables  $E_i = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ,  $Y_i = v^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ,  $\bar{E}_i = E_i - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})]$ . Then it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} (v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - v^\top g(\boldsymbol{\theta})) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} E_i Y_i - \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} E_j \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} Y_i \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[\bar{E}Y] \\ &= \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} \bar{E}_i Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[\bar{E}Y]}_{I_1} - \underbrace{\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} \bar{E}_j \right) \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} Y_i \right)}_{I_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

With Assumptions 1 and 2, we have  $\|\bar{E}\|_{\psi_1} \leq M$  and  $\|Y\| \leq \|v\| \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq B$ . Then the variance is bounded by  $\sigma_2^2[\bar{E}Y] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\bar{E}Y)^2] \leq \sigma_2^2[E]B^2$ . It also holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{|\bar{E}Y - \mathbb{E}[\bar{E}Y]|}{2MB} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( \frac{|\bar{E}|B + MB}{2MB} \right) \right] \leq 2, \quad (4.19)$$

which implies  $\|\bar{E}Y\|_{\psi_1} \leq 2MB$ . Applying Lemma 3 to  $\{\bar{E}_i Y_i\}_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n}$ , we have

$$\|\mathbb{E}[I_1]\| \leq \frac{c_1 B}{n\gamma}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|I_1\|^2] \leq \frac{c_2 dB^2 \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]}{n\gamma} + \frac{4(c_3 d + c_4 d \log^4 n) M^2 B^2}{n^2 \gamma^2}. \quad (4.20)$$

As  $\|\bar{E}\|_{\psi_1} \leq M$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}[\bar{E}] = 0$  and  $\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} Y_i \right\| \leq B$ , Lemma 3 implies that

$$\|\mathbb{E}[I_2]\| \leq \frac{c_1 B}{n\gamma}, \quad \mathbb{E}[\|I_2\|^2] \leq \frac{c_2 dB^2 \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]}{n\gamma} + \frac{(c_3 d + c_4 d \log^4 n) M^2 B^2}{n^2 \gamma^2}. \quad (4.21)$$

Combining (4.20) and (4.21), we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})]\| &= 2 \|\mathbb{E}[I_1 - I_2]\| \leq 2 \|\mathbb{E}[I_1]\| + 2 \|\mathbb{E}[I_2]\| \leq B_{n,n_0}, \\ \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2] &= 4\mathbb{E}[\|I_1 - I_2\|^2] \leq 8\mathbb{E}[\|I_1\|^2] + 8\mathbb{E}[\|I_2\|^2] \leq V_{n,n_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.22)$$

where  $B_{n,n_0}, V_{n,n_0}$  are given in (4.17).  $\square$

### 4.3 First order convergence

In this subsection, we will first analyze the descent for one iteration based on the error bounds. Then, our main result shows the first order convergence of the VMC method in expectation.

Under our assumptions in subsection 4.1, we can establish the  $L$ -smoothness of the objective function  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  to perform a standardized analysis in optimization. This is a common condition for functions to achieve effective descent. We prove the following lemma by giving the bound of the Hessian.

**Lemma 5.** *Let Assumption 1 and 2 hold. There exists a constant  $L > 0$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is  $L$ -smooth, that is*

$$\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)\| \leq L \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\|, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (4.23)$$

*Proof.* As Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [|\bar{E}_{\theta}|] \leq M.$$

The Hessian  $H(\theta)$  defined in (3.4) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|H(\theta)\| &\leq \|H_1\| + \|H_2\| + \|H_3\| + 2\|H_{12}\| \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\|\nabla_{\theta} E_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_{\theta}^{\top}\|] + 4\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [|\bar{E}_{\theta}| \|\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_{\theta} \nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_{\theta}^{\top}\|] \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [|\bar{E}_{\theta}| \|\nabla_{\theta}^2 \log \Psi_{\theta}\|] + 8\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [|\bar{E}_{\theta}| \|\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_{\theta}\|] \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\theta}} [\|\nabla_{\theta} \log \Psi_{\theta}^{\top}\|] \\ &\leq 2BL_1 + 4MB^2 + 2ML_2 + 8MB^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Assumptions 1 and 2. Let  $L = 2BL_1 + 2ML_2 + 12MB^2$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$  is  $L$ -smooth.  $\square$

According to [30], the  $L$ -smoothness (4.23) is also equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_2) \leq \mathcal{L}(\theta_1) + \langle g(\theta_1), \theta_2 - \theta_1 \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2. \quad (4.24)$$

It is already known that the stochastic gradient  $\hat{g}$  is biased, unlike the unbiased estimator in the classical SGD. However, the bias decays with increasing burn-in time  $n_0$  or the sample size  $n$ , which can be regarded sufficiently small. We discuss the expected descent of the function value within each iteration in the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *If the stepsize  $\alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{2L}$ , for any given  $\theta_k$  the loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\theta_{k+1})$  decreases in expectation as*

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_k) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\theta_{k+1})|\theta_k] \geq \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}(\theta_k)\|^2 - \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \cdot B_{n,n_0}^2 - \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \cdot V_{n,n_0}. \quad (4.25)$$

where  $B_{n,n_0}$  and  $V_{n,n_0}$  are defined in Lemma 4.

*Proof.* For convenience, we simplify the notations with  $\mathcal{L}_k := \mathcal{L}(\theta_k)$ ,  $g_k := g(\theta_k)$  and  $\hat{g}_k := \hat{g}(\theta_k, \mathbf{S}_k)$  for any  $k \geq 1$ . By Lemma 5, we perform a gradient descent analysis of the iteration (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{k+1} &\leq \mathcal{L}_k + \langle g_k, \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{L}_k - \alpha_k \langle g_k, \hat{g}_k - g_k \rangle - \alpha_k \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \|\hat{g}_k\|^2 \\ &= \mathcal{L}_k - (\alpha_k - \alpha_k^2 L) \langle g_k, \hat{g}_k - g_k \rangle - \left( \alpha_k - \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \right) \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \|\hat{g}_k - g_k\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Taking the conditional expectation of (4.26) on  $\theta_k$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1}|\theta_k] &\leq \mathcal{L}_k - \left( \alpha_k - \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \right) \|g_k\|^2 \\ &\quad - (\alpha_k - \alpha_k^2 L) \langle g_k, \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_k|\theta_k] - g_k \rangle + \frac{\alpha_k^2 L}{2} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}_k - g_k\|^2|\theta_k]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.27)$$



Through the fact  $|\langle x, y \rangle| \leq (\|x\|^2 + \|y\|^2)/2$ , it holds

$$-(\alpha_k - \alpha_k^2 L) \langle g_k, \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k] - g_k \rangle \leq \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_k^2 L}{2} \|g_k\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_k}{2} \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k] - g_k\|^2. \quad (4.28)$$

Therefore, we can plug in (4.28) to (4.27) and rearrange to get

$$2(\mathcal{L}_k - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_{k+1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k]) \geq \alpha_k \|g_k\|^2 - \alpha_k \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_k | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k] - g_k\|^2 - L\alpha_k^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{g}_k - g_k\|^2 | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k]. \quad (4.29)$$

Thus, (4.25) holds when we substitute the error bounds in Lemma 4 into (4.29).  $\square$

As  $n$  goes towards positive infinity, the objective function decreases as an exact gradient descent. However,  $n$  and  $n_0$  are not too large because of the high sampling cost in practice. The error bounds studied in Section 4.2 are valuable for our analysis of the stochastic optimization. Since  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is non-convex, we consider the convergence rate in terms of the expected norm of the gradient  $\mathbb{E}\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\|^2$ . Finally, we establish our first-order convergence results as follows.

**Theorem 2.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold and  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\}$  be generated by Algorithm 2. If the stepsize satisfies  $\alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{2L}$ , then for any  $K$ , we have*

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)\|^2 \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k}\right) + O\left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2}{n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k}\right) + O\left(\frac{(1-\gamma)^{2n_0}}{n^2}\right), \quad (4.30)$$

where  $O(\cdot)$  hides constants  $\gamma, M, B, C$  and retains  $n, n_0$  and  $K$ . In particular, if the stepsize is chosen as  $\alpha_k = \frac{c\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{k}}$  where  $c \leq \frac{1}{2L}$ , then we have

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)\|^2 \leq O\left(\frac{\log K}{\sqrt{nK}}\right) + O\left(\frac{(1-\gamma)^{2n_0}}{n^2}\right). \quad (4.31)$$

*Proof.* Lemma 6 suggests that, for any  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\alpha_k \|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)\|^2 \leq 2(\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1}) | \boldsymbol{\theta}_k]) + \alpha_k \cdot B_{n, n_0}^2 + \alpha_k^2 \cdot LV_{n, n_0}.$$

Thus, taking total expectation and summing over  $k = 1, \dots, K$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k\right) \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} \mathbb{E}\left[\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)\|^2\right] &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \mathbb{E}\left[\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_k)\|^2\right] \\ &\leq 2(\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{K+1})]) + \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2 \cdot LV_{n, n_0} + \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \cdot B_{n, n_0}^2 \\ &= O(1) + \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2 \cdot O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k \cdot O\left(\frac{(1-\gamma)^{2n_0}}{n^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Divide both sides by  $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k$ , then (4.30) holds. If we take  $\alpha_k = \frac{c\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{k}}$ , (4.31) is implied by

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{k}} = O(\sqrt{nK}), \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{c^2 n}{k} = O(n \log K).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Theorem 2 shows the convergence rate of the VMC method with certain choices of stepsizes. The convergence rate is related to  $K$  and the sample size  $n$  with an additional term from the bias. The burn-in period  $n_0$  influences the bias. Theoretically, when  $n_0$  is sufficiently large, the Markov chain becomes stationary and the bias is reduced to zero, regardless of the sample size  $n$ .

## 5 Escaping from saddle points

In this section, we discuss how VMC escapes from saddle points. First, a second moment lower-bound for non-stationary Markov chains is developed to guarantee the efficient noise. Then, we verify that the correlated negative curvature condition is satisfied by VMC. Eventually, we demonstrate our convergence analysis of Algorithm 2 to reach approximate second-order stationary points in high probability.

To deal with the second-order structure, the following assumption is needed.

**Assumption 4.** (1) The Hessian matrix  $H(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  defined in (3.4) is  $\rho$ -Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,

$$\|H(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) - H(\boldsymbol{\theta}_2)\| \leq \rho \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_2\|, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(2) Let  $v$  be the unit eigenvector with respect to the minimum eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix  $H(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Let  $\sigma_2^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  be the variance of the local energy in the quantum system. There exists a constant  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \left[ (\bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) v^T \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}))^2 \right] \geq \eta \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}], \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

(3) For any  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the ratio of the sub-exponential norm of the local energy to its variance has an upper bound  $\kappa > 0$ , that is,

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\|E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_{\psi_1}}{\sigma_2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]} \leq \kappa.$$

The first assumption is common to perform a second-order convergence analysis. The second assumption shows the relationship between the gradient  $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} [\bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})]$  and a negative curvature direction  $v$ . It guarantees the variance of the stochastic gradient will not disappear along a negative curvature direction unless the local energy has a zero variance. We assume that the absolute angle between the gradient and the eigenvector of Hessian is expected to have a positive lower bound. The third one guarantees that the local energy will have a respectively light-tailed distribution. It holds for most of distributions and especially near the ground state of quantum many-body problems.

Besides, over Assumption 1 and 2, we can assume an upper bound of the stochastic gradient to simplify our analysis:

$$l_g := \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\| < +\infty. \quad (5.1)$$

This treatment is legal because  $\bar{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$  is assumed to sub-exponential. Otherwise, the proof can be also established with similar techniques in section 4.2. The upper bound will simplify our proof in Lemma 10.

## 5.1 The Correlated Negative Curvature condition

We first prove a general lemma about the second moment for non-stationary Markov chains. The lemma shows that the second moment of the MCMC estimation has a positive lower-bound relying on the sample size  $n$ , the spectral gap  $\gamma$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f^2]$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{n_0+n}$  be the Markov chain with the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and the initial distribution  $\nu$ . Suppose it admits a absolute spectral gap  $\gamma$  and  $\chi = \chi(\nu, \pi) < +\infty$ . The function  $f$  has a finite fourth central moment  $\sigma_4^4[f] := \mathbb{E}_\pi[(f - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^4]$ . If  $n \geq \frac{32}{\gamma^3}$  and  $n_0 \geq \frac{2}{\gamma}(\log \chi + \log(\sigma_4[f]/\sigma_2[f]) + \log n)$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i) \right)^2 \right] \geq \frac{\gamma}{4n} \mathbb{E}_\pi[f^2]. \quad (5.2)$$

*Proof.* We denote  $Z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i)$  and  $c = \mathbb{E}_\pi[f]$ . Then it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z^2] = c^2 + \mathbb{E}_\nu[(Z - c)^2] + 2c(\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z] - c) \geq \frac{c^2}{2} + \mathbb{E}_\nu[(Z - c)^2] - 2(\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z] - c)^2. \quad (5.3)$$

Notice the difference

$$|\mathbb{E}_\nu[(Z - c)^2] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[(Z - c)^2]| \leq (1 - \gamma)^{n_0} \chi \cdot (\mathbb{E}_\pi[(Z - c)^4])^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (5.4)$$

where the inequality changes the measure as in (4.12). It follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\pi[(Z - c)^4] &= \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right)^4 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} (f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^4 \right] = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi} [(f(X) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^4] = \sigma_4^4[f], \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is because  $\pi$  is the stationary distribution of the Markov chain. Therefore, we derive that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu[(Z - c)^2] \geq \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right)^2 \right] - (1 - \gamma)^{n_0} \chi \sigma_4^2[f]. \quad (5.5)$$

It holds from Theorem 3.1 in [24] that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right)^2 \right] - \frac{\sigma_{asy}^2[f]}{n} \right| \leq \frac{16\sigma_2^2[f]}{\gamma^2 n^2}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $\sigma_{asy}^2[f] := \langle f, [2(I - (P - \pi))^{-1} - I]f \rangle_\pi$  on page 24 of [24]. Using the spectral method therein, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{asy}^2[f] &= \langle f, [2(I - (P - \pi))^{-1} - I]f \rangle_\pi = \|(I - P)^{-1}f\|_\pi^2 - \|P(I - P)^{-1}f\|_\pi^2 \\ &\geq (1 - (1 - \gamma)^2) \|(I - P)^{-1}f\|_\pi^2 \geq \frac{\gamma\sigma_2^2[f]}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Next, we bound the term  $(\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z] - c)^2$  in (5.3). By Lemma 3, it holds that

$$|\mathbb{E}_\nu[Z] - c| = \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} \mathbb{E}_\pi[f(X_i)] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[f] \right| \leq \frac{(1-\gamma)^{n_0} \chi \sigma_2[f]}{\gamma n}. \quad (5.8)$$

Finally, combining (5.3), (5.5), (5.6), (5.7) and (5.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n+n_0} f(X_i) \right)^2 \right] &\geq \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^2 + \frac{\gamma \sigma_2^2[f]}{2n} - \frac{16 \sigma_2^2[f]}{\gamma^2 n^2} - (1-\gamma)^{n_0} \chi \sigma_4^2[f] - \frac{2(1-\gamma)^{2n_0} \chi^2 \sigma_2^2[f]}{\gamma^2 n^2} \\ &\geq \sigma_2^2[f] \left( \frac{\gamma}{n} - \frac{16}{\gamma^2 n^2} - \frac{2(1-\gamma)^{2n_0} \chi^2}{\gamma^2 n^2} - (1-\gamma)^{n_0} \chi \cdot \frac{\sigma_4^2[f]}{\sigma_2^2[f]} \right) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma}{4n} \sigma_2^2[f] + \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{E}_\pi[f])^2 \geq \frac{\gamma}{4n} \mathbb{E}_\pi[f^2], \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality holds when  $n \geq \frac{32}{\gamma^3}$  and  $n_0 \geq \frac{2}{\gamma} (\log \chi + \log(\sigma_4[f]/\sigma_2[f]) + \log n)$ .  $\square$

The CNC condition (5.9) in the following is of vital importance to analyze the saddle escaping property in VMC. That is one of the reason why stochastic optimization algorithms can escape from saddle points. If the CNC condition does not hold, the noise may not be strong enough to escape along the descent direction. The following lemma shows that the stochastic gradient  $\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S})$  defined in (3.7) satisfies CNC condition.

**Lemma 8.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold. Then, for the unit eigenvector  $v$  with respect to the minimum eigenvalue of the Hessian, there exists  $\mu = \frac{\eta \kappa}{16n}$  such that it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu \left[ (v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{S}))^2 \right] \geq \mu \sigma_2^2[E_\theta], \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad (5.9)$$

as long as  $n \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\eta \gamma^3}\right) + \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\kappa B}{\sqrt{\eta \gamma^2}}\right)$  and  $n_0 \geq \frac{2}{\gamma} (\log \chi + \log(2\kappa) + \log n)$  where  $\Omega(\cdot)$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}(\cdot)$  hide constants  $M, B, C, \chi$ .

*Proof.* The MCMC estimate of the gradient  $\hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{S})$  is computed by (3.7). For convenience, fix a unit vector  $v$  and we denote empirical variables by  $E_i = E_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ,  $Y_i = v^\top \nabla_\theta \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i)$  and  $\bar{E}, \bar{Y}$  represents the average of  $E_i, Y_i$ . Let stationary variables  $E = E_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  and  $Y = v^\top \nabla_\theta \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x})$  with a dependent variable  $\mathbf{x} \sim \pi_\theta$ , then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{S}) &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n} (E_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n} E_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i)) v^\top \nabla \log \Psi_\theta(\mathbf{x}_i) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n} E_i Y_i - 2 (\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E + \mathbb{E}E) (\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y + \mathbb{E}Y) \\ &= \frac{2}{n} \underbrace{\sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n_0+n} (E_i - \mathbb{E}E)(Y_i - \mathbb{E}Y)}_{Z_1} - \underbrace{2 (\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E) (\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)}_{Z_2}. \end{aligned}$$

To obtain the lower bound, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [(v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{S}))^2] = \mathbb{E}_\nu [(Z_1 - Z_2)^2] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_1^2] - \mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2].$$

Since  $e^x > x^4/8$  when  $x \geq 0$ , it holds that  $\sigma_4[E] \leq 2 \|E\|_{\psi_1}$ . It implies the kurtosis of the local energy  $\sigma_4[E]/\sigma_2[E]$  is less than  $2\kappa$ . Then, when  $n \geq \frac{32}{\gamma^3}$  and  $n_0 \geq \frac{2}{\gamma}(\log \chi + \log(2\kappa) + \log n)$ , it follows from Lemma 7 that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_1^2] \geq \frac{\gamma}{4n} \mathbb{E}_\pi [(E - \mathbb{E}E)^2 (Y - \mathbb{E}Y)^2] \geq \frac{\eta\gamma\sigma_2^2[E_\theta]}{4n}. \quad (5.10)$$

Besides, the upper bound of  $\mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2]$  can be obtained by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2] = 4 \mathbb{E}_\nu [(\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E)^2 (\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)^2] \leq 4 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\nu [(\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E)^4] \cdot \mathbb{E}_\nu [(\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)^4]}. \quad (5.11)$$

By the result in the proof of Lemma 3, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [|\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E|^4] \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma_2^4[E_\theta]}{n^2\gamma^2} + \frac{M^4(\log n)^8}{n^4\gamma^4} \right). \quad (5.12)$$

Similarly, notice that  $|Y| = |v^\top \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \|v\| \|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{x})\| \leq B$ , we can apply [8, Theorem 12] to obtain

$$\mathbb{P} (|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y| \geq t) \leq 2C \exp \left( -\frac{n\gamma t^2}{4B^2} \right).$$

Using the similar technique in the proof of Lemma 2, we derive

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [|\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y|^4] \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{B^4}{n^2\gamma^2} \right). \quad (5.13)$$

Plugging (5.12) and (5.13) into (5.11) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2] \leq 4 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\nu [(\bar{E} - \mathbb{E}E)^4] \cdot \mathbb{E}_\nu [(\bar{Y} - \mathbb{E}Y)^4]} \leq \mathcal{O} \left( \frac{\sigma_2^2[E_\theta]B^2}{n^2\gamma^2} + \frac{(\log n)^4 M^2 B^2}{n^3\gamma^3} \right).$$

Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2] \leq \frac{\eta\gamma\sigma_2^2[E_\theta]}{32n}$  as long as  $n \geq \Omega \left( \frac{1}{\eta\gamma^3} \right) + \tilde{\Omega} \left( \frac{\kappa B}{\sqrt{\eta\gamma^2}} \right)$ . Finally, combining our discussion of  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$ , we derive that

$$\mathbb{E}_\nu [(v^\top \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{S}))^2] \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_1^2] - \mathbb{E}_\nu [Z_2^2] \geq \frac{\eta\gamma\sigma_2^2[E_\theta]}{32n}. \quad (5.14)$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Second order stationary

As discussed above, VMC performs a special SGD with the biased gradient estimator. While the convergence of SGD is well-understood for convex functions, the existence of saddle points and local minimum poses challenges for non-convex optimization. Since the ordinary GD often sticks near the saddle points, the additional noise within SGD allows it to escape from saddle points. By this way, the simple SGD without explicit improvement is proven to have second-order convergence.

We now give the definition of approximate second-order stationary point.

**Definition 3** (Approximate second-order stationary point). *Given a function  $\mathcal{L}$ , an  $(\epsilon_g, \epsilon_h)$  approximate second-order stationary point  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  is defined as*

$$\|g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \epsilon_g, \quad \lambda_{\min}(H(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \leq -\epsilon_h,$$

where  $g$  and  $H$  denote the gradient and Hessian of  $\mathcal{L}$  respectively.

If  $\epsilon_g = \epsilon_h = 0$ , the point  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is a second-order stationary point. The second order analysis contributes to understand how VMC performs well in solving eigenvalue problems.

We simultaneously consider the convergence of the VMC method from the perspective of optimization and eigenvalue equations. When the exact wavefunction  $\Psi$  satisfies  $\mathcal{H}\Psi = \lambda\Psi$ , the variance of the local energy  $\sigma_2^2[E]$  is equal to zero. Naturally, we define  $\epsilon$ -variance points as a criteria for the trial wavefunction approximation.

**Definition 4** ( $\epsilon$ -variance point). *For the optimization problem (3.2), we call  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  an  $\epsilon$ -variance point if the local energy satisfies  $\sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] < \epsilon$ .*

For notational simplification, we take an abbreviation  $\sigma_2^2 = \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}]$  in this subsection.

To escape from saddle points, a new stepsize schedule is established for Algorithm 2. Given a period  $T$ , note that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are the constant stepsizes with  $\beta > \alpha > 0$ , with values given in Table 1. Within one iteration period of  $T$  steps, we adopt a large stepsize  $\beta$  at the beginning of the period and a small one  $\alpha$  at the other  $T - 1$  iterations, that is,

$$\alpha_k = \begin{cases} \alpha, & k(\bmod T) \neq 0, \\ \beta, & k(\bmod T) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

It will be shown that the schedule can be suitably designed to achieve sufficient descent in one period.

Suppose the total number of iterations  $K$  is a multiple of  $T$  and there are  $K/T$  periods. We denote  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{m \cdot T}$  for  $m = 0, 1, \dots, K/T$  in each period. For some given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we consider four regimes of the iterates  $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m\}$  as follow,

$$\mathcal{R}_1 := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \|g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \geq \epsilon \right\}, \quad (5.16)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \|g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < \epsilon, \lambda_{\min}(H(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \leq -\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}, \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] \geq \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}, \quad (5.17)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_3 := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \mid \|g(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| < \epsilon, \lambda_{\min}(H(\boldsymbol{\theta})) > -\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}, \text{ or } \sigma_2^2[E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}] < \epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}, \quad (5.18)$$

$\mathcal{R}_1$  stands for the regime with a large gradient, where the stochastic gradient works effectively. When the iterate lies in  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , despite being close to a first-order stationary point, the CNC condition mentioned in section 5.1 guarantees a decrease after  $T$  iterations under our schedule.  $\mathcal{R}_3$  is a regime of  $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{1/4})$  approximate second order stationary points or  $\epsilon^{1/2}$  variance points. We need to show Algorithm 2 will reach  $\mathcal{R}_3$  with high probability, that is, converge to approximate second order stationary points.

The analysis below relies on a particular choice of parameters, whose values satisfy the following lemmas and the main theorem. For ease of verification, the choice of parameters is collected in Table 1.

With a large gradient, it is easy to show a sufficient decrease of the objective function value. We have analyzed the decrease for each iteration in Lemma 6, and it follows a similar argument for the biased SGD in VMC.

Parameter	Value	Order	Conditions
$\beta$	$\frac{\delta\epsilon^2}{192l_g\rho LV_{n,n_0}}$	$O(\epsilon)$	(5.22), (5.39)
$\alpha$	$\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{T}}$	$O(\epsilon^{9/4} \log^{-1}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$	(5.39)
$\mathcal{D}$	$\frac{\beta\epsilon^2}{192\rho l_g}$	$O(\epsilon^3)$	(5.22), (5.39)
$n$	$\frac{n\gamma}{64\epsilon}$	$O(\epsilon^{-1})$	Lemma 8
$n_0$	-	$O(\log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$	(4.17), Lemma 8
$B_{n,n_0}$	$\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon^2}{96T^{3/2}l_g\rho}}$	$O(\epsilon^3)$	(5.22), (5.39)
$T$	$\frac{1}{\beta^2\epsilon^{1/2}} \log^2\left(\frac{\rho l_g LV_{n,n_0}}{\mu\delta\epsilon}\right)$	$O(\epsilon^{-5/2} \log^2 \epsilon)$	(5.43)
$K$	$\frac{2[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathcal{L}^*]T}{\delta\mathcal{D}}$	$O(\epsilon^{-11/2} \log^2 \epsilon)$	(5.48)

Table 1: List of parameter values used in the convergence analysis.

**Lemma 9.** Suppose that  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$  lies in  $\mathcal{R}_1$  defined in (5.16) and Algorithm 2 updates with the schedule (5.15) and parameters in Table 1, then the expected value of  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})$  taken over the randomness of  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\}_{k=m\cdot T+1}^{(m+1)\cdot T}$  decreases as

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m] \geq \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.19)$$

*Proof.* We first decompose the difference of the expected function value into each iteration,

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m] = \sum_{p=0}^{T-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T+p}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T+p+1})] \middle| \boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T+p} \right], \quad (5.20)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T})|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T}] = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)$  due to the definition  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{m\cdot T}$ . Using the choice  $\beta^2 = T\alpha^2$  in Table 1, it follows from (5.20) that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left( \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m] \right) &\geq \beta \left\| g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \right\|^2 - \beta B_{n,n_0}^2 - \beta^2 LV_{n,n_0} \\ &\quad - (T-1) (\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 + \alpha^2 LV_{n,n_0}) \\ &\geq \beta \left\| g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \right\|^2 - 2T\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 - 2\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

where the first inequality is by Lemma 6 for  $p = 0, \dots, T-1$  and the second is by the direct substitution. Then, by the choice of  $\beta, n_0, \mathcal{D}$  in Table 1, these conditions hold that

$$\beta \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{8LV_{n,n_0}}, \quad B_{n,n_0}^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{8\sqrt{T}}, \quad \mathcal{D} \leq \frac{\beta\epsilon^2}{4}. \quad (5.22)$$

As  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$  lies in  $\mathcal{R}_1$ , which means  $\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m)\| \geq \epsilon$ , we plug (5.22) into (5.21) and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 2\left(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m]\right) &\geq \beta\epsilon^2 - 2\beta\sqrt{T}B_{n,n_0}^2 - 2\beta LV_{n,n_0} \cdot \frac{\epsilon^2}{8LV_{n,n_0}} \\ &\geq \beta\epsilon^2 - \frac{\beta\epsilon^2}{4} - \frac{\beta\epsilon^2}{4} = \frac{\beta\epsilon^2}{2} \geq 2\mathcal{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.23)$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Near the saddle points, the classical GD gets stuck if the gradient is orthogonal to the negative curvature direction. However, the stochastic gradient with the CNC condition has inherent noise along the negative curvature direction. Under our stepsize schedule (5.15), the objective function value can have sufficient decrease after a period.

**Lemma 10.** *Suppose  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$  lies in  $\mathcal{R}_2$  defined in (5.17) and Algorithm 2 updates with the schedule (5.15) and parameters in Table 1, then the expected value of  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})$  taken over the randomness of  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_k\}_{k=m}^{(m+1)\cdot T}$  decreases as*

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m] \geq \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.24)$$

*Proof.* The proof is by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we suppose that  $m = 0$  in this proof and denote

$$\mathcal{L}_p = \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p), \quad g_p = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p), \quad \hat{g}_p = \hat{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p, \mathbf{S}_p), \quad H_p = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^2\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p)$$

for  $p = 0, \dots, T-1$ . Every expectation in this proof is taken over all existed  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$  in every formula. We assume the expected function value decreases by no more than  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_T] < \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.25)$$

We proceed to show that the assumption (5.25) is invalid.

We start with estimating the expected distance between  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$  for  $p = 1, \dots, T-1$ . By Lemma 6, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} 2(\mathcal{L}_0 - \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{L}_T]) &\geq \beta\|g_0\|^2 - \beta B_{n,n_0}^2 - \beta^2 LV_{n,n_0} + \sum_{h=1}^{T-1} \left(\alpha\mathbb{E}\|g_h\|^2 - \alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 - \alpha^2 LV_{n,n_0}\right) \\ &\geq \beta\|g_0\|^2 + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\|g_h\|^2 - 2T\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 - 2\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.26)$$

where the first inequality is derived similarly to (5.21), and the second inequality is due to  $\beta = \sqrt{T}\alpha$ . Together with the assumption (5.25), it follows that

$$\beta\|g_0\|^2 + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^{T-1} \mathbb{E}\|g_h\|^2 \leq 2\mathcal{D} + 2T\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 + 2\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0} =: A_1. \quad (5.27)$$

A direct implication of (5.27) is that

$$\beta\|g_0\|^2 \leq A_1, \quad \alpha\mathbb{E}\left\|\sum_{h=1}^p g_h\right\|^2 \leq p\alpha \sum_{h=1}^p \mathbb{E}\|g_h\|^2 \leq pA_1. \quad (5.28)$$



We proceed to bound  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \beta \hat{g}_0 + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^p \hat{g}_h$  as follows. Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{h=1}^p (\hat{g}_h - g_h) \right\|^2 &= \sum_{h=1}^p \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_h - g_h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq h < l \leq p} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{g}_h - g_h, \hat{g}_l - g_l \rangle \\
&= \sum_{h=1}^p \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_h - g_h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq h < l \leq p} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{g}_h - g_h, \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_l | \boldsymbol{\theta}_l] - g_l \rangle \\
&\leq pV_{n,n_0} + p(p-1)B_{n,n_0} \sqrt{V_{n,n_0}} \leq 2pV_{n,n_0} + p^3 B_{n,n_0}^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where the second equality is because we can take conditional expectation on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_l$  first, the following inequality holds from the result  $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_h - g_h\|^2 \leq V_{n,n_0}$  and  $\|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_l | \boldsymbol{\theta}_l] - g_l\| \leq B_{n,n_0}$  in Lemma 4, and the last inequality is due to AM-GM inequality. Therefore, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left\| \beta \hat{g}_0 + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^p \hat{g}_h \right\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left\| \beta g_0 + \beta(\hat{g}_0 - g_0) + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^p g_h + \alpha \sum_{h=1}^p (\hat{g}_h - g_h) \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \underbrace{4\beta^2 \|g_0\|^2}_{(5.28)} + \underbrace{4\beta^2 \mathbb{E} \|\hat{g}_0 - g_0\|^2}_{\text{lemma 4}} + \underbrace{4\alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{h=1}^p g_h \right\|^2}_{(5.28)} + \underbrace{4\alpha^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{h=1}^p (\hat{g}_h - g_h) \right\|^2}_{(5.29)} \\
&\leq 4\beta A_1 + 4\beta^2 V_{n,n_0} + 4\alpha p A_1 + 2\alpha^2 (2pV_{n,n_0} + p^3 B_{n,n_0}^2) \\
&\leq 4\beta A_1 + 8\beta^2 V_{n,n_0} + 4p(\alpha A_1 + \alpha^2 T^2 B_{n,n_0}^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

where the second inequality is due to (5.28), Lemma 4 and (5.29), and the final follows from  $p\alpha^2 \leq T\alpha^2 = \beta^2$ . Thus, we can take

$$\begin{aligned}
A_2 &:= 8\alpha D + 16\alpha^2 T^2 B_{n,n_0}^2 + 8\alpha\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0}, \\
A_3 &:= 8\beta D + 8\alpha\beta T B_{n,n_0}^2 + 16\beta^2 V_{n,n_0},
\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_p - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 \leq (p-1)A_2 + A_3. \tag{5.31}$$

When we take  $p = T - 1$ , (5.30) shows that the expected distance between  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_T$  is bounded by a quadratic function of  $T$ .

We further prove the expected distance between  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_T$  grows at least exponentially for  $T$ , leading to a contradiction. Since  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_p$  stays close to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ , the quadratic Taylor approximation of the function  $\mathcal{L}$  at  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  is introduced as

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \mathcal{L}_0 + g_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\top H_0 (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0).$$

We denote  $Q_p = Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p)$  and  $q_p = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p) = g_0 + H_0(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$  for  $p = 0, \dots, T-1$ . Using the Taylor approximation is firstly proposed in [10]. As  $\mathcal{L}$  is twice-differentiable with a  $\rho$ -Lipschitz Hessian,

[22, Lemma 1.2.4] gives that

$$\|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}Q(\boldsymbol{\theta})\| \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2. \quad (5.32)$$

Thus,  $\|q_h - g_h\|^2 \leq \frac{\rho}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_h - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2$ . To derive the lower bound,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  is decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_p - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \alpha \hat{g}_p \\ &= \boldsymbol{\theta}_p - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 - \alpha q_p - \alpha(\hat{g}_p - g_p + g_p - q_p) \\ &= (I - \alpha H_0)(\boldsymbol{\theta}_p - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \alpha g_0 - \alpha(\hat{g}_p - g_p + g_p - q_p). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $-\lambda_0 < 0$  be the minimum eigenvalue of the Hessian  $H_0 = H(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ , and let  $v$  be the unit eigenvector with respect to  $-\lambda_0$  (which is deterministic conditional on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ ). Then  $(I - \alpha H_0)v = (1 + \alpha\lambda_0)v = \kappa v$ , and hence

$$\langle v, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \rangle = \kappa \langle v, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \rangle - \alpha \langle v, g_0 \rangle - \alpha \langle v, \hat{g}_p - q_p \rangle.$$

Recursively expanding this equality out, we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \rangle &= \kappa^p \langle v, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \rangle - \alpha \langle v, g_0 \rangle \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{p-h} - \alpha \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{p-h} \langle v, \hat{g}_h - q_h \rangle \\ &= \kappa^p \left[ \underbrace{\beta \langle v, -\hat{g}_0 \rangle}_u - \alpha \underbrace{\frac{1 - \kappa^{-p}}{\kappa - 1} \langle v, g_0 \rangle}_{d_p} - \alpha \underbrace{\sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \langle v, \hat{g}_h - g_h \rangle}_{\xi_p} - \alpha \underbrace{\sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \langle v, g_h - q_h \rangle}_{\delta_p} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|^2 &\geq \mathbb{E} \langle v, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \rangle^2 = \kappa^{2p} \mathbb{E} (\beta u - \alpha d_p - \alpha \xi_p - \alpha \delta_p)^2 \\ &\geq \kappa^{2p} (\beta^2 \mathbb{E}[u^2] - 2\alpha\beta \mathbb{E}[ud_p] - 2\alpha\beta \mathbb{E}[u\xi_p] - 2\alpha\beta \mathbb{E}[u\delta_p]). \end{aligned} \quad (5.34)$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 8 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}u^2 = \mathbb{E}[(v^T \hat{g}_0)^2] \geq \mu \sigma_2^2. \quad (5.35)$$

where  $\mu = \frac{\eta\gamma}{16n}$ . Next, because  $d_p$  is deterministic, the term  $\mathbb{E}[ud_p]$  can be bounded as

$$\mathbb{E}[ud_p] = -d_p \mathbb{E} \langle v, \hat{g}_0 \rangle = -d_p \langle v, g_0 \rangle + d_p \mathbb{E} \langle v, g_0 - \hat{g}_0 \rangle \leq d_p \mathbb{E} \langle v, g_0 - \hat{g}_0 \rangle \leq \frac{l_g B_{n, n_0}}{\kappa - 1}, \quad (5.36)$$

where the first inequality is due to  $-d_p \langle v, g_0 \rangle = -\frac{1 - \kappa^{-p}}{\kappa - 1} \langle v, g_0 \rangle^2 \leq 0$ , and the second inequality uses Lemma 4.

We next upper bound the term  $\mathbb{E}[u\xi_p]$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[u\xi_p] &= \mathbb{E}u \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \langle v, \hat{g}_h - g_h \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left[ u \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \langle v, \mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_h | \boldsymbol{\theta}_h] - g_h \rangle \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |u| \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{g}_h | \boldsymbol{\theta}_h] - g_h\| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ l_g \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} B_{n, n_0} \right] \leq \frac{l_g B_{n, n_0}}{\kappa - 1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.37)$$

where the second inequality is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and in the last inequality we use Lemma 4.

Finally, we bound the term  $\mathbb{E}[u\delta_p]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[u\delta_p] &= \mathbb{E}\left[u \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \langle v, g_h - q_h \rangle\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[l_g \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \|g_h - q_h\|\right] \\ &\leq \frac{l_g \rho}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} \|\theta_h - \theta_0\|^2\right] \leq \frac{l_g \rho}{2} \sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h} (A_2(h-1) + A_3) \\ &\leq \frac{l_g \rho}{2} \left[\frac{A_2}{(\kappa-1)^2} + \frac{A_3}{\kappa-1}\right],\end{aligned}\tag{5.38}$$

where the second inequality is due to (5.1), the third inequality uses (5.31), and the last inequality is because  $\sum_{h=1}^p \kappa^{-h}(h-1) \leq \frac{1}{(\kappa-1)^2}$ .

Substituting the four inequalities (5.35), (5.36), (5.37) and (5.38) into (5.34), we obtain the lower bound as

$$\mathbb{E}\|\theta_{p+1} - \theta_0\|^2 \geq \kappa^{2p} \left( \beta^2 \mu \sigma_2^2 - 2\alpha\beta \frac{l_g B_{n,n_0}}{\kappa-1} - 2\alpha\beta \frac{l_g B_{n,n_0}}{\kappa-1} - 2\alpha\beta \frac{l_g \rho}{2} \left[ \frac{A_2}{(\kappa-1)^2} + \frac{A_3}{\kappa-1} \right] \right).$$

According to our settings in Table 1, these conditions are satisfied:

$$\mathcal{D} \leq \frac{\mu \sigma_2^2 \lambda_0 \cdot \min\{\beta \lambda_0, 1\}}{192 l_g \rho}, \quad B_{n,n_0}^2 \leq \frac{\mu \beta \sigma_2^2 \lambda_0 \cdot \min\{\beta T \lambda_0, 1\}}{384 \alpha T^2 l_g \rho}, \quad \beta \leq \frac{\mu \sigma_2^2 \lambda_0^2 L}{384 l_g \rho L V_{n,n_0}}.\tag{5.39}$$

It follows that

$$A_2 \leq \frac{\mu \alpha \beta \sigma_2^2 \lambda_0^2}{8 l_g \rho}, \quad A_3 \leq \frac{\mu \beta \sigma_2^2 \lambda_0}{8 l_g \rho}.\tag{5.40}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\theta_{p+1} - \theta_0\|^2 \geq \kappa^{2p} \left( \beta^2 \mu \sigma_2^2 - \frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \mu \sigma_2^2 - \frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \mu \sigma_2^2 - \frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \mu \sigma_2^2 \right) = \frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \kappa^{2p} \mu \sigma_2^2.\tag{5.41}$$

In other word, (5.41) shows that the expected distance between  $\theta_0$  and  $\theta_{p+1}$  grows at least exponentially for  $p$ . Substituting  $p = T-1$ , it leads to a contradiction if the lower bound of  $\mathbb{E}\|\theta_T - \theta_0\|^2$  is greater than the upper bound, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{4} \beta^2 \kappa^{2T} \mu \sigma_2^2 \geq (T-1)A_2 + A_3.\tag{5.42}$$

We choose

$$T = \frac{c}{\alpha \lambda_0} \log \left( \frac{L V_{n,n_0} n}{\eta \alpha \beta \sigma_2} \right)\tag{5.43}$$

in Table 1 with taking a sufficiently large  $c$  and then (5.42) implies a contradiction. Hence, the proof is completed.  $\square$

Finally, we establish the main theorem in this section. It is shown that VMC returns approximate second-order points or  $\epsilon$ -variance points in high probability. Since an  $\epsilon$ -variance point is desired, we should design better neural network architectures to reduce those meaningless second order stability points.

**Theorem 3.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold. For any  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , with the stepsizes (5.15) and parameters in Table 1, Algorithm 2 returns an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon^{1/4})$  approximate second-order stationary point or an  $\epsilon^{1/2}$ -variance point with probability at least  $1 - \delta$  after the following steps*

$$O\left(\delta^{-4}\epsilon^{-11/2}\log^2\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\delta}\right)\right). \quad (5.44)$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{E}_m$  is the event

$$\mathcal{E}_m := \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \in \mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2 \right\},$$

and its complement is  $\mathcal{E}_m^c = \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m \in \mathcal{R}_3 \right\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_m$  denote the probability of the occurrence of the event  $\mathcal{E}_m$ .

When  $\mathcal{E}_m$  occurs, by Lemmas 9 and 10, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1}) \mid \mathcal{E}_m\right] \geq \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.45)$$

On the other hand, when  $\mathcal{E}_m^c$  occurs, it follows from (5.21) that

$$2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1}) \mid \mathcal{E}_m^c\right] \geq -2T\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 - 2\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0} \geq -\delta\mathcal{D}, \quad (5.46)$$

where the first inequality is by discarding positive terms in (5.21) and the second inequality is due to the choice  $\mathcal{D} \geq (2T\alpha B_{n,n_0}^2 + 2\beta^2 LV_{n,n_0})/\delta$  in Table 1. It means that the function value may increase by no more than  $\delta\mathcal{D}/2$ . When the expectation is taken overall, (5.45) and (5.46) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) - \mathcal{L}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m+1})\right] \geq (1 - \mathcal{P}_m) \cdot \left(-\frac{\delta\mathcal{D}}{2}\right) + \mathcal{P}_m \cdot \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.47)$$

Suppose Algorithm 2 runs for  $K$  steps starting from  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  and there are  $M = K/T$  of  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}^*$  be the global minimum of  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ . Summing (5.47) for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  yields that

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathcal{L}^* \geq -\frac{\delta\mathcal{D}M}{2} + \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{P}_m \cdot \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{P}_m \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathcal{L}^*}{M\mathcal{D}} + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \delta,$$

where the last inequality holds if  $K$  satisfies

$$K \geq \frac{2[\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \mathcal{L}^*]T}{\delta\mathcal{D}} = O\left(\delta^{-4}\epsilon^{-11/2}\log^2\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\delta}\right)\right). \quad (5.48)$$

Hence, the probability of the event  $\mathcal{E}_m^c$  occurs can be bounded by

$$1 - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathcal{P}_m \geq 1 - \delta.$$

This proves the statement in Theorem 3.  $\square$

## 6 Conclusions

We explore the theoretical convergence of the VMC algorithm for solving the ground state of many-body quantum systems. The upper bound of the bias and variance corresponding to the MCMC is estimated without assuming that the local energy in a quantum system is bounded. Then, we show that VMC with the biased stochastic gradient achieves first order stationary convergence. It has  $O\left(\frac{\log K}{\sqrt{nK}}\right)$  convergence rate with a sufficiently large sample size  $n$  after  $K$  iterations. Moreover, by verifying the correlated negative curvature condition, we discuss how VMC escapes from saddle points and establish the second order convergence guarantee of  $O\left(\epsilon^{-11/2} \log^2\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$ . Our result explains the observation that VMC usually converges to eigenvalues of the quantum system.

There are some potential directions to be concerned for future works. (1) Other variational methods, such as variational inference, variational Bayesian matrix factorization, and variational annealing, can be studied in our analytical framework. (2) Our convergence analysis suggests that improving the efficiency of sampling methods is of vital importance for the better performance of stochastic algorithms. (3) The convergence of the natural gradient method and the KFAC method for VMC is also interesting.

## References

- [1] Ahmad Ajalloeian and Sebastian U Stich. On the convergence of SGD with biased gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00051*, 2020.
- [2] Z. Cai. Approximating quantum many-body wave-functions using artificial neural networks. *Phys. Rev. B*, 97:035116, 2018.
- [3] G. Carleo and M. Troyer. Solving the quantum many-body problem with artificial neural networks. *Science*, 355:602–606, 2017.
- [4] Kenny Choo, Giuseppe Carleo, Nicolas Regnault, and Titus Neupert. Symmetries and many-body excitations with neural-network quantum states. *Physical review letters*, 121(16):167204, 2018.
- [5] D. Deng, X. Li, and S. Das Sarma. Quantum entanglement in neural network states. *Phys. Rev. X*, 7:021021, 2017.
- [6] Persi Diaconis and Laurent Saloff-Coste. What do we know about the Metropolis algorithm? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 57(1):20–36, 1998.
- [7] John C Duchi, Alekh Agarwal, Mikael Johansson, and Michael I Jordan. Ergodic mirror descent. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(4):1549–1578, 2012.
- [8] Jianqing Fan, Bai Jiang, and Qiang Sun. Hoeffding’s inequality for general Markov chains and its applications to statistical learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(139):1–35, 2021.
- [9] W.M.C. Foulkes, L. Mitas, R.J. Needs, and G. Rajagopal. Quantum Monte Carlo simulations of solids. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 73:33–83, 2001.

- [10] Rong Ge, Furong Huang, Chi Jin, and Yang Yuan. Escaping from saddle points—online stochastic gradient for tensor decomposition. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 797–842. PMLR, 2015.
- [11] I. Glasser, N. Pancotti, M. August, I. Rodriguez, and J. Cirac. Neural networks quantum states, string-bond states and chiral topological states. *Phys. Rev. X*, 8:011006, 2018.
- [12] James Gubernatis, Naoki Kawashima, and Philipp Werner. *Quantum Monte Carlo Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [13] Jan Hermann, Zeno Schätzle, and Frank Noé. Deep-neural-network solution of the electronic Schrödinger equation. *Nature Chemistry*, 12(10):891–897, 2020.
- [14] Bai Jiang, Qiang Sun, and Jianqing Fan. Bernstein’s inequality for general Markov chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.10721*, 2018.
- [15] Raphael Kaubruegger, Lorenzo Pastori, and Jan Carl Budich. Chiral topological phases from artificial neural networks. *Physical Review B*, 97(19):195136, 2018.
- [16] Jörg Kienitz. *Convergence of Markov chains via analytic and isoperimetric inequalities*. PhD thesis, Bielefeld University, 2000.
- [17] Xiao Liang, Wen-Yuan Liu, Pei-Ze Lin, Guang-Can Guo, Yong-Sheng Zhang, and Lixin He. Solving frustrated quantum many-particle models with convolutional neural networks. *Physical Review B*, 98(10):104426, 2018.
- [18] Jeffmin Lin, Gil Goldshlager, and Lin Lin. Explicitly antisymmetrized neural network layers for variational monte carlo simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.03491*, 2021.
- [19] Laurent Miclo and Cyril Roberto. Trous spectraux pour certains algorithmes de Métropolis sur  $r$ . *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIV*, pages 336–352, 2000.
- [20] Eric Moulines and Francis Bach. Non-asymptotic analysis of stochastic approximation algorithms for machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [21] Deanna Needell, Rachel Ward, and Nati Srebro. Stochastic gradient descent, weighted sampling, and the randomized Kaczmarz algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- [22] Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [23] Y. Nomura, A. Darmawan, Y. Yamajji, and M. Imada. Restricted Boltzmann machine learning for solving strongly correlated quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 96:205152, 2017.
- [24] Daniel Paulin. Concentration inequalities for Markov chains by Marton couplings and spectral methods. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20:1–32, 2015.
- [25] David Pfau, James S Spencer, Alexander GDG Matthews, and W Matthew C Foulkes. Ab initio solution of the many-electron Schrödinger equation with deep neural networks. *Physical Review Research*, 2(3):033429, 2020.

- [26] A. Rocchetto, E. Grant, S. Strelchuk, G. Carleo, and S. Severini. Learning hard quantum distributions with variational autoencoders. *Quantum Inf.*, 4:28, 2018.
- [27] H. Saito and M. Kato. Machine learning technique to find quantum many-body ground states of Bosons on a lattice. *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, 87:014001, 2017.
- [28] Laurent Saloff-Coste. Lectures on finite Markov chains. *Lectures on probability theory and statistics*, pages 301–413, 1997.
- [29] Tao Sun, Yuejiao Sun, and Wotao Yin. On Markov chain gradient descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [30] Stephen Wright, Jorge Nocedal, et al. Numerical optimization. *Springer Science*, 35(67-68):7, 1999.