

Analyticity of Entropy Rate of Continuous-State Hidden Markov Chains

Guangyue Han Brian Marcus
 University of Hong Kong University of British Columbia
email: ghan@hku.hk *email:* marcus@math.ubc.ca

October 27, 2018

Abstract

We prove that under certain mild assumptions, the entropy rate of a hidden Markov chain, observed when passing a finite-state stationary Markov chain through a discrete-time continuous-output channel, is jointly analytic as a function of the input Markov chain parameters and the channel parameters. In particular, as consequences of the main theorems, we obtain analyticity for the entropy rate associated with representative channels: Cauchy and Gaussian.

1 Main Results and Related Work

Entropy rate for hidden Markov chains is notoriously difficult to compute, even in the case where both input and output alphabets are finite and time is discrete. However, recently much progress has been made in this setting; see, for instance [4, 8, 9, 12] and the references therein.

In this paper, we consider a discrete-time channel with a finite input alphabet $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2, \dots, l\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and the continuous output alphabet $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{R}$. Here, we remark that all our results in this paper can be straightforwardly translated to the setting where \mathcal{Z} is finite or countably infinite.

We assume that the input process is a \mathcal{Y} -valued first-order stationary Markov chain Y with transition probability matrix $\Pi = (\pi_{ij})_{l \times l}$ and stationary vector $\pi = (\pi_i)_{1 \times l}$ (here we assume Y is first-order only for simplicity; a standard “blocking” approach can be used to reduce higher order cases to the first-order case).

We assume that the channel is memoryless in the sense that at each time, the distribution of the output $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, given the input $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, is independent of the past and future inputs and outputs, and is distributed according to a probability density function $q(z|y)$.

The corresponding output process of this channel is a *hidden Markov chain*, which will be denoted by Z throughout the paper. The entropy rate $H(Z)$ is defined as

$$H(Z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} H(Z_{-n}^0),$$

when the limit exists, where

$$H(Z_{-n}^0) = - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p(z_{-n}^0) \log p(z_{-n}^0) dz_{-n}^0;$$

here $z_{-n}^0 \triangleq (z_{-n}, z_{-n+1}, \dots, z_0)$ denotes an instance of $Z_{-n}^0 \triangleq (Z_{-n}, Z_{-n+1}, \dots, Z_0)$, and $p(z_{-n}^0)$ denotes the probability density of z_{-n}^0 . It is well-known (e.g., see page 60 of [7]) that if $H(Z_{-n}^0)$ is finite for all n , then the limit above exists and can be written as

$$H(Z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_n(Z),$$

where

$$H_n(Z) = - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p(z_{-n}^0) \log p(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0; \quad (1)$$

here $p(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})$ denotes the conditional density of z_0 given z_{-n}^{-1} . Since the channels considered in this paper are memoryless and Y is stationary, we have

$$H(Z_{-n}^0 | Y_{-n}^0) = (n+1)H(Z_0 | Y_0),$$

where

$$H(Z_0 | Y_0) = - \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \pi_y \int_{\mathcal{Z}} q(z|y) \log q(z|y) dz.$$

It then follows from

$$H(Z_{-n}^0 | Y_{-n}^0) \leq H(Z_{-n}^0) \leq H(Y_{-n}^0) + H(Z_{-n}^0 | Y_{-n}^0)$$

that if $\int_{\mathcal{Z} \in \mathcal{Z}} q(z|y) \log q(z|y) dz$ is finite for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then the formulas for $H(Z)$ above hold and $H(Z)$ is finite.

Unless specified otherwise, we will assume that $\Pi = \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} = (\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}})$ is analytically parameterized by $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \Omega_1$, where Ω_1 denotes a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^{m_1} (here, a domain is an open and connected set), and for any $(y, z) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$, $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)$ is analytically parameterized by $\vec{\theta} \in \Omega_2$, where Ω_2 denotes a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^{m_2} .

In earlier work, we established analyticity of entropy rate as a function of the underlying Markov chain parameters:

Theorem 1.1. [5, Theorem 1.1] *Assume that for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $q(z|y)$ is positive and continuous on \mathcal{Z} , and the following two integrals*

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} q(z|y) |\log \min_{y'} q(z|y')| dz, \quad \int_{\mathcal{Z}} q(z|y) |\log \max_{y'} q(z|y')| dz \quad (2)$$

are finite. If Π is strictly positive at $\vec{\varepsilon}_0$, then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $\vec{\varepsilon}_0$.

(we remark that the hypotheses (2) were inadvertently omitted in [5, Theorem 1.1].)

The aim of the current paper is to prove analyticity as a function of both the Markov chain parameters and channel parameters. Simple examples show that $H(Z)$ can fail to be analytic as a function of the channel parameter alone; see Example 4.4. Our positive results

require several technical regularity conditions, which we describe as follows. These conditions involve the complexification of the channel density functions (by definition, any real analytic function, such as $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)$ as above, at a given point can be uniquely extended to a complex analytic function on some complex neighborhood of the given point; we will continue to use the same notation, such as $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)$, for this complex extension). We require these technical conditions, which abstract the properties of commonly used probability density functions (e.g., Cauchy and Gaussian), in order to make our proofs work. There may be more general conditions that suffice. On a first reading, the reader may want to skip directly to the statements of results below.

Our regularity conditions are as follows. For given $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$,

- (a) Π is strictly positive at $\vec{\varepsilon}_0$;
- (b) for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|y)$ is positive on \mathcal{Z} ;
- (c) there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that (below, $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ denotes the r_2 -neighborhood of $\vec{\theta}_0$ in \mathbb{C}^{m_2})
 - for any $(y, z) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Z}$, $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,
 - for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)$ is jointly continuous on $\mathcal{Z} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,
 - the following three integrals

$$(i) \int \check{q}(z, r_2) dz, \quad (ii) \int \check{q}(z, r_2) \log \hat{q}(z, r_2) dz, \quad (iii) \int \check{q}(z, r_2) \log \check{q}(z, r_2) dz, \quad (3)$$

are all finite, where

$$\check{q}(z, r_2) \triangleq \sup_{(y, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)|, \quad \hat{q}(z, r_2) \triangleq \inf_{(y, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)|;$$

- (d) for some $I \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$,
 - (i) there exist $r_2 > 0$ such that for all j , the family of functions $\{g_z(\theta) = q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)\}_z$ on $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ is equicontinuous,
 - (ii) there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that for each z , the real $\log q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)$ can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and for all j ,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} \sup_{\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} \left| q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j) \log q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I) \right| dz < \infty. \quad (4)$$

It is easily seen that the most commonly used channel models, including Cauchy and Gaussian channels, satisfy all of these conditions (these channels are defined below).

Our first result deals with the case where the $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|i)$ are in some sense “comparable” with one another.

Theorem 1.2. For given $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, assume Conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d). If, there exist $C', C'' > 0$ such that for all i, j and all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$C' \leq \left| \frac{q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|j)}{q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|i)} \right| \leq C'', \quad (5)$$

then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$.

Theorem 1.2 applies to the additive Cauchy channel, parameterized by (γ_i, μ_i) , $\gamma_i > 0$, with

$$q(z|i) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\gamma_i}{(z - \mu_i)^2 + \gamma_i^2}. \quad (6)$$

So, for this channel, if Π is strictly positive at $\vec{\varepsilon}_0 \in \Omega_1$, then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, (\gamma_1, \mu_1, \gamma_2, \mu_2, \dots, \gamma_l, \mu_l))$.

Our next result deals with the case where for one particular i , the density $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|i)$ dominates all the others. The reader should note that while Theorem 1.2 above requires a condition to hold at one given parameter value, $\vec{\theta}_0$, Theorem 1.3 below requires a condition to hold for all parameter values $\vec{\theta}$ in a complex neighborhood of the given $\vec{\theta}_0$.

Theorem 1.3. For given $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, assume Conditions (a), (b), (c) and (d). If, in addition, for the same I as in Condition (d), there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{Z}$ such that for all $z \notin \Sigma$, all $j \neq I$ and all $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$

$$\left| \frac{q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j)}{q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)} \right| \leq \varepsilon, \quad (7)$$

then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$.

Theorem 1.3 applies to the additive Gaussian channel parameterized by (σ_i, μ_i) , $\sigma_i > 0$, with

$$q(z|i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} e^{-(z-\mu_i)^2/(2\sigma_i^2)}, \quad (8)$$

where some σ_i is strictly larger than all other ones. Setting $I = i$ to be the index corresponding to the largest value of σ_i , it is easy to see that indeed (8) satisfies Condition (7). So, for this channel, if Π is strictly positive at $\vec{\varepsilon}_0 \in \Omega_1$, then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, (\sigma_1, \mu_1, \sigma_2, \mu_2, \dots, \sigma_l, \mu_l))$.

Our final result deals with a case of more theoretical interest, namely: for all i , the real part of $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|i)$ “dominates” the imaginary part of the complex extension.

Theorem 1.4. For given $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, assume Conditions (a), (b) and (c). If, in addition, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $r_2 > 0$ such that for all $(y, z) \in (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z})$ and all $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$

$$(i) \quad |\Im(q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y))| < \delta |\Re(q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y))|, \quad (ii) \quad \left| \log \frac{q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)}{q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|y)} \right| \leq \delta, \quad (9)$$

then $H(Z)$ is analytic around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$.

Theorem 1.4 applies to additive Cauchy channels parameterized in (6) and other more artificial channels.

These results can be regarded as extensions of [3, Theorem 1.1], which deals with the case where \mathcal{Z} is finite. The flow of the proofs of these results follows that of this case. However, new techniques are needed to deal with the continuous case. This is most notable in Theorem 1.4, where the use of a complex Hilbert metric [6], to replace the classical real Hilbert metric, is critical. This metric was also used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. It is not needed for Theorems 1.2 and 1.3, because those results assume stronger conditions on the channel density functions.

We remark that in [3, Theorem 1.1], zero values are allowed for some transition probabilities. It seems more difficult to handle this phenomena in the continuous-state setting; this is the subject of forthcoming work.

To the best of our knowledge, the results in this paper, together with those in [5], are among the first results establishing analyticity of continuous-state hidden Markov chains. Given the interest in the counterpart results for the discrete-state setting, we expect that such results will be of significance in the continuous-state setting as well.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the (real) Hilbert metric, outline the framework of the proofs of our theorems and highlight the differences among the proofs. The following two sections are devoted to proving Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. In Section 5, we review the complex Hilbert metric. In Section 6, we prove Theorem 1.4.

2 The Main Idea of the Proofs

We first briefly review the classical (real) Hilbert metric. The real Hilbert metric will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3.

Let W be the standard simplex in the l -dimensional real Euclidean space,

$$W = \{w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \in \mathbb{R}^l : w_i \geq 0, \sum_i w_i = 1\},$$

and let W° denote its interior, consisting of the vectors with positive coordinates. For any two vectors $v, w \in W^\circ$, the Hilbert metric [11] is defined as

$$d_H(w, v) = \max_{i,j} \log \left(\frac{w_i/w_j}{v_i/v_j} \right). \quad (10)$$

It is well known and easy to see that on W° , the Hilbert metric dominates the Euclidean metric up to a positive constant (i.e., for some $K > 0$ and all $x, y \in W$, $|x - y| \leq K d_H(x, y)$); also, on any compact subset of W° , the two metrics are equivalent (see Proposition 2.1 of [3]).

For an $l \times l$ positive matrix $T = (t_{ij})$ (i.e., each $t_{ij} > 0$), the mapping f_T induced by T on W is defined by

$$f_T(w) = \frac{wT}{wT\mathbf{1}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all 1's column vector. The following theorem is well-known (see [11]).

Theorem 2.1. For a positive T , f_T is a contraction mapping on the entire W° under the Hilbert metric and the contraction coefficient (often referred to as the Birkhoff coefficient), is given by

$$\tau(T) = \sup_{v \neq w} \frac{d_H(vT, wT)}{d_H(v, w)} = \frac{1 - \sqrt{\phi(T)}}{1 + \sqrt{\phi(T)}}, \quad (12)$$

where $\phi(T) = \min_{i,j,k,l} \frac{t_{ik}t_{jl}}{t_{jk}t_{il}}$.

We will also need a complex version of W ,

$$\tilde{W} = \{w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \in \mathbb{C}^l : \sum_i w_i = 1\}.$$

And for any $D \subset W$ and $\delta > 0$, we define

$$\tilde{W}_D(\delta) = \{\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W} : |\tilde{w} - w| < \delta \text{ for some } \tilde{w}\}.$$

For each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, define $\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)$ as an $l \times l$ matrix with the entries

$$\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)_{ij} = \pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j), \text{ for all } i, j. \quad (13)$$

By (11), $\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)$ will induce a mapping $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \triangleq f_{\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)}$ from W to W . For any fixed n and z_{-n}^0 , define

$$x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_i = \cdot | z_i, z_{i-1}, \dots, z_{-n}), \quad (14)$$

(here \cdot represent the states of the Markov chain Y) then similar to Blackwell [1], $\{x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}\}$ satisfies the random dynamical system

$$x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), \quad (15)$$

starting with

$$x_{-n-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = \pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}, \quad (16)$$

where $\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ is the stationary vector for $\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}$. And obviously we have

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}) = x_{-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0) \mathbf{1}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) = \pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}) \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n+1}) \cdots \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0) \mathbf{1}. \quad (18)$$

Evidently $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$, $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n})$ and $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0)$ all depend on the real vector $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. In what follows, we shall show that they can be “complexified”. For $r_1, r_2 > 0$, let $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$ denote a r_1 -ball around $\vec{\varepsilon}_0$ in \mathbb{C}^{m_1} , and $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ denote a r_2 -ball around $\vec{\theta}_0$ in \mathbb{C}^{m_2} . For any $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$, one checks that for $r_1 > 0$ small enough, the stationary vector $\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ is unique and analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$ as a function of $\vec{\varepsilon}$ (because it is the unique solution of

$$\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} = \pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}, \quad \sum_y \pi_y^{\vec{\varepsilon}} = 1).$$

Then through (16) and (15), $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$; furthermore, through (17) and (18), $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n})$ and $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0)$ can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Ultimately $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ (which is defined by (1) with real superscripts $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta})$ on $p(z_{-n}^0)$ and $p(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})$) can be analytically extended to $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ as well.

The proofs of the main results require the mappings $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ to be contraction mappings with respect to the Euclidean metric. This will be derived from contraction, with respect to the Hilbert metric, the equivalence of the Hilbert and the Euclidean metrics and re-blocking into non-overlapping blocks. Namely, we will consecutively re-block the Z process to a \hat{Z} process such that \hat{Z}_i is of the form $Z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$. For any $\hat{z}_i = z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$, let $f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ denote the composed mapping $f_{z_k}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \circ f_{z_{k-1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \circ \dots \circ f_{z_j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$. Then, \hat{x}_i can be similarly defined as before: For any fixed \hat{n} and $z_{-\hat{n}}^0$, define

$$\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{z}_{-\hat{n}}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_{k(i)} = \cdot | \hat{z}_i, \hat{z}_{i-1}, \dots, \hat{z}_{-\hat{n}}), \quad (19)$$

then, $\{\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}\}$ satisfies the random dynamical system

$$\hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), \quad (20)$$

starting with

$$\hat{x}_{-\hat{n}-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = \pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}. \quad (21)$$

The framework for the proofs of the main theorems can be outlined as follows:

- (I) If necessary, we consecutively re-block the Z process to a \hat{Z} process such that \hat{Z}_i is of the form $Z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$.
- (II) We then show that there exists a complex neighborhood of a subset of W such that each complexified $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a contraction mapping, with respect to some metric, and moreover the complexified $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{z}_{-\hat{n}}^i)$ stays within the neighborhood.
- (III) It then follows that the complexified $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i)$ and thus the complexified $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n})$ exponentially forget their initial conditions.
- (IV) This, together with bounding arguments, will further imply that the complexified $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ uniformly converges to a complex analytic function, which is necessarily the complexified $H^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$, on a complex domain, and therefore $H^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ is analytic.

Although the three proofs all fit in the same above-mentioned framework, there does not seem to be a natural way to unify them. Among numerous differences, the most essential one is the way we establish (II):

- For Theorem 1.2, as i increases, the real $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ always stays within a compact subset D of W° . To establish (II), we will use the fact that each real $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a contraction on W° , and thus on D , with respect to the Hilbert metric. Then we use the equivalence between the Euclidean metric and the Hilbert metric on D , and equicontinuity in Condition (d(i)) to establish the contractiveness (with respect to the Euclidean metric) of the complexified $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ on a complex neighborhood of D .

- For Theorem 1.3, as i increases, the real $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ may move arbitrarily close to the boundary of W . To establish (II), we apply a dichotomy argument: there is a sufficiently large compact subset Σ of \mathcal{Z} such that for any $\hat{z}_i = z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$ with $z_{j(i)} \in \Sigma$, the complexified $f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a contraction on a complex neighborhood (under the Euclidean metric) of W° ; for any $\hat{z}_i = z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$ with $z_{j(i)} \notin \Sigma$, we directly establish (II) by estimating the first-order derivative of the complexified $f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$.
- For Theorem 1.4, as i increases, the real $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ may move arbitrarily close to the boundary of W . To establish (II), the complex Hilbert metric in Section 5 is employed to directly show the contractiveness, with respect to the complex Hilbert metric, of the complexified $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ on a complex neighborhood of W° .

3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

The following lemma says that $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ does not change much under a small complex perturbation of $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta})$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and any $x \in W$, we have*

$$|f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) - f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)| \leq \delta.$$

Proof. Since

$$f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) = \frac{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)}{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z) \mathbf{1}} = \frac{x (\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z) / q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I))}{x (\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z) / q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)) \mathbf{1}},$$

the lemma follows from (5) and Condition (d(i)). \square

Recall that $\tilde{W}_D(\delta) = \{\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W} : |\tilde{w} - w| < \delta \text{ for some } w \in D\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Given any $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, for any compact subset D of W° , there exists $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and a positive integer n_0 such that, for all z_i^j with $j \geq i + n_0$ and all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_D(\delta)$ under the Euclidean metric.*

Proof. For any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, one checks that for any $u, v \in D$, we have

$$d_H(u \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z), v \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z)) = d_H(u \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}, v \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}). \quad (22)$$

It then follows that for any z_i^j ,

$$d_H(f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(u), f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(v)) \leq \tau (\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0})^{j-i+1} d_H(u, v),$$

where $\tau(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0})$, the Birkhoff coefficient of $\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}$ as defined in (12), is strictly less than 1. It then follows from the fact that the Euclidean metric and the Hilbert metric are equivalent on D (see Proposition 2.1 of [3]) that there exists $C > 0$ such that for any z_i^j and any $u, v \in D$,

$$|f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(u) - f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(v)| \leq C\tau(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0})^{j-i+1}|u - v|.$$

For n_0 sufficiently large, $\rho_0 := C\tau(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0})^{n_0} < 1$. Thus, for $j \geq i + n_0$,

$$|D_w f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| \leq \rho_0 < 1$$

for all $w \in D$. From this and Condition (d(i)) it follows that there exists $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that

$$|D_w f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}| \leq \rho_1 < 1$$

for all $w \in \tilde{W}_D(\delta)$ and $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. The lemma then follows. \square

The following lemma essentially follows from the framework in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [3]. We briefly outline the proof for completeness.

We first introduce some notation. Let

$$\hat{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}) \triangleq p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_0|I),$$

where I is the same as in Condition (d).

Lemma 3.3. *1. There is a compact subset D of W° such that for any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and for all $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$ and $-n - 1 \leq i \leq -1$,*

$$x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i) \in \tilde{W}_D(\delta). \quad (23)$$

2. There exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for all $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$, $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

3. There exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and $L_1 > 0$ such that for any two \mathcal{Z} -valued sequences $\{a_{-n}^0\}$ and $\{b_{-n}^0\}$ with $a_{-n}^0 = b_{-n}^0$ and for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$|\hat{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0|a_{-n_1}^{-1}) - \hat{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_0|b_{-n_2}^{-1})| \leq L_1 \rho_1^n. \quad (24)$$

Proof. 1. For a fixed $n_0 > 0$, we will consecutively reblock z_{-n}^{-1} to \hat{z}_{-n}^{-1} such that each \hat{z}_i is of the form $z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$, where $k(i) - j(i) + 1 = n_0$ (n_0 is determined below).

By (15) and Condition (5), for any z_{-n}^0 and i , $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}$ (and thus $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}$) belongs to a compact subset D of W° . By Lemma 3.2, we can choose $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small, n_0 sufficiently large and $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction on $\tilde{W}_D(\delta)$ under the Euclidean metric.

To prove (23), it is enough to prove the version of (23) with $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i)$ replaced by $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{z}_{-n}^i)$ (with perhaps smaller r_1, r_2).

To see this, note that by Lemma 3.1, for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, for all $\hat{z}, x \in W$, and $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) - f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)| \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1), \quad (25)$$

and for all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$

$$|\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)| \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1). \quad (26)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| &= |f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) - f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})| \\ &\leq |f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) - f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})| + |f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) - f_{\hat{z}_i}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})|. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Then by (25) and (26), and (27), we have

$$|\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| \leq \rho_1 |\hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{i-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| + \delta(1 - \rho_1).$$

So, for all i ,

$$|\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| \leq \delta,$$

and thus for all i , we have $\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \in \tilde{W}_D(\delta)$, as desired.

2. It follows from (5) and Condition (d(i)) that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ and any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x)$ is analytic with respect to $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}, x) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2) \times \tilde{W}_D(\delta)$. It then follows from this fact and the iterative nature of $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ (see (15)) and Part 1 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, each $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Part 2 then immediately follows from (17).

3. Applying the same reblocking as in Part 1, we write

$$\hat{x}_{i, \hat{a}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{a}_{-\hat{n}_1}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_{k(i)} = \cdot | \hat{a}_{-\hat{n}_1}^i),$$

$$\hat{x}_{i, \hat{b}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{b}_{-\hat{n}_2}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_{k(i)} = \cdot | \hat{b}_{-\hat{n}_2}^i).$$

Evidently we have

$$\hat{x}_{i+1, \hat{a}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{\hat{a}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i, \hat{a}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), \quad \hat{x}_{i+1, \hat{b}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{\hat{b}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_{i, \hat{b}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}).$$

Note that there exists a positive constant L'_1 such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|\hat{x}_{-\hat{n}, \hat{a}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{-\hat{n}, \hat{b}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}| \leq L'_1,$$

for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, where $r_1, r_2 > 0$ are chosen sufficiently small. Since $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction on $\tilde{W}_D(\delta)$, we have, by Part 1,

$$|\hat{x}_{-1, \hat{a}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{-1, \hat{b}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}| \leq L'_1 \rho_1^{\hat{n}-1}.$$

This, together with (5), implies that there exists $L_1 > 0$, independent of n_1, n_2 , such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|\mathring{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0|a_{-n_1}^{-1}) - \mathring{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_0|b_{-n_2}^{-1})| \leq L_1 \rho_1^n. \quad (28)$$

□

The following lemma should be well-known. We sketch the proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.4. *Let n_1 and n_2 be positive integers and D a compact domain in \mathbb{C}^{n_1} . Let $f(\theta, z)$ be a jointly continuous function on $D \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$. Assume that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2}} \sup_{\theta \in D} |f(\theta, z)| dz < \infty. \quad (29)$$

Then

1. $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2}} f(\theta, z) dz$ is continuous on D .

2. If, for each $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, f is analytic on D , then $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2}} f(\theta, z) dz$ is analytic on D .

Proof. Let Σ be a compact domain in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} . Let $\delta_i, i = 1, 2, \dots$ be a sequence of positive numbers converging to 0. Consider a sequence of partitions of Σ :

$$\Sigma = \cup_{i=1}^{m_n} \Delta_{n,i},$$

where $\text{diam}(\Delta_{n,i}) \leq \delta_n$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m_n$. Evidently, the corresponding Riemann sum

$$R_n = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} f(\theta, z_i) \text{vol}(\Delta_{n,i})$$

(here $z_i \in \Delta_{n,i}$) is continuous in θ . Then

$$\int_{\Sigma} f(\theta, z) dz - R_n = \sum_{i=1}^{m_n} \int_{\Delta_{n,i}} (f(\theta, z) - f(\theta, z_i)) dz.$$

By the compactness of D and Σ , we deduce that for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exists N_0 such that for all $n \geq N_0$, all $\theta \in D$ and all $z \in \Delta_{n,i}, i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$|f(\theta, z) - f(\theta, z_i)| \leq \varepsilon_0$$

which implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_1 such that for all $n \geq N_1$ and all $\theta \in D$,

$$\left| \int_{\Sigma} f(\theta, z) dz - R_n \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

In other words, R_n uniformly (in $\theta \in D$) converges to

$$\int_{\Sigma} f(\theta, z) dz,$$

and so $\int_{\Sigma} f(\theta, z) dz$ is continuous in $\theta \in D$.

Now, take any increasing sequence of compact sets Σ_i whose union is \mathbb{R}^{n_2} . By (29), $\int_{\Sigma_i} f(\theta, z) dz$ converges uniformly, in $\theta \in D$, to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n_2}} f(\theta, z) dz$, which is therefore continuous on D . This gives Part 1.

Part 2 follows in the same way with analyticity replacing continuity. □

We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first show that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any n , $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

For a fixed n , recall that

$$H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) = - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0,$$

where

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) = \sum_{y_{-n}^0} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0) \prod_{i=-n}^0 q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y_i)$$

and

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) = x_{-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^{-1}) \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0) \mathbf{1}.$$

Now, for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) = \sum_{y_{-n}^0} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0) \prod_{i=-n}^0 q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y_i) \quad (30)$$

Since $\sum_{y_{-n}^0} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0)$ is continuous and therefore bounded as a function of $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$, there is a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0)| \leq K \prod_{i=-n}^0 \sup_{(y, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y)|. \quad (31)$$

It follows from Part 1 of Lemma 3.3 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any z_{-n}^0 ,

$$C_1 \leq |p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_2, \quad (32)$$

which implies that for some $C_3 > 0$,

$$|\log p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_3. \quad (33)$$

It then follows that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} \sup_{(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) \right| dz_{-n}^0 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} \sup_{(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_0 | I) + p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) \right| dz_{-n}^0 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} \sup_{\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} K \left| \prod_{i=-n}^0 q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y_i) \right| \left| \log q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_0 | I) \right| dz_{-n}^0 \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} \sup_{(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0)| |\log p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| dz_{-n}^0 < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

(for the first term we have used (3(i)) and (4); for the second term, we have used (3(i)), (31) and (33)). By lemma 3.4 (Part 2),

$$H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z_0|Z_{-n}^{-1}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0,$$

is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

Now, to prove the theorem, we only need to prove that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ uniformly converges on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. First, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_{n+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) - H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) dz_{-n-1}^0 - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0 \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) \log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) dz_{-n-1}^0 - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0 \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) (\log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})) dz_{-n-1}^0 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Then, by (24), (32), (33), we have, for some $0 < \rho_1 < 1$, $L'_1, L_1 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) (\log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}))| &\leq L'_1 \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) (\dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})) \right| \\ &\leq L'_1 |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0)| L_1 \rho_1^n. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for any given $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$,

$$|\pi_{y_{-n}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}| \leq (1 + \delta) \pi_{y_{-n}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}, \quad |\pi_{y_i y_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}| \leq (1 + \delta) \pi_{y_i y_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0},$$

and for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and all $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)| dz \leq (1 + \delta) \int_{\mathcal{Z}} q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|y) dz = 1 + \delta,$$

(here we have used the fact that $\int_{\mathcal{Z}} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)| dz$ is a continuous function of $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$; this follows from Lemma 3.4 (Part 1)). It then follows from (31) that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^{-1})| dz_{-n-1}^{-1} \leq (1 + \delta)^{2(n+2)}.$$

By choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we can combine all the relevant inequalities above to obtain some $L > 0$ and some $0 < \rho < 1$ such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|H_{n+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) - H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)| \leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) (\log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}))| dz_{-n-1}^0 \leq L \rho^n,$$

which implies the uniform convergence of $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ as n tends to infinity, and thus the analyticity of $H^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

The following lemma is an analog of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and any $x \in W$, we have*

$$|f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) - f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)| \leq \delta.$$

Proof. Note that for any $x \in W$,

$$f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) = \frac{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)}{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z) \mathbf{1}} = \frac{x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I))}{x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)) \mathbf{1}}. \quad (35)$$

It then follows from (7) that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{Z}$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, any $z \notin \Sigma$ and any $x \in W$, $x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)) \mathbf{1}$ is bounded away from 0. On the other hand, by the compactness of Σ , we deduce that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and any $x \in W$, $x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)) \mathbf{1}$ is bounded away from 0. The lemma then follows from Condition (d(i)). \square

Lemma 4.2. *1. Given any $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, there exist $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and a compact subset $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{Z}$ such that for any $z \notin \Sigma$ and all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_W(\delta)$ under the Euclidean metric.*

2. Given any $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$, for any compact subset $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{Z}$, there exist $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and a positive integer n_0 such that, for all z_i^j with $z_i \in \Sigma$ and $j \geq i + n_0$ and all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_{z_i^j}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_W(\delta)$ under the Euclidean metric.

Proof. **1.** For any $x \in W$,

$$f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x) = \frac{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z)}{x \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z) \mathbf{1}} = \frac{x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|I))}{x(\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(z)/q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|I)) \mathbf{1}}.$$

Observe, by the quotient rule, that $D_x f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)$ is a rational function of entries of x with coefficients that are products of quantities of the form $\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}$ and $q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j)/q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|I)$. By (7) (with $\vec{\theta}$ set to be $\vec{\theta}_0$), we obtain the result at $\vec{\varepsilon} = \vec{\varepsilon}_0$ and $\vec{\theta} = \vec{\theta}_0$. For general $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, the result holds by Condition (d(i)).

2. For any two points $x, y \in W$, we have, at $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$,

$$\frac{d_E(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))}{d_E(x, y)} = \frac{d_E(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))}{d_H(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))} \left(\prod_{k=i}^{j-1} \frac{d_H(f_{z_i^{k+1}}(x), f_{z_i^{k+1}}(y))}{d_H(f_{z_i^k}(x), f_{z_i^k}(y))} \right) \frac{d_H(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))}{d_E(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))} \frac{d_E(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))}{d_E(x, y)},$$

where d_E denotes the Euclidean metric. First, since the Hilbert metric dominates the Euclidean metric up to a multiplicative factor, there exists $C_1 > 0$ independent of all z_i^j such that for all $k = i + 1, \dots, j$,

$$\frac{d_E(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))}{d_H(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))} \leq C_1.$$

By the fact that f_z is a contraction mapping on W° under the Hilbert metric, there exists $0 < \rho_0 < 1$ independent of all z_i^j such that

$$\frac{d_H(f_{z_i^k}(x), f_{z_i^k}(y))}{d_H(f_{z_i^{k-1}}(x), f_{z_i^{k-1}}(y))} \leq \rho_0.$$

On the other hand, since the Hilbert and Euclidean metrics are equivalent on compact subsets of W° , and $f_{z_i}(W)$ is compact, there exists $C_2 > 0$, which only depends on Σ , such that

$$\frac{d_H(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))}{d_E(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))} \leq C_2.$$

Finally, it can be easily checked that there exists $C_3 > 0$, which only depends on Σ , such that

$$\frac{d_E(f_{z_i}(x), f_{z_i}(y))}{d_E(x, y)} \leq C_3.$$

Combining all the above inequalities, we deduce that there exists $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d_E(f_{z_i^j}(x), f_{z_i^j}(y))}{d_E(x, y)} \leq C_4 \rho_0^{j-i},$$

which, together with Condition (d(i)), implies Part 2. \square

Lemma 4.3. 1. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and for all $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$ and $-n - 1 \leq i \leq -1$,

$$x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i) \in \tilde{W}_W(\delta). \quad (36)$$

2. There exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for all $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$, $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

3. There exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$, $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and $L_1 > 0$ such that for any two \mathcal{Z} -valued sequences $\{a_{-n}^0\}$ and $\{b_{-n_2}^0\}$ with $a_{-n}^0 = b_{-n}^0$ and for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$|p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0 | a_{-n_1}^{-1}) - p^{\circ \vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_0 | b_{-n_2}^{-1})| \leq L_1 \rho_1^n. \quad (37)$$

Proof. 1. For a given compact subset $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{Z}$, consecutively reblock z_{-n}^{-1} to a $\hat{z}_{-\hat{n}}^{-1}$ such that each $\hat{z}_i = z_{j(i)}^{k(i)}$ is of

- Type I: $j(i) = k(i)$ and $z_{j(i)} \notin \Sigma$; or

- Type II: $z_{j(i)} \in \Sigma$ and $k(i) - j(i) \geq n_0$, where n_0 is as in Part 2 of Lemma 4.2.

By Lemma 4.2, we can choose $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that there exists $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction on $\tilde{W}_W(\delta)$ under the Euclidean metric.

To prove (36), it is enough to prove the version of (36) with $x_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i)$ replaced by $\hat{x}_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i)$ (with perhaps smaller r_1, r_2).

Now, choose $r_1, r_2 > 0$ so small (the existence of r_1, r_2 is guaranteed by Lemma 4.1) such that for any \hat{z} , for all $x \in W$, all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x) - f_{\hat{z}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)| \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1), \quad (38)$$

and for all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$,

$$|\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}| \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1). \quad (39)$$

We then deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| &= |f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) - f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})| \\ &\leq |f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) - f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})| + |f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) - f_{\hat{z}_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})|. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Then by (38) and (39), and (40), for $i > -\hat{n} - 1$, we have

$$|\hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| \leq \rho_1 |\hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| + \delta(1 - \rho_1).$$

So, for all i ,

$$|\hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - \hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}| \leq \delta,$$

and thus for all i , we have $\hat{x}_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \in \tilde{W}_W(\delta)$, as desired.

2. It follows from the same dichotomy argument in the proof of Lemma 4.1 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ and any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x)$ is analytic with respect to $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}, x) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2) \times \tilde{W}_W(\delta)$. It follows from this fact, the iterative nature of $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ (see (15)) and Part 1 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, each $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Part 2 then immediately follows from (17).

3. It follows from (36) and a similar argument as in the proof of Part 2 of Lemma 3.3. \square

We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By (36), for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any z_{-n}^0 and any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$C_1 \leq |\dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_2, \quad (41)$$

which implies that for some $C_3 > 0$,

$$|\log \dot{p}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_3. \quad (42)$$

Then, using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we can show that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any n , $H_n^{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}(Z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. So, to prove the theorem, we only need to prove that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that the $H_n^{\tilde{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\theta}}(Z)$ uniformly converges on $\mathbb{C}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\tilde{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This follows from (41), (42) and Lemma 4.3, and a completely parallel argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

With the following example, we show that for Gaussian channels, $H(Z)$ need not be analytic even as a function of the channel parameters alone, when the largest σ_i is not unique.

Example 4.4. Consider an additive Gaussian channel parameterized as in (8) with the binary input alphabet $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, 2\}$. Assume that the input Y is an i.i.d. process with

$$P(Y_1 = 1) = P(Y_1 = 2) = 1/2;$$

and assume that

$$q(z|1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} e^{-(z+1)^2/\sigma_1^2}, \quad q(z|2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2} e^{-(z-1)^2/\sigma_2^2}.$$

We then have

$$p(z) = P(Y = 1)q(z|1) + P(Y = 2)q(z|2) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} e^{-(z+1)^2/\sigma_1^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2} e^{-(z-1)^2/\sigma_2^2}.$$

We claim that for any fixed $\sigma > 0$, analyticity of $H(Z)$ as a function of (σ_1, σ_2) fails at $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = (\sigma, \sigma)$. To see this, we fix $\sigma_1 = \sigma$, and we show that $H(Z)$ is not analytic with respect to σ_2 at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$. Note that for any real σ_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} H(Z) &= - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(z) \log p(z) dz \\ &= - \int_0^{\infty} p(z) \left(\log \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2} e^{-(z-1)^2/\sigma_2^2} \right) dz - \int_{-\infty}^0 p(z) \left(\log \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-(z-1)^2/\sigma^2} \right) dz \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

$$- \int_0^{\infty} p(z) \log(1 + \Phi_z(\sigma_2)) dz - \int_{-\infty}^0 p(z) \log(1 + \Phi_z^{-1}(\sigma_2)) dz, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\Phi_z(\sigma_2) \triangleq \frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma} e^{(z-1)^2/\sigma_2^2 - (z+1)^2/\sigma^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_z^{-1}(\sigma_2) \triangleq \frac{1}{\Phi_z(\sigma_2)}. \quad (45)$$

We note that (43) is analytic as a function of σ_2 at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$. To see this, observe that the first term of (43) can be further computed as

$$- \log(2\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2) \int_0^{\infty} p(z) dz - \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma\sigma_2^2} (z-1)^2 e^{-(z+1)^2/\sigma^2} dz - \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_2^3} (z-1)^2 e^{-(z-1)^2/\sigma_2^2} dz,$$

which is analytic at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$ since each of the three terms above is analytic at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$ (for the second or third term, regard σ_2 as a complex variable and use the exponentially-decaying

tail of the integrand). With a similar argument applied to the second term of (43), we can then establish the analyticity of (43). So, to prove $H(Z)$ is not analytic at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$, it suffices to show that (44) is not analytic at $\sigma_2 = \sigma$.

Suppose, by way of contradiction, that (44) is analytic at σ , or equivalently, the following function of ω

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma^{-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z+1)^2 \sigma^{-2}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z-1)^2 \omega^2} \right) \log(1 + \Phi_z(1/\omega)) dz \\ & + \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma^{-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z+1)^2 \sigma^{-2}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(z-1)^2 \omega^2} \right) \log(1 + \Phi_z^{-1}(1/\omega)) dz \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

is analytic at $\sigma^{-1} \in \overline{\mathbb{C}_{\sigma^{-1}}(r)}$ (the closure of the r -neighborhood of σ^{-1} in \mathbb{C}) for some $r > 0$, where, recalling from (45),

$$\Phi_z(1/\omega) = \frac{\sigma^{-1}}{\omega} e^{(z-1)^2 \omega^2 - (z+1)^2 \sigma^{-2}}.$$

Then, by uniqueness, the analytic extension of (46) to $\overline{\mathbb{C}_{\sigma^{-1}}(r)}$ would agree with any analytic extension along the circle $\{\sigma^{-1} + r e^{i\alpha} : \alpha \in [-\pi/2, 3\pi/2]\}$ (from $\alpha = -\pi/2$ to $\alpha = 3\pi/2$). Such an analytic extension is obtained by regarding ω as a complex variable on the circle (this is a valid analytic extension by virtue of the exponentially-decaying tails of the integrands in (46)). Here, we remark that for any $r > 0$ and α , there are at most two ‘‘singular’’ z (note that the following inequality boils down to a system of two quadratic equations in z) such that

$$\Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + r e^{i\alpha})) = -1,$$

which means $\log(1 + \Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + r e^{i\alpha})))$ or $\log(1 + \Phi_z^{-1}(1/(\sigma^{-1} + r e^{i\alpha})))$ would ‘‘blow up’’ at such z . However, an easy bounding argument (roughly speaking, the two ‘‘blowing up’’ terms will only do so ‘‘slowly’’) yields that during the analytic extension, (46) is still well-defined with the presence of such singular z , and so the above analytic extension is indeed valid.

Next, we will find a contradiction by showing that the analytic extension of (46) disagrees at $\alpha = -\pi/2$ and $\alpha = 3\pi/2$. Setting $\omega = \sigma^{-1} + r e^{i\alpha}$, we then have

$$\frac{\sigma^{-1}}{\omega} = \frac{\sigma^{-1}}{\sigma^{-1} + r \cos \alpha + i r \sin \alpha} = \frac{\sigma^{-2} + \sigma^{-1} r \cos \alpha - i \sigma^{-1} r \sin \alpha}{\sigma^{-2} + 2\sigma^{-1} r \cos \alpha + r^2} \triangleq e^{a(r, \alpha) + i b(r, \alpha)},$$

where one can easily check that

$$a(r, \alpha) = O(r), \quad b(r, \alpha) = O(r), \quad \frac{\partial b(r, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} = O(r).$$

Then, some straightforward computations yield that

$$\Phi_z(1/\omega) = e^{A(z, r, \alpha)} e^{iB(z, r, \alpha)},$$

where

$$A(z, r, \alpha) \triangleq 2(z-1)^2 \sigma^{-1} r \cos \alpha + (z-1)^2 r^2 \cos 2\alpha - 4z\sigma^{-2} + a(r, \alpha),$$

and

$$B(z, r, \alpha) \triangleq 2(z-1)^2 \sigma^{-1} r \sin \alpha + (z-1)^2 r^2 \sin 2\alpha + b(r, \alpha).$$

Now, for some small yet fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $N > 0$ large enough and then $r > 0$ small enough such that

(I) for all $0 \leq z \leq N$ and all $\alpha \in [-\pi/2, 3\pi/2]$, $B(z, r, \alpha) \in (-\pi, \pi)$;

(II) for all $z \geq N$ and all $\alpha \in [-\pi/2 + \varepsilon, \pi/2 - \varepsilon] \cup [\pi/2 + \varepsilon, 3\pi/2 - \varepsilon]$,

$$4z\sigma^{-2} \gg |a(r, \alpha)|, \quad |2(z-1)^2 \sigma^{-1} r \cos \alpha| \gg |(z-1)^2 r^2 \cos 2\alpha + a(r, \alpha)|$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} (2(z-1)^2 \sigma^{-1} r \sin \alpha) \right| \gg \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} ((z-1)^2 r^2 \sin 2\alpha + b(r, \alpha)) \right|.$$

Note that for all $0 \leq z \leq N$, by (I), $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ will not go around -1 (in any direction) for one complete round as α increases from $-\pi/2$ to $3\pi/2$. Next, we consider the case when $z \geq N$. Notice that, by (II), for any fixed $z \geq N$, as α increases from $-\pi/2 + \varepsilon$ to $\pi/2 - \varepsilon$, $B(z, r, \alpha)$ increases as well. If, for some $z \geq N$ and $\alpha_0 \in [-\pi/2, -\pi/2 + \varepsilon] \cup [\pi/2 - \varepsilon, \pi/2]$,

$$A(z, r, \alpha_0) > 0,$$

it then follows from (II) that there exists $\ell = \ell(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and for the same z and any $\alpha \in [-\ell\varepsilon, \ell\varepsilon]$,

$$A(z, r, \alpha) > 0.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (II) that for any $z \geq N$ and for any $\alpha \in [\pi/2 + \varepsilon, 3\pi/2 - \varepsilon]$,

$$A(z, r, \alpha) < 0;$$

straightforward computations also yield that for any $z \geq N$ and for any $\alpha \in [\pi/2, \pi/2 + \varepsilon] \cup [3\pi/2 - \varepsilon, 3\pi/2]$,

$$A(z, r, \alpha) < 0.$$

It then follows that $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ will not go around -1 (in any direction) for one complete round as α increases from $\pi/2$ to $3\pi/2$.

We are now ready to conclude that as α increases from $-\pi/2$ to $3\pi/2$, for any $z \geq N$ with $\Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha})) \neq -1$, $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ will go around -1 anti-clockwise $k(z)$ times, where $k(z)$ is a non-negative integer; meanwhile, one checks that when z is large enough, $k(z)$ is strictly positive. The idea can be roughly described as follows. Consider the ‘‘trajectory’’ of $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ as α increases from $-\pi/2$ to $3\pi/2$. Obviously, $A(z, r, \alpha) > 0$ means the magnitude of the corresponding ‘‘location’’ is strictly bigger than 1; $B(z, r, \alpha) > 0$ means at the corresponding ‘‘location’’, $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ is going anti-clockwise. The above argument shows that given sufficiently small ε (and thus ℓ sufficiently large), for all the time when the ‘‘location’’ is at least 1 away from the origin, ‘‘more often’’ $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ goes around -1 anti-clockwise (for any $\alpha \in [-\pi/2, -\pi/2 + \varepsilon] \cup [\pi/2 - \varepsilon, \pi/2]$, $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ may go around -1 clockwise, whereas for all $\alpha \in [-\ell\varepsilon, \ell\varepsilon]$, $\Phi_z(1/\omega)$ must go around -1 anti-clockwise).

So, for any analytic extension along the circle $\{\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha} : \alpha \in [-\pi/2, 3\pi/2]\}$ (from $\alpha = -\pi/2$ to $\alpha = 3\pi/2$), we have proven that for any $z \geq 0$ with $\Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha})) \neq -1$,

$$\Im \left(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow (3\pi/2)^-} \log(1 + \Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha}))) \right) = \Im \left(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow (-\pi/2)^+} \log(1 + \Phi_z(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha}))) \right) + 2k(z)\pi i,$$

where $k(z)$ is a non-negative integer for all z and a strictly positive integer for all sufficiently large z . Using a similar argument, we can also prove that for any $z \leq 0$ with $\Phi_z^{-1}(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha})) \neq -1$,

$$\Im \left(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow (3\pi/2)^-} \log(1 + \Phi_z^{-1}(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha}))) \right) = \Im \left(\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow (-\pi/2)^+} \log(1 + \Phi_z^{-1}(1/(\sigma^{-1} + re^{i\alpha}))) \right) + 2k(z)\pi i,$$

where $k(z)$ is a non-negative integer for all z and a strictly positive integer for all sufficiently large $|z|$. This, however, implies that for the above analytic extension, (46) disagrees at $\alpha = -\pi/2$ and $\alpha = 3\pi/2$, which is a contradiction.

5 A Complex Hilbert Metric

Recall that \tilde{W} denote the complex version of W ,

$$\tilde{W} = \{w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_l) \in \mathbb{C}^l : \sum_i w_i = 1\}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{W}^+ = \{v \in \tilde{W} : \Re(v_i/v_j) > 0 \text{ for all } i, j\}.$$

For $v, w \in \tilde{W}^+$, define

$$\tilde{d}_H(v, w) = \max_{i,j} \left| \log \left(\frac{w_i/w_j}{v_i/v_j} \right) \right|, \quad (47)$$

where \log is taken as the principal branch of the complex $\log(\cdot)$ function (i.e., the branch whose branch cut is the negative real axis). Since the principal branch of \log is additive on the right-half plane, \tilde{d}_H is a metric on \tilde{W}^+ , which we call a *complex Hilbert metric* (for alternative complex Hilbert metrics, see [10] and [2]).

Let M denote the set of all $l \times l$ stochastic matrices, i.e.,

$$M = \{\Pi = (\pi_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times l} : \pi_{ij} \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^l \pi_{ij} = 1\},$$

and let \tilde{M} denote the complex version of M , defined as

$$\tilde{M} = \{\Pi = (\pi_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{l \times l} : \sum_{j=1}^l \pi_{ij} = 1, \text{ for all } i\}.$$

For a given positive $\Pi \in M$ and a small $\delta_1 > 0$, let $\tilde{M}_\Pi(\delta_1)$ denote the δ_1 -neighborhood, under the Euclidean metric, around Π within \tilde{M} . For an element $\tilde{\Pi} \in \tilde{M}_\Pi(\delta_1)$, similar to

(11), $\tilde{\Pi}$ will induce a mapping $f_{\tilde{\Pi}}$ on \tilde{W} . For a small $\delta_2 > 0$, let $\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta_2)$ denote the δ_2 -neighborhood of W° within \tilde{W}^+ under the complex Hilbert metric, i.e.,

$$\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta_2) = \{v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l) \in \tilde{W}^+ : \tilde{d}_H(v, u) \leq \delta_2, \text{ for some } u \in W^\circ\}.$$

The main result of [6] states:

Theorem 5.1. *Let Π be a positive matrix in M . For sufficiently small $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$, there exists $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that for any $\tilde{\Pi} \in \tilde{M}_\Pi(\delta_1)$, $f_{\tilde{\Pi}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta_2)$ under the complex Hilbert metric in (47).*

For $\delta > 0$, let $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}^+}[\delta]$ denote the “ δ -cone” of \mathbb{R}^+ within \mathbb{C} , i.e.,

$$\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}^+}[\delta] = \{x + yi \in \mathbb{C} : x > 0, -\delta x \leq y \leq \delta x\}.$$

The following Lemma can be easily checked.

Lemma 5.2. *For sufficiently small $\delta_1 > 0$, there exists a positive constant L_1 such that for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}^+}[\delta_1]$*

$$|\log \alpha - \log \beta| \leq L_1 \max \left(\frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{|\alpha|}, \frac{|\alpha - \beta|}{|\beta|} \right).$$

The following lemma essentially follows from the proof of Part 2 of Lemma 2.3 in [6] (in particular, its Part 1 is just a rephrased version of Part 2 of that lemma), allows us to connect the complex Hilbert metric and the Euclidean metric. We give a proof for completeness.

Lemma 5.3. *1. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists $\xi > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{W}^+$, $x \in W^\circ$ with $\tilde{d}_H(\tilde{x}, x) \leq \xi$, we have $\tilde{x}_i \in \tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$ for all i .*

2. For any $\zeta > 0$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \tilde{W}^+$ with $|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}|, |\tilde{y} - y| \leq \zeta$ for some $x, y \in W^\circ$, we have

$$|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}| \leq C \tilde{d}_H(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}).$$

Proof. We only prove Part 2. Let $\xi = \tilde{d}_H(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$. Then we have for all i, j ,

$$\left| \log \left(\frac{\tilde{x}_i/\tilde{y}_i}{\tilde{x}_j/\tilde{y}_j} \right) \right| \leq \xi.$$

There exists $C_1 > 0$ such that for ξ sufficiently small, and for all i, j , $\left| \frac{\tilde{x}_i/\tilde{y}_i}{\tilde{x}_j/\tilde{y}_j} - 1 \right| \leq C_1 \xi$. Let $\alpha_j = \tilde{x}_j/\tilde{y}_j$. Then for all i, j ,

$$|\tilde{x}_i - \alpha_j \tilde{y}_i| \leq C_1 \xi |\alpha_j| |\tilde{y}_i|,$$

and so

$$|1 - \alpha_j| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (\tilde{x}_i - \alpha_j \tilde{y}_i) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{x}_i - \alpha_j \tilde{y}_i| \leq C_1 \xi |\alpha_j| \sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{y}_i| = C_1 (1 + B\zeta) \xi |\alpha_j|.$$

It follows that $|\tilde{x}_j - \tilde{y}_j| \leq C_1 (1 + B\zeta) \xi |\tilde{x}_j| \leq C_1 (1 + B\zeta) \xi (x_j + \zeta)$, which implies Part 2, if ξ is sufficiently small. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The following lemma is an analog of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 6.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and any $x \in W$, we have*

$$\tilde{d}_H(f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x), f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)) \leq \delta.$$

Proof. Since all $\pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)$ are strictly positive, for any $\delta_1 > 0$, there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that for all i, j and all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$,

$$\frac{|\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)|}{\pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} \leq \delta_1.$$

Now, for any $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l) \in W$, any j and any $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$, we have

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i (\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0))}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} \right| = \left| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0) (\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)) / \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} \right| \leq \delta_1.$$

Thus, for any $\delta_2 > 0$, choosing δ_1 sufficiently small, we have

$$\left| \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} \right| = \left| \log \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i (\pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} - \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0))}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} \right) \right| \leq \delta_2.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_H(f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x), f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)) &= \max_{j,k} \left| \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j)}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0) q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|j)} - \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ik}^{\vec{\varepsilon}} q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|k)}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ik}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0) q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|k)} \right| \\ &= \max_{j,k} \left| \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ij}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} + \log \frac{q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|j)}{q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|j)} - \log \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ik}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}}{\sum_{i=1}^l x_i \pi_{ik}(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)} - \log \frac{q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|k)}{q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|k)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the second inequality of (9) that for any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and any $x \in W$, we have

$$\tilde{d}_H(f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x), f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)) \leq \delta.$$

□

The following lemma, roughly speaking, says that when we perturb $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$ “a bit” to $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta})$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is still a contraction mapping on a complex neighborhood of W° , and the contraction coefficient is uniform over all the values of z and $\vec{\theta}$. More precisely, recalling $\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$ denote the δ -neighborhood of W° of \tilde{W} under the complex Hilbert metric, we have

Lemma 6.2. *For sufficiently small $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$, there exists $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$ under the complex Hilbert metric in (47).*

Proof. By (7), we can choose $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and any $u, v \in \tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$,

$$\tilde{d}_H(u\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z), v\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z))$$

is well-defined. Moreover, it can be easily checked that

$$\tilde{d}_H(u\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z), v\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z)) = \tilde{d}_H(u\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}, v\Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}). \quad (48)$$

The lemma then immediately follows from Theorem 5.1. \square

The following lemma is also needed.

Lemma 6.3. 1. For any $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$ and for any $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$ and $-n-1 \leq i \leq -1$,

$$x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^i) \in \tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta), \quad (49)$$

and

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}^+}[\delta]. \quad (50)$$

2. There exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for all $z_{-n}^0 \in \mathcal{Z}^{n+1}$, $p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

3. For sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, there exist $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ and a positive constant L_1 such that for any two \mathcal{Z} -valued sequences $\{a_{-n_1}^0\}$ and $\{b_{-n_2}^0\}$ with $a_{-n}^0 = b_{-n}^0$ and for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$|p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0|a_{-n_1}^{-1}) - p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_0|b_{-n_2}^{-1})| \leq L_1 \rho_1^n \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(a_0|y')|.$$

Proof. 1. By Lemma 6.2, we can choose $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small such that there exists $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is a ρ_1 -contraction mapping on $\tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$ under the complex Hilbert metric.

Now, choose $r_1, r_2 > 0$ so small (the existence of r_1, r_2 is guaranteed by Lemma 6.1) such that for any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, for all $x \in W$, all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$

$$\tilde{d}_H(f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x), f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x)) \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1), \quad (51)$$

and for all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1)$,

$$\tilde{d}_H(\pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}}, \pi(\vec{\varepsilon}_0)) \leq \delta(1 - \rho_1). \quad (52)$$

We then deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_H(x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) &= \tilde{d}_H(f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})) \\ &\leq \tilde{d}_H(f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})) + \tilde{d}_H(f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}), f_{z_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0})). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Then, by (51), (52) and (53), for $i > -n - 1$, we have

$$\tilde{d}_H(x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) \leq \rho \tilde{d}_H(x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) + \delta(1 - \rho_1).$$

So, for all i ,

$$\tilde{d}_H(x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0}) \leq \delta,$$

and thus for all i , we have $x_{i+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} \in \tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$, as desired. This, together with (17) and Lemma 5.3 (Part 2), implies (50).

2. It follows from (9(i)) and Part 1 of Lemma 5.3 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2, \delta > 0$ and any $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $f_z^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x)$ is analytic with respect to $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}, x) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2) \times \tilde{W}_{W^\circ, H}(\delta)$.

It follows from this fact, the iterative nature of $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ (see (15)) and Part 1 that for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, each $x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Part 2 then immediately follows from (17).

3. For all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} x_{i,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} &= x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_{-n_1}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_i = \cdot | a_{-n_1}^i), \\ x_{i,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} &= x_i^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_{-n_2}^i) = p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(y_i = \cdot | b_{-n_2}^i). \end{aligned}$$

Apparently we have

$$x_{i+1,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{a_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_{i,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}), \quad x_{i+1,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} = f_{b_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(x_{i,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}).$$

Note that there exists a positive constant L'_1 such that

$$\tilde{d}_H(x_{-n,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_{-n,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) \leq L'_1,$$

for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, where $r_1, r_2 > 0$ are chosen sufficiently small. Then from (49), we have

$$\tilde{d}_H(x_{-1,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}, x_{-1,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}) \leq L'_1 \rho_1^{n-1}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.3, there exists a positive constant L''_1 independent of n_1, n_2 such that for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$|x_{-1,a}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}} - x_{-1,b}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}| \leq L''_1 \rho_1^n. \quad (54)$$

Now, using (17) and the fact that

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0) = \sum_y \pi_y^{\vec{\varepsilon}} q^{\vec{\theta}}(a_0 | y),$$

we conclude that there is a positive constant L_1 , independent of n_1, n_2 such that

$$|p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(a_0 | a_{-n_1}^{-1}) - p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(b_0 | b_{-n_2}^{-1})| \leq L_1 \rho_1^n \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(a_0 | y')|. \quad (55)$$

We then have finished the proof. \square

We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We first prove that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for any n , $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

For a fixed n , recall that

$$H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) = - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0,$$

where

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) = \sum_{y_{-n}^0} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0) \prod_{i=-n}^0 q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y_i)$$

and

$$p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) = x_{-1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^{-1}) \Pi^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0) \mathbf{1}.$$

Now, for any $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$, we have

$$|p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0)| \leq \sum_{y_{-n}^0} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0)| \prod_{i=-n}^0 |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z_i | y_i)| \leq \sum_{y_{-n}^0} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}}(y_{-n}^0)| \prod_{i=-n}^0 \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_i | y')|. \quad (56)$$

And, by (49), for sufficiently small $r_1, r_2 > 0$, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$C_1 \inf_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0 | y')| \leq |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_2 \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0 | y')|, \quad (57)$$

which, together with (50), implies that for some $C_3 > 0$,

$$|\log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})| \leq C_3 + \max\{|\log \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0 | y')||, \log \inf_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0 | y')|\}.$$

This, together with (3), implies that on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} \sup_{(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) \right| dz_{-n}^0 < \infty \quad (58)$$

By Lemma 3.4 (Part 2), $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z_0 | Z_{-n}^{-1})$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$.

Now, to prove the theorem, we only need to prove that there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that the $H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly converges on $\mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} |H_{n+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) - H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)| &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n-1}^{-1}) dz_{-n-1}^0 - \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^0) \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1}) dz_{-n}^0 \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) (\log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0 | z_{-n}^{-1})) dz_{-n-1}^0 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$. Then, by Lemmas 5.2 and 6.3, either we have, for some $0 < \rho_1 < 1$, $L'_1 > 0$ and some δ_1 with $(1 + \delta_1)\rho_1 < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0)(\log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}))| &\leq L'_1 \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) \frac{p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})}{p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1})} \right| \\ &\leq L'_1 |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^{-1})| L_1 \rho_1^n \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0|y')|, \end{aligned}$$

or we have, for some $0 < \rho_1 < 1$, $L'_1 > 0$ and some δ_1 with $(1 + \delta_1)\rho_1 < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0)(\log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}))| &\leq L'_1 \left| p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0) \frac{p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})}{p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1})} \right| \\ &\leq L'_1 |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^{-1})| |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}|z_{-n}^0)| L_1 \rho_1^n \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_0|y')|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for any given $\delta > 0$, there exist $r_1, r_2 > 0$ such that for all $\vec{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^m(r_1)$,

$$|\pi_{y_{-n}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}| \leq (1 + \delta)\pi_{y_{-n}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}, \quad |\pi_{y_i y_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}}| \leq (1 + \delta)\pi_{y_i y_{i+1}}^{\vec{\varepsilon}_0},$$

and for any $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and all $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)| dz \leq (1 + \delta) \int_{\mathcal{Z}} q^{\vec{\theta}_0}(z|y) dz = 1 + \delta,$$

(here we have used the fact that $\int_{\mathcal{Z}} |q^{\vec{\theta}}(z|y)| dz$ is a continuous function of $\vec{\theta} \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$; this follows from Lemma 3.4 (Part 1)). It then follows from (56) that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Z}^n} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n}^{-1})| dz_{-n}^{-1} \leq (1 + \delta)^{2n}, \quad \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+1}} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^{-1})| dz_{-n-1}^{-1} \leq (1 + \delta)^{2(n+1)}.$$

Moreover, similar to (57), we have for some $C_4, C_5 > 0$,

$$C_4 \inf_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_{-n-1}|y')| \leq |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}|z_{-n}^0)| \leq C_5 \sup_{(y', \vec{\theta}') \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)} |q^{\vec{\theta}'}(z_{-n-1}|y')|.$$

By choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we can combine all the relevant inequalities above to obtain some $L > 0$ and some $0 < \rho < 1$ such that for all $(\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\varepsilon}_0}^{m_1}(r_1) \times \mathbb{C}_{\vec{\theta}_0}^{m_2}(r_2)$,

$$|H_{n+1}^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z) - H_n^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)| \leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{n+2}} |p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_{-n-1}^0)(\log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n-1}^{-1}) - \log p^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(z_0|z_{-n}^{-1}))| dz_{-n-1}^0 \leq L\rho^n,$$

which implies the analyticity of $H^{\vec{\varepsilon}, \vec{\theta}}(Z)$ around $(\vec{\varepsilon}_0, \vec{\theta}_0)$. □

References

- [1] D. Blackwell. The entropy of functions of finite-state Markov chains. *Trans. First Prague Conf. Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes*, 1957, pp. 13–20.
- [2] L. Dubois. Projective metrics and contraction principles for complex cones. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. 79, no. 3, 2009, pp. 719–737.
- [3] G. Han and B. Marcus. Analyticity of entropy rate of hidden Markov chains. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 12, 2006, pp. 5251–5266.
- [4] G. Han and B. Marcus. Asymptotics of input-constrained binary symmetric channel capacity. *Annals of Applied Probability*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2009, pp. 1063–1091.
- [5] G. Han and B. Marcus. Entropy rate of continuous-state hidden Markov chains. *IEEE ISIT*, 2010, pp. 1468–1472.
- [6] G. Han and B. Marcus and Y. Peres. A complex Hilbert metric and applications to domain of analyticity for entropy rate of hidden Markov processes. *Entropy of Hidden Markov Processes and Connections to Dynamical Systems, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, vol. 385, edited by B. Marcus, K. Petersen and T. Weissman, 2011, pp. 98–116.
- [7] S. Ihara. *Information Theory for Continuous Systems*. World Scientific, 1993.
- [8] P. Jacquet, G. Seroussi, and W. Szpankowski. On the entropy of a hidden Markov process. *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 395, 2008, pp. 203–219.
- [9] E. Ordentlich and T. Weissman. Bounds on the entropy rate of binary hidden Markov processes. *Entropy of Hidden Markov Processes and Connections to Dynamical Systems, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, vol. 385, edited by B. Marcus, K. Petersen and T. Weissman, 2011, pp. 117–171.
- [10] H. Rugh. Cones and gauges in complex spaces: Spectral gaps and complex Perron-Frobenius theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, vol. 171, no. 3, 2010.
- [11] E. Seneta. *Non-negative Matrices and Markov Chains*. Springer-Verlag, New York Heidelberg Berlin, 1980.
- [12] O. Zuk, E. Domany, I. Kanter and M. Aizenman. From finite-system entropy to entropy rate for a hidden Markov process. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 13, no. 9, 2006, pp. 517–520.