

ABSOLUTE REGULARITY OF SEMI-CONTRACTIVE GARCH-TYPE PROCESSESPAUL DOUKHAN,* *Université Cergy-Pontoise*MICHAEL H. NEUMANN,** *Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena***Abstract**

We prove existence and uniqueness of a stationary distribution and absolute regularity for nonlinear GARCH and INGARCH models of order (p, q) . In contrast to previous work we impose, besides a geometric drift condition, only a semi-contractive condition which allows us to include models which would be ruled out by a fully contractive condition. This results in a subgeometric rather than the more usual geometric decay rate of the mixing coefficients. The proofs are heavily based on a coupling of two versions of the processes.

Keywords: Absolute regularity; coupling; GARCH; INGARCH; mixing

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60G10

Secondary 60J05

1. Introduction

Conditionally heteroscedastic processes are frequently used to model the evolution of stock prices, exchange rates and interest rates. Starting with the seminal papers by Engle (1982) on autoregressive conditional heteroscedastic models (ARCH) and Bollerslev (1986) on generalized ARCH, numerous variants of these models have been proposed for modeling financial time series; see for example Francq and Zakoïan (2010) for a detailed overview. More recently, integer-valued GARCH models (INGARCH) which mirror the structure of GARCH models have been proposed for modeling time series of counts; see for example Fokianos (2012).

In this paper, we prove existence and uniqueness of a stationary distribution under a time-homogeneous dynamic. As our main result, we show absolute regularity of the observable process under the semi-contractive condition (1.5) rather than a more common fully contractive condition on the volatility function. In conjunction with standard conditions (A1) and (A3), this results in an atypical decay rate for the coefficients of absolute regularity,

$$\beta_n = O(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}), \quad \text{for some } \rho < 1. \quad (1.1)$$

* Postal address: UMR 8088 Analyse, Géométrie et Modélisation
2, avenue Adolphe Chauvin
95302 Cergy-Pontoise Cedex
France

** Postal address: Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena
Institut für Mathematik
Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2
07743 Jena
Germany

Our technique allows to obtain this strong result even for non-stationary models with a non-homogeneous dynamic, under uniform (in t) versions of our regularity conditions. This opens a wide range of applications for modeling real data sets.

The results hold for general GARCH processes obeying the model equations

$$Y_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t, \quad (1.2a)$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = f(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p}; \sigma_{t-1}, \dots, \sigma_{t-q}). \quad (1.2b)$$

Here, $(\varepsilon_t)_t$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, where ε_t is independent of all lagged random variables and $\mathbb{E}\varepsilon_t^2 = 1$. A general INGARCH process is characterized by the model equations

$$Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} = Q(\lambda_t), \quad (1.3a)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_s = \sigma((Y_s, \lambda_s), (Y_{s-1}, \lambda_{s-1}), \dots)$ and, analogously to the GARCH case,

$$\lambda_t = f(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p}; \lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}). \quad (1.3b)$$

Here $\{Q(\lambda): \lambda \geq 0\}$ is a family of distributions on the non-negative integers. An important aspect is that such models allow for a feedback mechanism in the hidden process which often makes a parsimonious parametrization possible. Absolute regularity (β -mixing) with a geometric decay rate of the coefficients of standard (linear) GARCH(p, q) processes was shown in the PhD thesis of [Boussama \(1998\)](#). Geometric β -mixing for nonlinear GARCH(1,1) specifications can be found in [Carrasco and Chen \(2002, proposition 5\)](#) and [Francq and Zakoïan \(2006, Theorem 3\)](#). Properties of INGARCH processes have already been studied under a fully contractive condition,

$$\begin{aligned} & |f(y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q) - f(y'_1, \dots, y'_p; \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q)| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^p a_i |y_i - y'_i| + \sum_{j=1}^q b_j |\lambda_j - \lambda'_j|, \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

where $y_1, \dots, y_p, y'_1, \dots, y'_p \in \mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, \dots\}$, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q, \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q \geq 0$, and a_1, \dots, a_p and b_1, \dots, b_q being non-negative constants such that $\sum_{i=1}^p a_i + \sum_{j=1}^q b_j < 1$. [Neumann \(2011\)](#) showed, in the case of $p = q = 1$, that condition (1.4) implies that the bivariate process $((\lambda_t, Y_t))_t$ has a unique stationary distribution and that a stationary version of the count process $(Y_t)_t$ is absolutely regular with mixing coefficients $\beta_n = O(\rho^n)$, for some $\rho < 1$. It was also shown that the intensity process $(\lambda_t)_t$ is not strongly mixing in general (see Remark 3 in that paper for a simple counterexample) but ergodic. [Franke \(2010\)](#) showed in the case of $p, q \geq 1$ that there exists a stationary distribution. Moreover, he proved τ -weak dependence as defined in [Dedecker et al. \(2007\)](#), again with an exponential decay of the coefficients of weak dependence. Also under a fully contractive condition, [Fokianos et al. \(2009\)](#) analyzed linear and nonlinear version of INGARCH(1,1) processes. Since the verification of geometric ergodicity turned out to be unclear with conventional Markov chain theory, these authors proved ergodicity for a perturbed version of the original process. As the perturbations can be chosen arbitrarily small this result could be used to derive the asymptotic distribution of parameter estimates.

We will cover both GARCH and INGARCH models and we want to stress that we impose a contractive condition considerably weaker than (1.4),

$$|f(y_1, \dots, y_p; z_1, \dots, z_q) - f(y_1, \dots, y_p; z'_1, \dots, z'_q)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q c_i |z_i - z'_i|, \quad (1.5)$$

where c_1, \dots, c_q are non-negative constants with $c_1 + \dots + c_q < 1$. This allows us to consider, for example, threshold models where the function f is specified as

$$f(y; \lambda) = \begin{cases} a + by + c\lambda, & \text{if } y \in [L, U], \\ a' + b'y + c'\lambda, & \text{if } y \notin [L, U]. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

Such a specification was proposed in the framework of integer-valued time series by [Woodard et al. \(2011\)](#). Furthermore, our semi-contractive condition also allows us to consider functions f with

$$f(y; \lambda) = g(y) + h(\lambda)$$

and with only $\text{Lip}(h) < 1$. Note that well-established threshold models in financial mathematics such as those proposed for example by [Glosten, Jagannathan and Runkle \(1993\)](#),

$$\sigma_t^2 = \omega + \alpha Y_{t-1}^2 + \beta Y_{t-1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{t-1} < 0\}} + \gamma \sigma_{t-1}^2,$$

or by [Francq and Zakoïan \(2010, page 250\)](#),

$$\sigma_t = \omega + \sum_{i=1}^p (\alpha_i^+ Y_{t-i} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{t-i} > 0\}} - \alpha_i^- Y_{t-i} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{t-i} < 0\}}) + \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_j \sigma_{t-j}$$

even fulfill the fully contractive condition [\(1.4\)](#).

To unify our notation, we use the expression $(\lambda_t)_t$ for the hidden process in what follows, that is σ_t^2 will be replaced by λ_t in case of a GARCH process. It is worth noting at this point that, although the bivariate process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_t$ is a Markov chain of order $p \vee q$, the process $(Y_t)_t$ does not share this property, except for the case $q = 0$ which is not of primary interest here.

We show as our main result that the coefficients of absolute regularity of the observable process $(Y_t)_t$ satisfy [\(1.1\)](#). Recall that $\beta_n = \sup_k \beta(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^k, \mathcal{F}_{k+n}^\infty)$ with $\mathcal{F}_k^l = \sigma(Y_s: k \leq s \leq l)$ where, for any couple of σ -fields \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} :

$$\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^m |\mathbb{P}(A_i \cap B_j) - P(A_i)P(B_j)| \right\}$$

where the supremum is taken over partitions of Ω , $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$ and $(B_j)_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ subject to $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, and $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. This subexponential rate is quite unusual and it is a consequence of the fact that we only impose a semi-contractive rather than a fully contractive condition.

To prove this result, we construct a coupling of two versions of the bivariate process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_t$, both started independently at time 0 with the stationary distribution. These two versions, $((\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t))_t$ and $((\tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t))_t$, are defined on a sufficiently rich probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$. In the context of Markov chains, such a coupling typically leads to a coalescence of the two versions at some random time τ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau > n)$ then serves as an estimate of β_n . In our case, since $(Y_t)_t$ is not a Markov chain, it can well happen that $\tilde{Y}_\tau = \tilde{Y}'_\tau$ at some time τ but that afterwards these two processes diverge again. This follows from the fact that the accompanying hidden processes $(\tilde{\lambda}_t)_t$ and $(\tilde{\lambda}'_t)_t$ still can attain different values at time τ which means that the observable processes may diverge again with positive probability. In view of this, we have to use

$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y}_m \neq \tilde{Y}'_m \text{ for any } m \geq n)$ as an upper estimate for β_n . When the two processes reach a state with

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+1} \quad \text{and} \quad |\tilde{\lambda}_t - \tilde{\lambda}'_t| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+1}| \leq \rho^{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (1.7)$$

then we have p subsequent hits and the contractive condition begins to take effect which eventually leads to the result that both processes coalesce with a (conditional) probability exceeding $1 - O(\rho^{\sqrt{n}})$. To reach such a state with the crucial property (1.7), the two processes need several trials, beginning at certain stopping times τ_1, τ_2, \dots . Because of the condition of $|\tilde{\lambda}_t - \tilde{\lambda}'_t| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+1}| \leq \rho^{\sqrt{n}}$ in (1.7), each of these trials covers in order \sqrt{n} time points. This means, up to time n there can be in order at most \sqrt{n} such trials. Such a number of successive trials ensures that a state with (1.7) is reached before time n with a probability exceeding $1 - O(\rho^{\sqrt{n}})$. This might give some insight why we obtain the unusual rate of $\rho^{\sqrt{n}}$ for the coefficients of absolute regularity. The desired uniqueness of the stationary law follows as a by-product of the successful coupling. The result on absolute regularity can be extended to non-stationary GARCH-type processes; a uniform (in t) version of our semi-contractive condition will ensure this.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we fix and discuss our assumptions. Our main results are based on a coupling technique which is introduced in Subsection 2.1. To make the main ideas of our proofs easily accessible, we present the consequences of this coupling for a simple special case in Subsection 2.2. The main results are formulated in Subsection 2.3. is briefly discussed at the end of this Subsection. A few applications in statistics are mentioned in Subsection 2.4. All proofs are deferred to a final Section 3.

2. Assumptions and main results

We assume that the process $(Y_t)_t$, which is defined on some probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , obeys the model equations

$$Y_t | \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim Q(\lambda_t), \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\lambda_t = f(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p}; \lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}), \quad (2.1b)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_s = \sigma((Y_s, \lambda_s), (Y_{s-1}, \lambda_{s-1}), \dots)$ and $\{Q(\lambda): \lambda \in [0, \infty)\}$ is some family of univariate distributions. Note that assumption (2.1a) is correctly formulated since it follows from (2.1b) that λ_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable.

The canonical domain of the function f is different in the two cases of GARCH and INGARCH models. To unify notation, we define f in both cases on $\mathbb{R}^p \times [0, \infty)^q$, e.g. by a linear interpolation in the INGARCH case. Recall that $(\lambda_t)_t$ denotes the volatility process in the case of GARCH(p, q) models ((1.2a)-(1.2b)) and the intensity process in the INGARCH(p, q) case ((1.3a)-(1.3b)). Here, the distribution of an observable random variable Y_t conditioned on the past is $Q(\lambda_t)$, where the parameter λ_t itself is random, depending on lagged variables Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p} and previous values $\lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}$ of the (typically hidden) accompanying process $(\lambda_t)_t$.

Possible examples we have in mind are linear or nonlinear GARCH(p, q) processes, with λ_t being the conditional variance of the observable variable Y_t , or integer-valued GARCH processes, where $Q(\lambda)$ is often chosen to be a Poisson distribution with

intensity parameter λ . Existence of a one-sided version of these processes, i.e. $t \in \mathbb{N}$, is guaranteed since we can construct such processes iteratively. We will show that there exists a stationary distribution which implies by Kolmogorov's extension theorem (see e.g. [Durrett \(1991\)](#)) that also a stationary two-sided version, i.e. $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, does exist. In the proof of our main result, we also use some Markov chain techniques. The process $(Z_t)_t$ with $Z_t = (Y_t^2, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}^2, \sigma_t^2, \dots, \sigma_{t-q+1}^2)$ for a GARCH(p, q) model obeying [\(1.2a\)](#) and [\(1.2b\)](#) as well as $Z_t = (Y_t, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}, \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_{t-q+1})$ in the INGARCH(p, q) case according to [\(1.3a\)](#) and [\(1.3b\)](#) has this property. In the following it turns out to be convenient to drop the random component of the random vector Z_t and we also define $X_t = (Y_{t-1}^2, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}^2, \sigma_t^2, \dots, \sigma_{t-q+1}^2)$ as well as $X_t = (Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}, \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_{t-q+1})$, respectively.

We impose the following conditions:

(A1) (*Geometric drift condition*)

There exist positive constants $a_1, \dots, a_{p-1}, b_0, \dots, b_{q-1}, \kappa < 1$ and $a_0 < \infty$ such that, for $V((y_1, \dots, y_{p-1}; \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{q-1})) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i y_i + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} b_j \lambda_j$, the condition

$$\mathbb{E}(V(X_t) \mid X_{t-1}) \leq \kappa V(X_{t-1}) + a_0$$

is fulfilled with probability 1.

(A2) (*Semi-contractive condition*)

The function f is measurable and there exist non-negative constants c_1, \dots, c_q with $c_1 + \dots + c_q < 1$ such that

$$|f(y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q) - f(y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q c_i |\lambda_i - \lambda'_i|$$

for all $y_1, \dots, y_p \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q, \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q \geq 0$.

(A3) (*Similarity condition*)

There exists some constant $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\text{TV}(Q(\lambda), Q(\lambda')) \leq 1 - e^{-\delta|\lambda - \lambda'|} \quad \forall \lambda, \lambda' \geq 0,$$

where $\text{TV}(Q_1, Q_2) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}} |Q_1(A) - Q_2(A)|$ denotes the total variation distance between probability measures Q_1 and Q_2 .

Remark 2.1. In the case of $p = q = 1$, X_t reduces to λ_t . Condition (A1) follows from the following drift condition which is frequently used in the context of linear and nonlinear GARCH-type models; see e.g. [Lindner \(2009\)](#) and [Franke \(2010\)](#).

(A1') There exist constants $\bar{a}_0 \in [0, \infty)$, and $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_p, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_q \in [0, 1)$, with $\sum_{i=1}^p \bar{a}_i + \sum_{j=1}^q \bar{b}_j < 1$ such that

- in the GARCH(p, q) case,

$$\sigma_t^2 \leq \bar{a}_0 + \bar{a}_1 Y_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \bar{a}_p Y_{t-p}^2 + \bar{b}_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \bar{b}_q \sigma_{t-q}^2,$$

- in the INGARCH(p, q) case,

$$\lambda_t \leq \bar{a}_0 + \bar{a}_1 Y_{t-1} + \dots + \bar{a}_p Y_{t-p} + \bar{b}_1 \lambda_{t-1} + \dots + \bar{b}_q \lambda_{t-q}.$$

Remark 2.2. Condition (A2) is the essential difference to the fully contractive condition imposed e.g. in [Neumann \(2011\)](#) and [Truquet \(2018\)](#). Here, we only assume Lipschitz continuity of f w.r.t lagged values $\lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}$. This includes the case of threshold models where the thresholds are set on the lagged variables of the observable process, $Y_{t-1}^2, \dots, Y_{t-p}^2$ or Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p} , respectively.

Remark 2.3. With the standard specification for GARCH models, we have that

$$Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} = \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda_t),$$

that is, λ_t takes the role of the conditional volatility σ_t^2 . Let p_λ be the density of a $\mathcal{N}(0, \lambda)$ distribution. If the volatilities satisfy $\lambda_t \geq \omega$, then we obtain, for $0 < \omega \leq \lambda \leq \lambda'$,

$$1 - \text{TV}(\mathcal{N}(0, \lambda), \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda')) = \int p_\lambda \wedge p_{\lambda'} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\lambda'}} \geq \frac{\lambda}{\lambda'} \geq e^{-|\lambda - \lambda'|/\lambda} \geq e^{-|\lambda - \lambda'|/\omega},$$

that is, the similarity condition (A3) is fulfilled with $\delta = 1/\omega$ (In order to prove the third inequality in the above display, note that $1 + u \leq e^u$, $\forall u \geq 0$, which implies that $\lambda'/\lambda = 1 + (\lambda' - \lambda)/\lambda \leq e^{|\lambda' - \lambda|/\lambda}$).

While a normal distribution seems to be the dominating choice for the distribution of the innovations in GARCH models, there exist quite a few proposals for their integer-valued counterparts, the INGARCH models. For the sake of an easy description, let $(\mathcal{P}_t(\lambda))_{\lambda \geq 0}$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, be a sequence of independent standard Poisson processes.

1. *Poisson seed.* If $Q(\lambda) = \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, then Y_t can be expressed as $Y_t = \mathcal{P}_t(\lambda_t)$.
2. *Mixed Poisson seed.* Here we have the specification $Y_t = \mathcal{P}_t(\lambda_t Z_t)$, where Z_t is a non-negative random variable. The special case of a Bernoulli distributed random variable Z_t , leads to the so-called zero-inflated Poisson model in [Lambert \(1992\)](#); it takes into account additional unobserved data.
3. *Compound Poisson seed.* Let $(Z_{t,i})_{t,i \geq 0}$ be a double sequence of i.i.d. non-negative random variables. In this case, Y_t is given by $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{P}_t(\lambda_t)} Z_{t,i}$. This process is integer-valued if $\mathbb{P}(Z_{t,i} \in \mathbb{N}_0) = 1$.

In cases 1 and 3, the similarity assumption (A3) is fulfilled with $\delta = 1$; see [Adell and Jodrá \(2006\)](#). Regarding case 2, let $Q_{MP}(\lambda)$ denote the mixed Poisson distribution with intensity parameter λ . Then,

$$\text{TV}(Q_{MP}(\lambda), Q_{MP}(\lambda')) \leq \mathbb{E} \left(1 - e^{-Z_t |\lambda - \lambda'|} \right) \leq 1 - e^{-\delta |\lambda - \lambda'|},$$

where $\delta = \mathbb{E} Z_t$.

Remark 2.4. For two probability measures Q_1 and Q_2 on \mathcal{B} , let $d_1 = dQ_1/d(Q_1 + Q_2)$ and $d_2 = dQ_2/d(Q_1 + Q_2)$ be the respective densities w.r.t. the dominating measure $Q_1 + Q_2$. Then

$$\Delta := \int d_1 \wedge d_2 d(Q_1 + Q_2) = 1 - \text{TV}(Q_1, Q_2). \quad (2.2)$$

Furthermore, using the method of maximal coupling as described for example in [den Hollander \(2012, page 15\)](#) we can construct, with the aid of an additional randomization, random variables X_1 and X_2 such that

- $X_1 \sim Q_1, \quad X_2 \sim Q_2,$
- $P(X_1 = X_2) = \Delta.$

Indeed, let U be a random variable with a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. If $U \leq \Delta$, then we choose

$$X_1 = X_2 = F^{-1}(U),$$

where $F(x) = \int_{(-\infty, x]} d_1 \wedge d_2 d(Q_1 + Q_2)$. Here and below, H^{-1} denotes the generalized inverse of a generic distribution function H , that is, $H^{-1}(t) = \inf\{x: H(x) \geq t\}$ (This function is sometimes denoted by H^-). This definition makes sense no matter if the distribution H is a continuous or discrete one. If $U > \Delta$, then we set

$$X_1 = G_1^{-1}(U - \Delta), \quad X_2 = G_2^{-1}(U - \Delta),$$

where $G_i(x) = \int_{(-\infty, x]} (d_i - d_1 \wedge d_2) d(Q_1 + Q_2)$, for $i = 1, 2$.

2.1. Definition of the coupling

We use a coupling approach to prove stationarity and absolute regularity of the GARCH-type process. In the case of a stationary Markov chain $(Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ defined on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, one usually constructs, on an appropriate probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$, two versions $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(\tilde{Z}'_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ of this chain which are started at $t = 0$ independently, both with their stationary distribution. If one succeeds to construct a coupling such that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Z}_m \neq \tilde{Z}'_m \text{ for any } m \geq n)$ tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the inequality

$$\beta_n \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Z}_m \neq \tilde{Z}'_m \text{ for any } m \geq n) \quad (2.3)$$

provides an upper bound for the mixing coefficient. However, since a Markov process in discrete time is always strongly Markovian, it actually suffices to derive an upper estimate for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Z}_n \neq \tilde{Z}'_n)$ and we can conclude that the original process $(Z_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is absolutely regular with coefficients satisfying $\beta_n \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Z}_n \neq \tilde{Z}'_n)$. In our case, the process $(Y_t)_t$ is not a Markov chain. Once we have constructed a coupling of $((\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t))_t$ and $((\tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t))_t$, we have to stick to the estimate (2.3). (Even if $\tilde{Y}_n = \tilde{Y}'_n$ it could well happen that $\tilde{\lambda}_n \neq \tilde{\lambda}'_n$ which means that we cannot achieve $\tilde{Y}_{n+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{n+1}$ with a conditional probability of 1.) This means that we are required to find a construction where the two versions hit at some time and stay together afterwards (they coalesce).

Suppose that pre-sample values $\tilde{Y}_0, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{1-p}, \tilde{\lambda}_0, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{1-q}$ and $\tilde{Y}'_0, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{1-p}, \tilde{\lambda}'_0, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{1-q}$ are given. The values of $\tilde{\lambda}_1$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'_1$ arise as a result of the model equation (2.1b),

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = f(\tilde{Y}_0, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{1-p}; \tilde{\lambda}_0, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{1-q}), \quad \tilde{\lambda}'_1 = f(\tilde{Y}'_0, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{1-p}; \tilde{\lambda}'_0, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{1-q}).$$

Note that the conditional distribution of \tilde{Y}_1 given the past has to be $Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1)$ and that of \tilde{Y}'_1 $Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1)$. We couple the two Markov chains in such a way that $\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t$ with a maximum conditional probability. According to Remark 2.4 above, we utilize a sequence $(U_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ of i.i.d. random variables with a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, 1]$, also independent of $(\tilde{Y}_0, \tilde{Y}'_0, \tilde{\lambda}_0, \tilde{\lambda}'_0), (\tilde{Y}_{-1}, \tilde{Y}'_{-1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{-1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{-1}), \dots$

Let $q_1 = dQ(\tilde{\lambda}_1)/d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1))$, $q'_1 = dQ(\tilde{\lambda}'_1)/d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1))$ and $\bar{q}_1 = \int q_1 \wedge q'_1 d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1))$.

If $U_1 \leq \bar{q}_1$ then we define

$$\tilde{Y}_1 = \tilde{Y}'_1 = F_1^{-1}(U_1),$$

where $F_1(x) = \int_{(-\infty, x]} q_1 \wedge q'_1 d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1))$. If $U_1 > \bar{q}_1$ then we set

$$\tilde{Y}_1 = G_1^{-1}(U_1 - \bar{q}_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Y}'_1 = G'_1{}^{-1}(U_1 - \bar{q}_1),$$

where

$$G_1(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x (q_1 - q_1 \wedge q'_1) d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1)), \quad G'_1(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x (q'_1 - q_1 \wedge q'_1) d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_1) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_1)).$$

We iterate this process in the same way.

Let $q_t = dQ(\tilde{\lambda}_t)/d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_t) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_t))$, $q'_t = dQ(\tilde{\lambda}'_t)/d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_t) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_t))$ and $\bar{q}_t = \int q_t \wedge q'_t d(Q(\tilde{\lambda}_t) + Q(\tilde{\lambda}'_t))$. Furthermore, denote by F_t , G_t and G'_t the distribution functions of the densities $(q_t \wedge q'_t)$, $(q_t - (q_t \wedge q'_t))$ and $(q'_t - (q_t \wedge q'_t))$, respectively. On the basis of given values $\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p}; \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-q}$ and $\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p}; \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q}$ we set

$$\tilde{\lambda}_t = f(\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p}; \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-q}), \quad \tilde{\lambda}'_t = f(\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p}; \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q}),$$

as well as

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t = F_t^{-1}(U_t) \quad \text{if } U_t \leq \bar{q}_t \quad (2.4a)$$

and

$$\tilde{Y}_t = G_t^{-1}(U_t - \bar{q}_t), \quad \tilde{Y}'_t = G'_t{}^{-1}(U_t - \bar{q}_t) \quad \text{if } U_t > \bar{q}_t. \quad (2.4b)$$

2.2. A first glimpse at the consequences of the coupling

To communicate the main ideas involved in the proofs in a transparent way, we first consider the special case of an INGARCH(1,1) process and present a sketch of the major steps in the proofs of the results. For definiteness we assume that $Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_t)$.

Note that $\text{TV}(\text{Poisson}(\lambda), \text{Poisson}(\lambda')) \leq 1 - e^{-|\lambda - \lambda'|}$. To see this, assume w.l.o.g. $\lambda \leq \lambda'$. If $Y \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$ and $W \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda' - \lambda)$ are independent, then $Y' = Y + W \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda')$. It follows that $P(Y \neq Y') = P(W = 0) = 1 - e^{-|\lambda - \lambda'|}$, which implies that the similarity condition (A3) is satisfied with $\delta = 1$.

Let $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma(\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t, (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}), \dots)$ denote the σ -field of the t -past of both versions of the processes. Suppose that τ is some stopping time and that, for some reason, $|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}| \leq K$. Note that $\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}$ are both \mathcal{G}_τ -measurable, where

$$\mathcal{G}_\tau = \left\{ G \in \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{G}_n : G \cap \{\tau \leq n\} \in \mathcal{G}_n \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\}.$$

Then, according to the maximal coupling explained above,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \geq e^{-|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}|} \geq e^{-K}.$$

If in addition $\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}$, then the contractive condition (A2) implies that

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+2}| \leq c_1 K.$$

Therefore, we obtain for the next step that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2} \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \mathcal{G}_\tau) \geq e^{-c_1 K}$$

and, if additionally $\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2}$,

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+3} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+3}| \leq c_1^2 K.$$

Proceeding in the same way we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+M} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+M} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2} \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \mathcal{G}_\tau) \times \\ & \quad \dots \times \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+M} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+M} \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+M-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+M-1}, \mathcal{G}_\tau) \\ & \geq e^{-K(1+c_1+\dots+c_1^{M-1})}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m}, |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+m} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+m}| \leq c_1^{m-1} K, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \\ & \geq e^{-K/(1-c_1)} \geq 1 - \frac{K}{1-c_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In what follows we sketch how (2.6) can be used to prove absolute regularity. Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi$ denote the probability where $(\tilde{Y}_0, \tilde{\lambda}_0)$ and $(\tilde{Y}'_0, \tilde{\lambda}'_0)$ are independent and distributed with their common stationary law π . (Its existence and uniqueness is proved in Corollary 2.1 below.) We define the stopping time

$$\tau^{(n)} = \inf\{t \geq 0: |\tilde{\lambda}_{t+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t+1}| \leq C \rho^{n^\alpha}\},$$

for some $C < \infty$ and some $\alpha > 0$ whose optimal choice is explained below. We obtain from (2.6) that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n & \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tilde{Y}_m \neq \tilde{Y}'_m \text{ for any } m \geq n) \\ & \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tilde{Y}_m \neq \tilde{Y}'_m \text{ for any } m > \tau^{(n)} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau^{(n)}}) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau^{(n)} \geq n) \\ & \leq \frac{C \rho^{n^\alpha}}{1-c_1} + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau^{(n)} \geq n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

It remains to derive an upper estimate for the second term on the right-hand side of (2.7). To this end, we consider subsequent trials to achieve a state with $|\tilde{\lambda}_t - \tilde{\lambda}'_t| \leq C_1$, for some $C_1 \in (0, \infty)$, followed by subsequent hits $\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t+d_n-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{t+d_n-1}$, where $d_n = \lceil n^\alpha \rceil$. We define a first stopping time as

$$\tau_1 = \inf\{t \geq 0: |\tilde{\lambda}_t + \tilde{\lambda}'_t| \leq C_1\}.$$

(If $|\tilde{\lambda}_0 + \tilde{\lambda}'_0| \leq C_1$, then $\tau_1 = 0$. Otherwise τ_1 is the first arrival time of the process $((\tilde{\lambda}_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t))_t$ at $A := \{(u_1, u_2): u_1 + u_2 \leq C_1\}$.) At time τ_1 we have that $|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau_1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau_1}| \leq C_1$. According to (2.5), there exists some constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+d_n-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+d_n-1} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}) \geq C_2.$$

After such a successful trial with d_n hits we obtain from the contractive property (A2) that

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau_1+d_n} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau_1+d_n}| \leq C_1 c_1^{d_n}. \quad (2.8)$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi \left(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+m} \neq \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+m} \text{ for any } m \geq d_n \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+d_n-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+d_n-1}, \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1} \right) \\ \leq \frac{C_1 c_1^{d_n}}{1 - c_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which brings us closer to the desired result. This means, a trial which actually leads to a favorable state with (2.8) covers d_n time points. Accordingly, for $i > 1$ we consider the following *retarded* return times as starting points for the next trials:

$$\tau_i = \inf\{t \geq \tau_{i-1} + d_n : \tilde{\lambda}_t + \tilde{\lambda}'_t \leq C_1\}.$$

Now we are in a position to derive an upper bound for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau^{(n)} \geq n)$. We define events

$$A_i = \{\tilde{Y}_{\tau_i} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_i}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_i+d_n-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_i+d_n-1}\}.$$

Since each trial covers d_n time points we cannot get more than $O(n^{1-\alpha})$ different stopping times τ_i before time n . Let $K_n = C_3 n^{1-\alpha}$, for some $C_3 > 0$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau_{K_n} + d_n \geq n) \leq \frac{1}{\eta^{n-d_n}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\pi(\eta^{\tau_1 + (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \dots + (\tau_{K_n} - \tau_{K_n-1})}) = o(\rho^{n^\alpha}),$$

for some $\eta > 1$ and $\rho < 1$, if C_3 is small enough. Therefore, and since $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(A_1^c \cap \dots \cap A_{K_n}^c) \leq (1 - C_2)^{K_n}$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau^{(n)} \geq n) \leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau_{K_n} + d_n \geq n) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(A_1^c \cap \dots \cap A_{K_n}^c) = o(\rho^{n^\alpha}) + O(\rho^{n^{1-\alpha}}), \quad (2.9)$$

for some $\rho < 1$. The first term on the right-hand side of (2.7) and the second one on the right-hand side of (2.9) are of the same order for the choice of $\alpha = 1/2$, which gives the estimate

$$\beta_n = O(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}).$$

2.3. Main results

To prove our main results we use the coupling method described in Subsection 2.1. Recall that $((\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t))_t$ and $((\tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t))_t$ denote the two versions of the process which are coupled on a suitable probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}})$ according to (2.4a) and (2.4b). Moreover, we remind the reader that $\mathcal{G}_t = \sigma((\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t), (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}), \dots)$. The following lemma describes the core of our coupling method.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled and let τ be any stopping time such that $\tilde{Y}_\tau = \tilde{Y}'_\tau, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau-p+2}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m} \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+m} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+m}| \leq \frac{1}{1-c} \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}| \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau \right) \\ \geq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\delta}{1-c} \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $c = c_1 + \dots + c_q$.

This lemma tells us that the two processes $(\tilde{Y}_t)_t$ and $(\tilde{Y}'_t)_t$ coalesce with a conditional probability greater than or equal to $\exp\{-\delta K/(1-c)\}$, where $K = \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|$. Therefore, in order to prove the desired decay rate for the coefficients of absolute regularity, we show that there exists a stopping time $\tau^{(n)}$ such that $\tilde{Y}_{\tau^{(n)}} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau^{(n)}}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau^{(n)}-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau^{(n)}-p+2}, |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau^{(n)}+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau^{(n)}+1}| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau^{(n)}-q+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau^{(n)}-q+2}| \leq \rho\sqrt{n}$ and that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau^{(n)} < n) = 1 - O(\rho\sqrt{n})$, for some $\rho < 1$. The following main result summarizes the result of our coupling method.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled. If*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}[V(\tilde{X}_0) + V(\tilde{X}'_0)] < \infty,$$

then

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{Y}_m = \tilde{Y}'_m \quad \forall m \geq n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |\tilde{\lambda}_m - \tilde{\lambda}'_m| \leq \frac{\rho\sqrt{n}}{1-c}\right) = 1 - O(\rho\sqrt{n}).$$

The following two results are immediate consequences of the main Proposition 2.1.

Corollary 2.1. *Suppose that (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled. Then the Markov process $(Z_t)_t$ has a unique stationary distribution π .*

Remark 2.5. Woodard *et al.* (2011) and Douc *et al.* (2013) also derived properties of nonlinear INGARCH(1,1) processes which are, as in our case here, Markov chains that are not necessarily irreducible. Woodard *et al.* (2011) used the fact that a drift condition in conjunction with the weak Feller property of the Markov kernel ensures the existence of a stationary distribution while its uniqueness follows from a so-called asymptotic strong Feller property. These properties were e.g. verified for a Poisson threshold model with an intensity function as in (1.6). Douc *et al.* (2013) extended these results to more general intensity functions, including among other examples the log-linear Poisson autoregression model introduced by Fokianos and Tjøstheim (2011). They also focus on the intensity process and impose the weak Feller condition directly on it. Under an additional high-level condition on two appropriately coupled versions of the Markov chain (see their condition (A3)) they showed that the intensity process $(\lambda_t)_t$, and as a consequence the bivariate process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_t$ as well, possess unique stationary distributions and that stationary versions of the processes are ergodic. In the case of a Poisson threshold model (1.6) they also imposed the condition $\max\{c, c'\} < 1$ in order to ensure semi-contractivity.

Under the semicontractivity condition imposed here, we cannot derive the above mentioned Feller properties in general. On the other hand, the coupling result stated in Proposition 2.1 compensates for this failure. A metric d which resembles the coupling result is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d((y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q), (y'_1, \dots, y'_p; \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q)) \\ = \mathbb{1}((y_1, \dots, y_p) \neq (y'_1, \dots, y'_p)) + \sum_{i=1}^q |\lambda_i - \lambda'_i|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows for arbitrary $z \in [0, \infty)^{p+q}$ that $P^{Z_1|Z_0=z'} \Rightarrow P^{Z_1|Z_0=z}$ as $d(z', z) \rightarrow 0$, where \Rightarrow indicates weak dependence. In other words, the weak Feller property holds w.r.t. the metric d rather than the more usual Euclidean norm. As can be seen in the proof of Corollary 2.1, we also obtain that

$$\inf \left\{ d(\zeta_n, \zeta'_n): \zeta_n \sim P^{Z_n|Z_0=z}, \zeta'_n \sim P^{Z_n|Z_0=z'} \right\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

which means that the asymptotic Feller property is also fulfilled.

The following theorem is our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled. A stationary version of the process $(Y_t)_t$ is absolutely regular (β -mixing) with coefficients satisfying*

$$\beta_n \leq C \rho^{\sqrt{n}} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N},$$

for some $C < \infty$ and $\rho < 1$.

At this point we would like to recall that the accompanying process $(\lambda_t)_t$ is not mixing in general. The following counter-example was already given in Neumann (2011, Remark 3). In the case of an INGARCH(1,1) process, consider the specification $f(y; \lambda) = y/2 + g(\lambda)$, where g is strictly monotone and satisfies $0 < \kappa_1 \leq g(\lambda) < 0.5$ as well as $|g(\lambda) - g(\lambda')| \leq \kappa_2 |\lambda - \lambda'|$ for all $\lambda, \lambda' \geq 0$ and some $\kappa_2 < 0.5$. Then our regularity conditions (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled. Using the fact that $g(\lambda) \in [\kappa_1, 0.5)$ we obtain from $2\lambda_t = Y_{t-1} + 2g(\lambda_{t-1})$ that $Y_{t-1} = [2\lambda_t]$ and, therefore, $2g(\lambda_{t-1}) = 2\lambda_t - [2\lambda_t]$. This means that we can perfectly recover λ_{t-1} once we know the value of λ_t . Iterating this argument we see that we can recover from λ_t the complete past of the hidden process $(\lambda_t)_t$. Taking into account that the above choice of f excludes the case that this process is purely non-random we conclude that a stationary version of $(\lambda_t)_t$ cannot be strongly mixing, and therefore also not be absolutely regular.

However, exploiting once more our coupling idea we can show that λ_t can be expressed as

$$\lambda_t = g(Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots),$$

for some measurable function g . This yields ergodicity of the process $(\lambda_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and also of the bivariate process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ as stated in the following lemma.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that (A1) to (A3) are fulfilled. Then a stationary version of the process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is ergodic.*

Compared to absolute regularity of the process $(Y_t)_t$, the ergodicity result for the accompanying process $(\lambda_t)_t$ seems to be a bit poor. However, combined with additional structural assumptions even the property of ergodicity might prove to be sufficient for deriving asymptotic properties of statistical procedures; see for example Neumann (2011, Section 4), Leucht and Neumann (2013) and Leucht et al. (2015).

Remark 2.6. It is possible to extend our result on absolute regularity to the case of a time-varying transition mechanism, where the function f additionally depends on time. In this case, equation (2.1b) has to be replaced by

$$\lambda_t = f_t(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p}; \lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}) \quad (2.10)$$

and assumption (A2) by

(A2') (Uniform semi-contractive condition)

There exist non-negative constants c_1, \dots, c_q with $c_1 + \dots + c_q < 1$ such that

$$|f_t(y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q) - f_t(y_1, \dots, y_p; \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q c_i |\lambda_i - \lambda'_i|$$

for all $t \geq 0$, $y_1, \dots, y_p \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q, \lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_q \geq 0$.

We are convinced that similar results as in our paper can be proved under these conditions and we hope that we can report on this elsewhere.

2.4. Some applications in statistics

In what follows we discuss a couple of instances where absolute regularity yields powerful uniform limit theorems, which also indicates the relevance of the present results. Assume that a real valued process $(Y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is strictly stationary and strongly mixing with coefficients satisfying $\alpha_n \leq C\rho^{\sqrt{n}}$, for some $C < \infty$. If in addition $\mathbb{E}g(Y_0) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}g^2(Y_0) \ln^2(|g(Y_0)| \vee 1) < \infty$, then Doukhan *et al.* (1994) prove the following central limit theorem in the Skorohod space $D[0, 1]$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{[nu]} g(Y_j) \xrightarrow{D[0,1]} \sigma(g)W(u),$$

where W is a Brownian motion and where the series $\sigma^2(g) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}g(Y_0)g(Y_j)$ is assumed to converge. For the detection of changes in the mean we refer to Theorems 4.1.2 and 4.1.5 of Csörgö and Horvath (1997). The same volume deals in § 4.4 with the detection of change points for other parameters involving functional central limit theorems; Doukhan *et al.* (1995) prove a corresponding result under β -mixing.

In the non-parametric estimation frame, the specific structure of β -mixing is also fruitful. Viennet (1997)'s covariance inequality gives relevant bounds for the centred moments of kernel type estimators (and more general non-parametric estimators) without imposing the existence of uniformly bounded joint densities as this is usually done under weaker strong mixing assumptions. This inequality writes

$$n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \text{var} \widehat{f}_n(x) w(x) dx \leq \left(1 + 4 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \beta_i\right) \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{w^2(x) \sum_{j=1}^m e_i^2(x)\right\},$$

for projection type estimators on the vector space spanned by $\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ which is an orthonormal system of $\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, w(x) dx)$. The standard bound of such quadratic loss has order m/n under weak β -mixing assumptions. This fact was also decisive to use model selection procedures under dependence. Baraud *et al.* (2001) proposed adaptive estimation and a selection procedure for regression models (including autoregression) under this β -mixing condition. Beyond the above mentioned covariance inequality from Viennet (1997), they used the Berbee coupling for β -mixing sequences.

3. Proofs

Proof of Remark 2.1. Let, for non-negative y_1, \dots, y_{p-1} , $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{q-1}$ and positive a_1, \dots, a_{p-1} , b_0, \dots, b_{q-1} ,

$$V((y_1, \dots, y_{p-1}, \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{q-1})) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a_i y_i + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} b_j \lambda_j.$$

We consider, without loss of generality, only the case of an INGARCH(p, q) process since the proof in the GARCH(p, q) case is analogous. Recall that $X_t = (Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}, \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_{t-q+1})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(V(X_t) \mid X_{t-1}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(a_1 Y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=2}^{p-1} a_i Y_{t-i} + b_0 \lambda_t + \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} b_j \lambda_{t-1} \mid Y_{t-2}, \dots, Y_{t-p}, \lambda_{t-1}, \dots, \lambda_{t-q}\right) \\
&\leq a_1 \lambda_{t-1} + \sum_{i=2}^{p-1} a_i Y_{t-i} \\
&\quad + b_0 \left(\bar{a}_0 + \bar{a}_1 \lambda_{t-1} + \sum_{i=2}^p \bar{a}_i Y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q \bar{b}_j \lambda_{t-j} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} b_j \lambda_{t-j}. \tag{3.1}
\end{aligned}$$

We are going to find positive constants $a_1, \dots, a_{p-1}, b_0, \dots, b_{q-1}$, $\kappa < 1$, and $a_0 < \infty$ such that the right-hand side of (3.1) is smaller than or equal to

$$a_0 + \kappa V(X_{t-1}) = a_0 + \kappa \left(\sum_{i=2}^p a_{i-1} Y_{t-i} + \sum_{j=1}^q b_{j-1} \lambda_{t-j} \right).$$

We set, w.l.o.g., $b_0 = 1$ and, accordingly, $a_0 = \bar{a}_0$. Condition (A1) will be fulfilled for all possible values of the involved random variables if

$$a_1 + b_1 + \bar{a}_1 + \bar{b}_1 < 1 \tag{3.2a}$$

$$\bar{b}_j + b_j < b_{j-1}, \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, q-1, \tag{3.2b}$$

$$\bar{b}_q < b_{q-1} \tag{3.2c}$$

$$\bar{a}_i + a_i < a_{i-1}, \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, p-1, \tag{3.2d}$$

$$\bar{a}_p < a_{p-1}, \tag{3.2e}$$

where the possible choice of κ becomes apparent at the end of the proof.

Let $\bar{a} = \sum_{i=1}^p \bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{b} = \sum_{j=1}^q \bar{b}_j$. We choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\bar{a} + \bar{b} + 2\varepsilon < 1$ and we define

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 &= \bar{a} - \bar{a}_1 + \varepsilon, \\
b_1 &= \bar{b} - \bar{b}_1 + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.2a) is fulfilled. Furthermore, we define recursively, for any $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon/(q-2))$,

$$b_j = b_{j-1} - \bar{b}_j - \delta, \quad \text{for } j = 2, \dots, q-1,$$

which implies that (3.2b) holds true. Then

$$b_{q-1} = \bar{b} - \bar{b}_1 - \dots - \bar{b}_{q-1} + \varepsilon - (q-2)\delta > \bar{b}_q,$$

which means that (3.2c) is satisfied. Moreover, we set, for $\gamma \in (0, \varepsilon/(p-2))$,

$$a_i = a_{i-1} - \bar{a}_i - \gamma, \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, p-1.$$

Then (3.2d) is fulfilled. Finally,

$$a_{p-1} = \bar{a} - \bar{a}_1 - \dots - \bar{a}_{p-1} + \varepsilon - (p-2)\delta > \bar{a}_p,$$

which shows that (3.2e) is also satisfied.

Since all inequalities (3.2a) to (3.2e) are fulfilled in the strict sense we can include a factor $\kappa < 1$ which is sufficiently close to 1 on the right-hand sides, which leaves the strict inequalities intact. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Recall that $\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}$ are \mathcal{G}_τ -measurable. Therefore, it follows from the similarity condition (A3) and the maximal coupling scheme that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \geq e^{-\delta|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}|}.$$

If now in addition $\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}$ then we got p consecutive hits ($\tilde{Y}_\tau = \tilde{Y}'_\tau, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau-p+2}$ was assumed) and the contractive property begins to take effect, which implies that

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+2}| \leq c_1|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}| + \dots + c_q|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-q+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-q+2}|.$$

Again by (A3),

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}) \geq e^{-\delta|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+2}|}$$

and, if additionally $\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+3} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+3}| \\ & \leq c_1|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+2}| + \sum_{i=2}^q c_i|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+3-i} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+3-i}| \\ & \leq c_1(c_1|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}| + \dots + c_q|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-q+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-q+2}|) + \sum_{i=2}^q c_i|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+3-i} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+3-i}|. \end{aligned}$$

Iterating these calculations we obtain for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the following general formulas. If $\tilde{Y}_{\tau-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau-p+2}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+k-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+k-1}$, then

$$|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+k} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+k}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q d_{k,i}|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|, \quad (3.3)$$

where $d_{1,1} = 1$, $d_{1,i} = 0$ if $i \geq 2$, and, for $k \geq 2$,

$$d_{k,i} = \sum_{\{l: (k+i-2)/q \leq l \leq k+i-2\}} \sum_{\{(i_1, \dots, i_l): i_1 + \dots + i_l = k+i-2\}} c_{i_1} \times \dots \times c_{i_l}. \quad (3.4)$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+k} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+k} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+k-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+k-1}) \geq e^{-\delta \sum_{i=1}^q d_{k,i}|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|}.$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \\ & = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_\tau) \times \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+2} \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \mathcal{G}_\tau) \times \\ & \quad \dots \times \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m} \mid \tilde{Y}_{\tau+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+m-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m-1}, \mathcal{G}_\tau) \\ & \geq e^{-\delta \sum_{i=1}^q d_{1,i}|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|} \times \dots \times e^{-\delta \sum_{i=1}^q d_{m,i}|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|} \\ & = \exp\left\{-\delta \sum_{i=1}^q D_{m,i}|\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$D_{m,i} := \sum_{k=1}^m d_{k,i} \leq \sum_{l=0}^{m+i-2} (c_1 + \dots + c_q)^l \leq \frac{1}{1-c}.$$

Since $\tilde{Y}_{\tau-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau-p+2}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m}$ means that the contractive property takes effect at all time points from $\tau+1$ to $\tau+m$ we obtain that in this case

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+1}| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+m+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+m+1}| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \sum_{i=1}^q d_{k,i} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^q D_{m+1,i} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}|. \end{aligned}$$

With $m \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left(\tilde{Y}_{\tau+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau+m} \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau+m} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau+m}| \leq \frac{1}{1-c} \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}| \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\tau} \right) \\ \geq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\delta}{1-c} \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau-i+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau-i+2}| \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the assertion. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.1. In view of the result of Lemma 2.1, we define a stopping time as

$$\tau^{(n)} = \inf \{ t \geq 0: \tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+2} \text{ and } |\tilde{\lambda}_{t+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t+1}| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+2}| \leq \rho \sqrt{n} \},$$

for some $\rho \in (0, 1)$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_t &= \sigma((\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t), (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}), \dots) \\ &= \sigma(\tilde{\lambda}_{t+1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t+1}, (\tilde{Y}_t, \tilde{Y}'_t, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \tilde{\lambda}'_t), (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-1}), \dots). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}} \left(\tilde{Y}_{\tau^{(n)}+m} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau^{(n)}+m} \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau^{(n)}+m} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau^{(n)}+m}| \leq \frac{\rho \sqrt{n}}{1-c} \middle| \mathcal{G}_{\tau^{(n)}} \right) \\ \geq e^{-(\delta/(1-c))\rho \sqrt{n}} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{1-c} \rho \sqrt{n}. \quad (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it remains to estimate $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau^{(n)} \geq n)$. To this end, we define stopping times τ_1, τ_2, \dots which serve as starting points of subsequent trials to reach a state with

$$\tilde{Y}_t = \tilde{Y}'_t, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+2} = \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+2} \text{ and } |\tilde{\lambda}_{t+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t+1}| + \dots + |\tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+2} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+2}| \leq \rho \sqrt{n}. \quad (3.7)$$

Recall that $\tilde{X}_t = (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}^2, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+1}^2, \tilde{\sigma}_t^2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_{t-q+1}^2)$, $\tilde{X}'_t = (\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}^2, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+1}^2, \tilde{\sigma}_t'^2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}'_{t-q+1}^2)$ in the case of a GARCH(p, q) model. Furthermore, in the INGARCH(p, q) case we define these quantities as $\tilde{X}_t = (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+1}, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+1})$, $\tilde{X}'_t = (\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_t, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+1})$.

Let $W_t = (V(\tilde{X}_t) + V(\tilde{X}'_t))/2$ and

$$\tau_1 = \inf \{ t \geq 0: W_t \leq C_1^{(0)} \},$$

where $C_1^{(0)} \in (0, \infty)$ is defined in the course of the proof of Lemma 3.1 below. Then there exists some $C_2^{(0)} > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}) \geq C_2^{(0)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Furthermore, it follows from (A1) that there exists some $C_1^{(1)} < \infty$ and $C_3^{(1)} > 0$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(W_{\tau_1+1} \leq C_1^{(1)} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}) \geq C_3^{(1)}. \quad (3.9)$$

This, in turn, yields that there exist constants $C_2^{(1)}, C_3^{(2)} > 0$ and $C_1^{(2)} < \infty$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, W_{\tau_1+1} \leq C_1^{(1)}) \geq C_2^{(1)} \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(W_{\tau_1+2} \leq C_1^{(2)} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+1}, W_{\tau_1+1} \leq C_1^{(1)}) \geq C_3^{(2)}. \quad (3.11)$$

Proceeding in the same way we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\left(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+p-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+p-1} \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+p-2} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+p-2}, \\ W_{\tau_1+1} \leq C_1^{(1)}, \dots, W_{\tau_1+p-1} \leq C_1^{(p-1)} \end{array}\right) \\ \geq C_2^{(p-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

This leads to

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+p-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+p-1} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}) \geq C_2^{(0)} \dots C_2^{(p-1)} C_3^{(1)} \dots C_3^{(p-1)} =: C_4, \quad (3.13)$$

that is, with a probability not smaller than $C_4 > 0$ we reach after p steps a state with $\tilde{Y}_{\tau_1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+p-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+p-1}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^q b_i |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau_1+p-i} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau_1+p-i}| \leq W_{\tau_1+p-1} \leq C_1^{(p-1)}$.

Now the contractive condition begins to take effect and it follows from Lemma 2.1 that after $D_n - p + 1 := \lceil C_5 \sqrt{n} \rceil$ additional hits we arrive at a state with (3.7), if C_5 is large enough. This actually happens with a probability bounded away from zero. Hence, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\begin{array}{l} \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+D_n-1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+D_n-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{\tau_1+D_n-p+1} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_1+D_n-p+1} \\ \text{and } \sum_{i=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau_1+D_n-i+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau_1+D_n-i+1}| \leq \rho \sqrt{n} \end{array} \mid \mathcal{G}_{\tau_1-1}\right) \geq C_6,$$

for some $C_6 > 0$. This means, a trial to reach a favorable state with (3.7) covers D_n time points. Accordingly, for $i > 1$, we consider the following retarded return times

$$\tau_i = \inf\{t > \tau_{i-1} + D_n : W_t \leq C_1^{(0)}\}$$

Now we are in a position to derive an upper bound for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau^{(n)} \geq n)$.

We define events

$$A_i = \left\{ \tilde{Y}_{\tau_i+D_n-\ell} = \tilde{Y}'_{\tau_i+D_n-\ell} \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell < p, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{\tau_i+D_n-j+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{\tau_i+D_n-j+1}| \leq \rho \sqrt{n} \right\}.$$

Let $K_n = C_7 D_n$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\eta^{\tau_1} \leq 1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_1} | W_0 > C_1^{(0)}) \leq 1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}W_0$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_m - \tau_{m-1}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_{m-1}-1}) \leq \eta^{D_n} C := \rho^{D_n} (1 + (a_0 + \kappa C_1^{(0)}) / (1 - \kappa))$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\eta^{\tau_1 + (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \dots + (\tau_{K_n} - \tau_{K_n-1})} \\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\eta^{\tau_1 + (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \dots + (\tau_{K_n-1} - \tau_{K_n-2})} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\eta^{\tau_{K_n} - \tau_{K_n-1}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_{K_n-1}-1}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \eta^{D_n} C \tilde{\mathbb{E}}\eta^{\tau_1 + (\tau_2 - \tau_1) + \dots + (\tau_{K_n-1} - \tau_{K_n-2})} \\ &\leq \dots \leq \eta^{D_n(K_n-1)} C^{K_n-1} (1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}W_0). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\tau_{K_n} + D_n - 1 \geq n) &\leq \frac{\eta^{D_n(K_n-1)} C^{K_n-1} (1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\pi W_0)}{\eta^{n-D_n+1}} \\ &= O\left(\eta^{C_7 D_n^2 - n - 1} C^{C_7 D_n - 1}\right) = o\left(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

if $C_7 < 1$ is sufficiently small. Therefore, and since $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(A_1^c \cap \dots \cap A_{K_n}^c) \leq (1 - C_6)^{K_n}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau^{(n)} \geq n) &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\tau_{K_n} + D_n - 1 \geq n) + \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(A_1^c \cap \dots \cap A_{K_n}^c) \\ &= o(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}) + (1 - C_6)^{K_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

□

Proof of Corollary 2.1. In order to prove existence of a stationary version of $(Z_t)_t$, it would suffice to derive this property for $(X_t)_t$, where $X_t = (Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p+1}, \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_{t-q+1})$. It follows from the drift condition (A1) that conditions (F1) and (F3), and therefore (F2) as well, in Tweedie (1988) are fulfilled. If the Markov chain were weak Feller, i.e. for any bounded and continuous function $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{p+q-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the map $x \mapsto \int \varphi(y) P^{X_1|X_0=x}(dy)$ were continuous, then we could conclude from Theorem 2 in Tweedie (1988) that $(X_t)_t$ has a stationary distribution. This fact has been used e.g. in Douc et al. (2013) where the weak Feller property was explicitly imposed. The Feller property can be easily shown in case of a continuous volatility/intensity function f , however, this might fail with a discontinuous function as they appear with certain threshold models. We show below that the missing Feller property will be compensated by the coupling result in Proposition 2.1.

First we convert the coupling result in a convergence result for the conditional distributions $P^{Z_n|X_0=x}$, where x is an arbitrarily chosen point in the range of X_0 . Using maximal coupling as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 we construct two versions of the process, $(\tilde{Z}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and $(\tilde{Z}'_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, where $\tilde{X}_0 = x$ and $\tilde{X}'_0 \sim P^{X_1|X_0=x}$. We obtain that

$$\tilde{P}\left((\tilde{Y}_n, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{n-p+1}) \neq (\tilde{Y}'_n, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{n-p+1}) \text{ or } \sum_{j=1}^q |\tilde{\lambda}_{n-j+1} - \tilde{\lambda}'_{n-j+1}| > \frac{\rho^{\sqrt{n-q+1}}}{1-c}\right) = O\left(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (3.15)$$

Now we can construct, on a suitable probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{P})$, a sequence of random vectors $(\zeta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\zeta_n = (\zeta_{n,1}, \dots, \zeta_{n,p}, \zeta_{n,p+1}, \dots, \zeta_{n,p+q})^T = (\zeta_{n,Y}^T, \zeta_{n,\lambda}^T)^T \sim P^{Z_n|X_0=x}$ and

$$\tilde{P}\left(\zeta_{n,Y} \neq \zeta_{n+1,Y} \text{ or } \|\zeta_{n,\lambda} - \zeta_{n+1,\lambda}\|_{l_1} > \frac{\rho^{\sqrt{n-q+1}}}{1-c}\right) = O\left(\rho^{\sqrt{n}}\right). \quad (3.16)$$

(Given ζ_1, \dots, ζ_n , the vector ζ_{n+1} has to be defined according to the conditional distribution of \tilde{Z}'_n given \tilde{Z}_n .) Since $\sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \rho^{\sqrt{m}} = O(\sqrt{n}\rho^{\sqrt{n}})$ we obtain from (3.16) that

$$\tilde{P}\left(\zeta_{m,Y} = \zeta_{m+1,Y} \quad \forall m \geq n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \|\zeta_{m,\lambda} - \zeta_{m+1,\lambda}\|_{l_1} \leq K\sqrt{n}\rho^{\sqrt{n}}\right) = 1 - O(\sqrt{n}\rho^{\sqrt{n}}), \quad (3.17)$$

for some $K < \infty$. It follows that

$$\tilde{P}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{\omega: \zeta_{m,Y} = \zeta_{m+1,Y} \quad \forall m \geq n\}\right) = 1,$$

which means that all $\zeta_{m,Y}$ are equal for $m \geq n(\omega)$, and therefore they are eventually equal to some random vector ζ_Y . Furthermore, since $\zeta_{N,\lambda} = (\zeta_{N,\lambda} - \zeta_{N-1,\lambda}) + \dots + (\zeta_{n+1,\lambda} - \zeta_{n,\lambda}) + \zeta_{n,\lambda}$ we obtain that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{N,i} - \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{N,i} \leq \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} |\zeta_{m+1,i} - \zeta_{m,i}| \quad \forall i = p+1, \dots, p+q.$$

Hence, it follows from (3.17) that

$$\tilde{P}\left(\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{N,i} = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_{N,i} \quad \forall i = p+1, \dots, p+q\right) = 1,$$

which implies that $\zeta_{N,\lambda}$ converges to some random vector ζ_λ with probability 1. Let $\zeta = (\zeta_Y^T, \zeta_\lambda^T)^T$ and denote by $\pi = \tilde{P}^\zeta$ the distribution of ζ . Let $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{p+q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and uniformly continuous function. Next we show that π is a stationary distribution of the Markov chain $(Z_t)_t$. Since the map $y \mapsto \int \varphi(z) P^{Z_1|Z_0=y}(dz)$ is continuous in the last q arguments y_{p+1}, \dots, y_{p+q} we obtain that

$$\int \left[\int \varphi(z) P^{Z_1|Z_0=y}(dz) \right] \tilde{P}^{\zeta_n}(dy) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \left[\int \varphi(z) P^{Z_1|Z_0=y}(dz) \right] \pi(dy),$$

which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \varphi(y) \pi(dy) - \int \left[\int \varphi(z) P^{Z_1|Z_0=y}(dz) \right] \pi(dy) \right| \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \varphi(y) \tilde{P}^{\zeta_n}(dy) - \int \left[\int \varphi(z) P^{Z_1|Z_0=y}(dz) \right] \tilde{P}^{\zeta_n}(dy) \right| \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int \varphi(y) \tilde{P}^{\zeta_n}(dy) - \int \varphi(y) \tilde{P}^{\zeta_{n+1}}(dy) \right| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, π is a stationary distribution of $(Z_t)_t$.

To show uniqueness, suppose that π_1 and π_2 are two arbitrary stationary distributions. We start the processes to be coupled such that $\tilde{Z}_0 \sim \pi_1$ and $\tilde{Z}'_0 \sim \pi_2$. (Here, it does not matter whether or not \tilde{Z}_0 and \tilde{Z}'_0 are independent.) Since both π_1 and π_2 are stationary laws we have that

$$\tilde{Z}_n \sim \pi_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Z}'_n \sim \pi_2 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.18)$$

Furthermore, it follows from the geometric drift condition (A1) that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(V(\tilde{X}_1) + V(\tilde{X}'_1)) < \infty$, which implies by Proposition 2.1 that

$$\|\tilde{Z}_n - \tilde{Z}'_n\| \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This and (3.18) imply that $\pi_1 = \pi_2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let π denote the stationary distribution of $(Z_t)_t$ and let, for $-\infty \leq s \leq t \leq \infty$, $\mathcal{F}_{s,t}^Y = \sigma(Y_s, \dots, Y_t)$. We start both versions of the process at time 0 independently, with $\tilde{Z}_0 \sim \pi$ and $\tilde{Z}'_0 \sim \pi$. We denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\pi$ the corresponding distribution and expectation, respectively. Since, by (3.19) below, $\lambda_t = g(Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots)$ we have in particular that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty,0}^Y = \sigma(Z_0, Z_{-1}, \dots)$. We obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n &= \mathbb{E} \left(\text{ess sup} \{ |P(V | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty,0}^Y) - P(V)| : V \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\infty}^Y \} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\text{ess sup} \{ |P(V | Y_0, Z_0, Z_{-1}, \dots) - P(V)| : V \in \mathcal{F}_{n,\infty}^Y \} \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\pi \left(\text{ess sup} \{ |\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi((\tilde{Y}_n, \tilde{Y}_{n+1}, \dots) \in A | \mathcal{G}_0) - \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi((\tilde{Y}'_n, \tilde{Y}'_{n+1}, \dots) \in A | \mathcal{G}_0)| : A \in \mathcal{C} \} \right) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_\pi \left(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\exists m \geq n: \tilde{Y}_m \neq \tilde{Y}'_m | \mathcal{G}_0) \right) = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_\pi(\exists m \geq n: \tilde{Y}_m \neq \tilde{Y}'_m). \end{aligned}$$

Here, \mathcal{C} denotes the σ -field generated by the cylinder sets. Proposition 2.1 yields that $\beta_n = O(\rho^{\sqrt{n}})$, as required. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a stationary version of the process. We will show that there exists a measurable function $g: \mathbb{N}_0^\infty \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that $\lambda_t = g(Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots)$. To this end, we consider the same ‘‘forward iterations’’ as in the proof of Lemma 2.1. We use the true values $Y_0, \dots, Y_{1-p}, \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{1-q}$ as well as $Y_0, \dots, Y_{1-p}, \lambda'_0, \dots, \lambda'_{1-q}$ with $\lambda'_0 = \dots = \lambda'_{1-q} = 0$ as starting values. Then we define, according to the model equation (2.1b),

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= f(Y_0, \dots, Y_{1-p}; \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{1-q}), \\ \lambda'_1 &= f(Y_0, \dots, Y_{1-p}; \lambda'_0, \dots, \lambda'_{1-q}) =: g^{[1]}(Y_0, \dots, Y_{1-p}). \end{aligned}$$

Iterating this scheme we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k &= f(Y_{k-1}, \dots, Y_{k-p}; \lambda_{k-1}, \dots, \lambda_{k-q}), \\ \lambda'_k &= f(Y_{k-1}, \dots, Y_{k-p}; \lambda'_{k-1}, \dots, \lambda'_{k-q}) =: g^{[k]}(Y_{k-1}, \dots, Y_{1-p}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that in all steps matching values of the process $(Y_t)_t$ are used for computing λ_k and λ'_k , which means that the contractive property takes effect at each step. Therefore we obtain, analogously to (3.3) in the proof of Lemma 2.1,

$$|\lambda_k - \lambda'_k| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q d_{k+1,i} \lambda_{1-i},$$

where it follows from (3.4) that $d_{k+1} \rightarrow_{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$. By stationarity we conclude, for fixed $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, that

$$\mathbb{E} |\lambda_t - g^{[k]}(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p-k+1})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^q d_{k+1,i} \mathbb{E} \lambda_{t-k-i+1} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

that is, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, $g^{[k]}(Y_{t-1}, \dots, Y_{t-p-k+1})$ converges in L_1 to λ_t . By taking an appropriate subsequence we also get almost sure convergence. This means that there exists some measurable function $g: \mathbb{N}_0^\infty \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\lambda_t = g(Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \dots) \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (3.19)$$

Since absolute regularity of the process $(Y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ implies strong mixing (see e.g. [Doukhan \(1994, p. 20\)](#)) we conclude from Remark 2.6 on page 50 in combination with Proposition 2.8 on page 51 in [Bradley \(2007\)](#) that any stationary version of this process is also ergodic.

Finally, we conclude from the representation (3.19) by proposition 2.10(ii) in [Bradley \(2007, p. 54\)](#) that also the bivariate process $((Y_t, \lambda_t))_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is ergodic. \square

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that (A1) is fulfilled. Then*

$$(i) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_1} | \mathcal{G}_{-1}) \leq (V(\tilde{X}_0) + V(\tilde{X}'_0))/2, \quad \text{if } (V(\tilde{X}_0) + V(\tilde{X}'_0))/2 > C_1^{(0)},$$

where $\eta = 2/(1 + \kappa)$ and $C_1^{(0)} = (2a_0 + 2)/(1 - \kappa)$.

$$(ii) \quad \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_{m+1} - \tau_m} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m - 1}) \leq \rho^{D_n} \left(1 + \frac{a_0 + \kappa C_1^{(0)}}{1 - \kappa} \right).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We already defined $\tilde{X}_t = (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}^2, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+1}^2, \tilde{\sigma}_t^2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_{t-q+1}^2)$, and $\tilde{X}'_t = (\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}^2, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+1}^2, \tilde{\sigma}'_t^2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}'_{t-q+1}^2)$ in the case of a GARCH(p, q) model. Furthermore, in the INGARCH(p, q) case we set analogously $\tilde{X}_t = (\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p+1}, \tilde{\lambda}_t, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-q+1})$, $\tilde{X}'_t = (\tilde{Y}'_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}'_{t-p+1}, \tilde{\lambda}'_t, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}'_{t-q+1})$. Let $W_t = (V(\tilde{X}_t) + V(\tilde{X}'_t))/2$.

Since $\tilde{Y}_{t-1} | \mathcal{G}_{t-1} = Q(\tilde{\lambda}_{t-1})$ we see that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tilde{Y}_{t-1} | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tilde{Y}_{t-1} | \tilde{X}_{t-1})$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tilde{\lambda}_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(f(\tilde{Y}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{t-p}; \tilde{\lambda}_{t-1}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{t-q}) | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tilde{\lambda}_t | \tilde{X}_{t-1})$.

Therefore we obtain $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(V(\tilde{X}_t) | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(V(\tilde{X}_t) | \tilde{X}_{t-1})$ and, analogously, $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(V(\tilde{X}'_t) | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) = \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(V(\tilde{X}'_t) | \tilde{X}'_{t-1})$. Hence, we obtain from the geometric drift condition (A1) that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) \leq \kappa W_{t-1} + a_0. \quad (3.20)$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) \leq \eta^{-1} W_{t-1} - 1, \quad \text{if } W_{t-1} > C_1^{(0)} \quad (3.21)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_t | \mathcal{G}_{t-1}) \leq \kappa C_1^{(0)} + a_0, \quad \text{if } W_{t-1} \leq C_1^{(0)}. \quad (3.22)$$

In what follows we adapt the line of arguments from [Nummelin and Tuominen \(1982\)](#), who derived similar bounds for stopping times in the context of a Markov chain.

Proof of (i)

Let $W_0 = x > C_1^{(0)}$. We denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x$ the conditional distribution and expectation, respectively, given $W_0 = x$. It follows from (3.21) that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(W_1) \leq \eta^{-1} x - 1,$$

which implies that

$$x - \eta \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(W_1) \geq \eta. \quad (3.23)$$

Analogously we conclude from (3.21) that

$$\mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}) \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(W_2 | W_1) \leq \mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}) (\eta^{-1} W_1 - 1),$$

which yields that

$$\mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}) (W_1 - \eta \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(W_2 | W_1)) \geq \eta \mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}).$$

Multiplying both sides by η and taking the expectation over W_1 under the condition $W_0 = x$ we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left(\mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}) (\eta W_1 - \eta^2 W_2) \right) \geq \eta^2 \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}). \quad (3.24)$$

Proceeding in the same way we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x \left(\mathbb{1}(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}, \dots, W_k > C_1^{(0)}) (\eta^k W_k - \eta^{k+1} W_{k+1}) \right) \\ \geq \eta^{k+1} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}, \dots, W_k > C_1^{(0)}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Adding both sides of (3.23) to (3.25) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} x &\geq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{k+1} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x(W_1 > C_1^{(0)}, \dots, W_k > C_1^{(0)}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \eta^{k+1} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_x(\tau_1 \geq k+1) \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_x(\eta^{\tau_1}), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Proof of (ii)

Here we have to take into account that τ_{m+1} is not a usual but a retarded return time. Recall that X_{τ_m} is \mathcal{G}_{τ_m-1} -measurable. Since $X_{\tau_m} \leq C_1^{(0)}$ we obtain from (i) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_{m+1}-\tau_m} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \\ &= \eta^{D_n} \tilde{\mathbb{P}}(W_{\tau_m+D_n} \leq C_1^{(0)} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \\ &\quad + \eta^{D_n} \int_{(C_1^{(0)}, \infty)} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\eta^{\tau_{m+1}-(\tau_m+D_n)} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}, W_{\tau_m+D_n} = x) \tilde{\mathbb{P}}^{W_{\tau_m+D_n}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}(dx) \\ &\leq \eta^{D_n} (1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_{\tau_m+D_n} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1})) \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Furthermore, since $W_{\tau_m} \leq C_1^{(0)}$ we obtain from (3.20) that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_{\tau_{m+1}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \leq \kappa W_{\tau_m} + a_0 \leq \kappa C_1^{(0)} + a_0,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_{\tau_{m+2}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_{\tau_{m+2}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}, W_{\tau_{m+1}}) | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\kappa W_{\tau_{m+1}} + a_0 | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \\ &\leq 2a_0 + \kappa(\kappa C_1^{(0)} + a_0), \end{aligned}$$

and, eventually,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(W_{\tau_{m+k}} | \mathcal{G}_{\tau_m-1}) \leq \frac{a_0 + \kappa C_1^{(0)}}{1 - \kappa} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.27)$$

(ii) now follows from (3.26) and (3.27). \square

Acknowledgements

This work has been developed within the MME-DII center of excellence (ANR-11-LABEX-0023-01) and with the help of PAI-CONICYT MEC N° 80170072. The first author wishes to thank the University of Jena and Universidad of Valparaiso for their hospitality. The research of the second author was supported by a guest professorship of IEA at the University of Cergy-Pontoise. We thank two anonymous referees for their comments which helped us to improve the presentation of our results.

References

- ADELL, J. A. AND JODRÁ, P. (2006). Exact Kolmogorov and total variation distances between some familiar discrete distributions. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications* **2006**, Article 64307.
- BARAUD, Y., COMTE, F., AND VIENNET, G. (2001). Adaptive estimation in autoregression or β -mixing regression via model selection. *Annals of Statistics* **29-3**, 839–875.
- BOLLERSLEV, T. (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **31**, 307–327.
- BOUSSAMA, F. (1998). *Ergodicité, mélanges et estimation des modèles GARCH*. PhD Dissertation, University Paris 7.
- BRADLEY, R. C. (2007). *Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions, Volume I*. Kendrick Press, Heber City.
- CARRASCO, M. AND CHEN, X. (2002). Mixing and moment properties of various GARCH and stochastic volatility models. *Econometric Theory* **18**, 17–39.
- CSORGÖ, M. AND HORVATH, L. (1997). *Limit Theorems in Change-Point Analysis*. Wiley, Chichester.
- DEDECKER, J., DOUKHAN, P., LANG, G., LEÓN, J. R., LOUHICHI, S., AND PRIEUR, C. (2007). *Weak Dependence: With Examples and Applications*. Lecture Notes in Statistics **190**, Springer, New York.
- DEN HOLLANDER, F. (2012). Probability theory: The coupling method. Lecture Notes, University of Leiden, The Netherlands.
- DOUC, R., DOUKHAN, P., AND MOULINES, E. (2013). Ergodicity of observation-driven time series models and consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **123-7**, 2620–2647.
- DOUKHAN, P. (1994). *Mixing: Properties and Examples*. Lecture Notes in Statistics **84**. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- DOUKHAN, P., MASSART, P., AND RIO, E. (1994). The functional central limit theorem for strongly mixing processes. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques* **30-2**, 62–82.
- DOUKHAN, P., MASSART, P., AND RIO, E. (1995). Invariance principles for absolutely regular empirical processes. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques* **31-2**, 393–427.
- DURRETT, R. (1991). *Probability. Theory and Examples*. Wadsworth, Pacific Grove.
- ENGLE, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica* **50**, 987–1007.
- FOKIANOS, K. (2012). Count time series models. In: T. Subba Rao, S. Subba Rao, and C. R. Rao. *Time Series: Methods and Applications, Handbook of Statistics* **30**, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 315–347.
- FOKIANOS, K., RAHBEK, A., AND TJØSTHEIM, D. (2009). Poisson autoregression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **104-488**, 1430–1439.

- FOKIANOS, K. AND TJØSTHEIM, D. (2011). Log-linear Poisson autoregression. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **102** (3), 563–578.
- FRANCQ, C. AND ZAKOÏAN, J.-M. (2006). Mixing properties of a general class of GARCH(1,1) models without moment assumptions on the observed process. *Econometric Theory* **22**, 815–834.
- FRANCQ, C. AND ZAKOÏAN, J.-M. (2010). *GARCH Models: Structure, Statistical Inference and Financial Applications*. Wiley, Chichester.
- FRANKE, J. (2010). Weak dependence of functional INGARCH processes. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- GLOSTEN, L. R., JAGANNATHAN, R., AND RUNKLE, D. E. (1993). On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks. *Journal of Finance* **48**, 1779–1801.
- LAMBERT, D. (1992). Zero-inflated Poisson regression, with an application to defects in manufacturing. *Technometrics* **34**, 1–14.
- LEUCHT, A. AND NEUMANN, M. H. (2013). Degenerate U - and V -statistics under ergodicity: asymptotics, bootstrap and applications in statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **65-2**, 349–386.
- LEUCHT, A., KREISS, J.-P., AND NEUMANN, M. H. (2015). A model specification test for GARCH(1,1) processes. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **42**, 1167–1193.
- LINDNER, A. M. (2009) Stationarity, mixing, distributional properties and moments of GARCH(p,q)-processes. In: *Handbook of Financial Time Series*. Springer, Berlin.
- NEUMANN, M. H. (2011). Absolute regularity and ergodicity of Poisson count processes. *Bernoulli* **17**, 1268–1284.
- NUMMELIN, E. AND TUOMINEN, P. (1982). Geometric ergodicity of Harris recurrent Markov chain with applications to renewal theory. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **12**, 187–202.
- TRUQUET, L. (2018+). Local stationarity and time-inhomogeneous Markov chains. *Annals of Statistics*, to appear.
- TWEEDIE, R. L. (1988). Invariant measures for Markov chains with no irreducibility assumptions. *Journal of Applied Probability* **25**, 275–285.
- VIENNET, G. (1997). Inequalities for absolutely regular sequences: application to density estimation. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **107-4**, 467–492.
- WOODARD, D. B., MATTESON, D. S., AND HENDERSON, S. G. (2011). Stationarity of generalized autoregressive moving average models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **5**, 800–828.