

Markov Chain Importance Sampling – a highly efficient estimator for MCMC

Ingmar Schuster

Freie Universität Berlin
ingmar.schuster@fu-berlin.de

Ilja Klebanov

Zuse Institute Berlin
klebanov@zib.de

Abstract

Markov chain algorithms are ubiquitous in machine learning and statistics and many other disciplines. In this work we present a novel estimator applicable to several classes of Markov chains, dubbed Markov chain importance sampling (MCIS). For a broad class of Metropolis–Hastings algorithms, MCIS efficiently makes use of rejected proposals. For discretized Langevin diffusions, it provides a novel way of correcting the discretization error. Our estimator satisfies a central limit theorem and improves on error per CPU cycle, often to a large extent. As a by-product it enables estimating the normalizing constant, an important quantity in Bayesian machine learning and statistics.

1 Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, such as Metropolis–Hastings [13] or discretized Langevin [18, 22], constitute a widely used tool to compute expected values $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu(x)$ of a function $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to a probability measure μ . MCMC methods can tackle high dimensions as well as scenarios where the probability density of μ is given only up to an unknown normalizing constant $Z > 0$,

$$d\mu(x) = \frac{\rho(x)}{Z} dx, \quad Z = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x) dx,$$

a situation often occurring in Bayesian inverse problems.

In the following we will take a novel approach to the idea of integral estimation using Markov chain sampling. In particular, we will look at several Markov chain constructions producing samples Y_k that are asymptotically μ_θ distributed, where θ is some algorithm parameter and μ_θ approximates μ in a certain sense. We will denote the probability density corresponding to μ_θ by ρ_θ . Using the importance sampling trick [20], the samples will be reweighted in order to correct for sampling only from an approximation of μ :

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[f] \approx S_K^{\text{IS}}(f) := \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K w_k f(Y_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^K w_k}, \quad w_k := \frac{\rho(Y_k)}{\rho_\theta(Y_k)}. \quad (1)$$

An efficient estimation of ρ_θ for two classes of Markov chain algorithms, the Euler–Maruyama discretized Langevin diffusion (DL) and Metropolis–Hastings (MH), results in our integral estimators S_K^{MHIS} and S_K^{DLIS} , which strongly outperform the standard estimator. In addition, our estimators allow to approximate the normalizing constant Z of the target density, a quantity that is important for Bayesian model selection and averaging. This refutes the folk theorem that Metropolis–Hastings algorithms do not allow for an easy approximation of the normalizing constant Z .

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce Markov chain importance sampling (MCIS) and derive explicit formulas for and approximations of ρ_θ for MH and DL. Section 3 deals with convergence properties of S_K^{MHIS} , and a law of large numbers as well as a central limit theorem

are given. After comparing our approach to related work in Section 4, we show several numerical experiments in Section 5. Section 6 summarizes our work and gives an outlook. In the appendix we give proofs for our theorems, discuss how our estimators can be improved by using easily implementable control variates, present further numerical results and provide fully vectorized code for the most CPU-intensive calculation introduced by our estimator.

2 The Markov chain importance sampling estimator

In this section, we derive explicit formulas for ρ_θ and its Monte Carlo estimation $\hat{\rho}_\theta$ for Metropolis–Hastings and discretized Langevin sampling. We will also introduce the Markov chain importance sampling (MCIS) estimator that relies on $\hat{\rho}_\theta$ for integral estimation.

2.1 Metropolis-Hastings

To introduce notation, let us recall the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm:

Algorithm 1 (MH). *Let $(q_\theta(\cdot|x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ be a family of globally supported probability densities on $\mathbb{R}^d$, which is continuous in both arguments, referred to as proposal density, and ρ be another probability density on $\mathbb{R}^d$ called the target density. Starting with some initial point $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, iterate for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- (i) *Draw a sample Y_k from the proposal density $q_\theta(\cdot|X_k)$.*
- (ii) *Compute the acceptance probability $\alpha_k = \alpha(X_k, Y_k)$, where $\alpha(x, y) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{q_\theta(x|y)\rho(y)}{q_\theta(y|x)\rho(x)} \right\}$.*
- (iii) *With probability α_k set $X_{k+1} = Y_k$, else set $X_{k+1} = X_k$.*

The resulting Markov chain can be shown to be μ -reversible and therefore the stationary distribution of the chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is μ . We will always assume that the Markov chain is irreducible, which for the MH algorithm implies that it is Harris recurrent, see [20, Lemma 7.3].

The proposal densities $\{q_\theta(\cdot|x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$ can be chosen as e.g. Gaussian densities centered at the current state $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In this case, θ denotes the variance (or covariance matrix) of q_θ and balances the trade-off between the speed of convergence and the ratio of accepted points. The consensus is that acceptance rates should be neither very high nor low, and under strong assumptions optimal acceptance rates have been established [21].

While it is well known that the points X_k are asymptotically distributed according to μ [20, Chapter 7], the distribution of the samples Y_k has not been studied up to now to the best of our knowledge. Asymptotically, the generation of the random variables X_k and Y_k follows the hierarchical model

$$X \sim \mu, \quad Y \sim q_\theta(\cdot|X)$$

and thus the joint density of (X_k, Y_k) is asymptotically given by $\rho(x)q_\theta(y|x)$. The marginal density of Y is then given by the Bochner integral

$$\rho_\theta(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x) q_\theta(y|x) dx, \quad (2)$$

where ρ_θ clearly is associated with ρ and the parameters θ of q_θ . To get an intuition for how ρ_θ might differ from ρ , consider the standard case of Gaussian random walk proposals centered at the current Markov chain state. In this case, ρ_θ is simply the convolution of ρ with a Gaussian kernel, see Figure 1 for an illustration. For many random walk proposals, ρ_θ will actually be the embedding of μ into a reproducing kernel Hilbert space, called the kernel mean embedding. We refer the interested reader to [17] for a review. For the independent MH algorithm [28], where the proposals Y_k are chosen independent of the current state X_k , $q_\theta(y|x) = q_\theta(y)$, we obviously have $\rho_\theta = q_\theta$. In many cases of interest ρ_θ will not be available in closed form. However, as we have samples X_k available from MH that are asymptotically μ -distributed, we can estimate ρ_θ using the Monte Carlo sum

$$\hat{\rho}_\theta(y) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K q_\theta(y|X_k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} q_\theta(y|x) d\mu(x) = \rho_\theta(y) \quad (3)$$

under the mild assumption that we can evaluate $q_\theta(y|x)$ efficiently for any points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Thus, the estimator in equation (3) is available for a large class of MH algorithms.




Figure 1: *Left:* Marginal proposal density for Gaussian random walk MH and discretized Langevin. *Right:* Resulting importance weights. Parameters were chosen to match Gaussian proposal noise in both sampling schemes.

2.2 Discretized Langevin algorithm

The Langevin stochastic differential equation with target density ρ is given by

$$dZ_t = \nabla \log \rho(Z_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t,$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is d -dimensional Brownian motion. Its Euler-Maruyama discretization results in the so-called discretized Langevin algorithm (DL, sometimes named unadjusted Langevin algorithm [22, 18]):

Algorithm 2 (DL). Let $\rho \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a probability density and $\theta > 0$. Starting with some initial point $Y_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, iterate for $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

- (i) Draw a sample $G_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ from the standard normal distribution.
- (ii) Set

$$Y_{k+1} = Y_k + \theta \nabla \log \rho(Y_k) + \sqrt{2\theta} G_k. \quad (4)$$

The idea of using a discretized Langevin equation to sample approximately from a distribution given by a density ρ was introduced in [18] and studied by [22]. One of the advantages of this sampling algorithm is that ρ might be given only up to proportionality, as the normalizing constant vanishes when taking the gradient of the logarithm. However, due to the discretization of the SDE (θ is strictly larger than zero), iterating (4) will not sample exactly from the density ρ . Rather, under mild conditions on ρ , the algorithm resulting from (4) produces a Markov chain sampling asymptotically from a density ρ_θ and Markov kernel $q_\theta(\cdot|y) = \mathcal{N}(\cdot; y + \theta \nabla \log \rho(y), 2\theta I)$, see, e.g. [10]. While ρ_θ has long been known to exist [10], it is in general not known in closed form, and even an estimate of it has not been reported in the literature to the best of our knowledge.

However, since ρ_θ is invariant under the Markov kernel q_θ and the samples Y_k , $k \geq 1$, are asymptotically μ_θ -distributed, we can approximate $\rho_\theta(y)$ for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by a Monte Carlo sum similar to (3),

$$\hat{\rho}_\theta(y) := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K q_\theta(y|Y_k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \int q_\theta(y|y') \rho_\theta(y') dy' = \rho_\theta(y). \quad (5)$$

It is conjectured that under certain assumptions the more general discrete time algorithm $Y_{k+1} = Y_k + \theta_1 \nabla \log \rho(Y_k) + \theta_2 R_k$ possesses some stationary density ρ_θ even if $\theta_2 \neq \sqrt{2\theta_1}$ and R_k is not a standard normal variable.¹ Our estimator in equation (5) generalizes to these cases.

2.3 Application to integral estimation

The Monte Carlo sums (3) and (5) suggest the following approximations to the general importance sampling estimator S^{IS} introduced in (1):

Definition 3. Let the samples Y_k with asymptotic density ρ_θ be generated by a Markov chain (Y_k may e.g. be the proposed points in MH) and R_k be estimates of $\rho_\theta(Y_k)$. We define the Markov chain importance sampling (MCIS) estimator by

$$S_K^{\text{MCIS}}(f) := \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{w}_k f(Y_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \hat{w}_k}, \quad \hat{w}_k := \frac{\rho(Y_k)}{R_k}. \quad (6)$$

- (i) If the samples $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are the proposals of MH (Algorithm 1), we use (3) to compute R_k and refer to S_K^{MHIS} as Metropolis–Hastings importance sampling (MHIS) estimator.

¹Personal communication with Alain Durmus.

- (ii) If $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the Markov chain given by DL (Algorithm 2), we use (5) to compute R_k and refer to S_K^{DLIS} as discretized Langevin importance sampling (DLIS) estimator.

The estimates $\hat{\rho}_\theta$ used for computing R_k for MHIS and DLIS are based on *all* (accepted) points. This results in a runtime quadratic in the number of samples K , see Section 5.3. Computationally more efficient versions of these estimators relying only on subsets of the samples constitute further implementations of MCIS. We will refer to the case where the estimators rely on only a single sample, $R_k^{\text{S-MHIS}} = q_\theta(Y_k | X_k)$ and $R_k^{\text{S-DLIS}} = q_\theta(Y_k | Y_{k-1})$ as S-MHIS (Single-MHIS) and S-DLIS and include them in our experimental results for reference. The S-MHIS estimator is studied in depth in independent work [24].

An important observation is that $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{w}_k$ is a consistent estimator for the normalizing constant $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho(x) dx$, which in a Bayesian context is also called model evidence or the marginal likelihood of the model. The normalizing constant is an essential quantity for Bayesian model selection, model averaging and testing. Our estimator refutes the folk theorem that it is hard to estimate with mainstream Monte Carlo methods such as MH. This might obviate the need for specialized estimators for the normalizing constant or even specialized sampling schemes for model choice such as [5, 2].

3 Convergence properties of the MHIS estimator

In this section we will take a closer look at the convergence properties of MHIS. We derive inheritance of geometric and uniform ergodicity for the augmented $((X_k, Y_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ chain and state a law of large numbers and a central limit theorem.

3.1 The augmented chain $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$

Using the notation from Algorithm 1, our estimator for $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f]$ is based on the proposals Y_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note, however, that the chain (Y_k) is not a Markov chain. Therefore, our analysis will rely on the augmented Markov chain $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ given by

$$Z_k = (X_k, Y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}. \quad (7)$$

This raises the question which properties of the original chain (X_k) are inherited by the augmented chain (Z_k) . Denoting the transition kernel of $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by

$$K_X: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad K_X(x, A) = \mathbb{P}[X_{k+1} \in A | X_k = x],$$

and the one of $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ by $K_Z: \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we first make the following crucial observation. Since X_{k+1} is either equal to X_k (with probability $1 - \alpha_k$) or to Y_k (with probability α_k), the distribution of X_{k+1} given $Z_k = (X_k, Y_k)$ is a *discrete* distribution with probability mass distributed between the two points X_k and Y_k resulting in a degenerate transition kernel K_Z :

$$K_Z((x, y), A \times B) = (1 - \alpha(x, y)) \mathbb{1}_A(x) q_\theta(B|x) + \alpha(x, y) \mathbb{1}_A(y) q_\theta(B|y),$$

where $\mathbb{1}_A$ denotes the indicator function of a set A and $q_\theta(A|x) := \int_A q_\theta(x'|x) dx'$ is a slight abuse of notation.




Figure 2: Since X_{k+1} is either equal to X_k or to Y_k , the transition kernel $K_Z((X_k, Y_k), \bullet)$ is degenerate and its support is given by the two red lines.

This observation implies that the equality $K_Z((x, y), \bullet) = K_Z((x', y'), \bullet)$ can only hold if $[x = x' \text{ and } y = y']$ or $[x = y' \text{ and } y = x']$, excluding the existence of accessible atoms of (Z_k) . Similarly,

reversibility is never satisfiable for the chain (Z_k) .

However, while K_Z^m is degenerate for $m = 1$, it is globally supported for $m \geq 2$ and the augmented chain (Z_k) still inherits those properties of (X_k) which rely on the asymptotic behavior of the kernel rather than on the kernel itself.

Theorem 4. *Let $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Markov chain generated by Metropolis–Hastings (Algorithm 1). Then the augmented chain $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by (7) has the following properties.*

- (i) (Z_k) has a stationary distribution with density $\pi(x, y) = \rho(x)q_\theta(y|x)$.
- (ii) (Z_k) is aperiodic, irreducible and Harris positive.
- (iii) If (X_k) is geometrically ergodic, so is (Z_k) .
- (iv) If (X_k) is uniformly ergodic, so is (Z_k) .

The proof is given in Appendix A.

3.2 Central limit theorem for MHIS

Since the analysis of the MHIS estimator appears very intricate due to the interdependence between each pair of the points Y_k via the density $\hat{\rho}_\theta$, we will simplify the analysis by considering the importance sampling estimator S_K^{IS} given by (1) with the true target approximation ρ_θ given by (2) rather than its Monte Carlo approximation $\hat{\rho}_\theta$.

Theorem 5. *Let the chains $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be given by the MH algorithm 1, $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (X_k, Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the augmented chain (7), and let the following assumptions hold:*

- (i) (X_k) is geometrically ergodic.
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \rho_\theta} [|\phi(Y)|^{2+\epsilon}] < \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, where $\phi := f\rho/\rho_\theta$.
- (iii) $\gamma_{\text{CLT}} := \gamma_0 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k < \infty$, where $\gamma_k := \text{Cov}[\phi(Y_1), \phi(Y_{k+1})]$.

Then the importance sampling estimator S_K^{IS} given by (1) with the target approximation ρ_θ given by (2) fulfills a law of large numbers (LLN) and a central limit theorem (CLT):

$$S_K^{\text{IS}}(f) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f], \quad \sqrt{K} (S_K^{\text{IS}}(f) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\gamma_{\text{CLT}}}{\sqrt{Z}}\right).$$

The proof is given in Appendix A.

4 Related work

The shadow Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (SHMC) approach, little known in machine learning and statistics, is a special case of MCIS. In particular, it relies on the observation that HMC without an MH correction does not sample from the desired Hamiltonian density ρ^h but rather a modified density ρ_θ^h . Again, the idea is to approximate ρ_θ^h and use the MCIS estimator. Like MCIS in general, SHMC is known to strongly outperform standard HMC. See [26, 12], [14] for algorithmic details and [19] for a version tailored towards computational statistics.

Previous work derives the density of rejected proposals ρ_θ^r and accepted proposals ρ_θ^a and analyzes the variance reduction from a Rao-Blackwellization perspective. Note that ρ_θ is related to these densities through the mixture representation $\rho_\theta = \alpha \rho_\theta^a + (1 - \alpha) \rho_\theta^r$, where α is the overall acceptance rate. Using an estimate of ρ_θ^r , [3] experimentally demonstrates that a subsequent importance sampling estimator for the integral of interest has strongly decreased variance. The same paper also proposes the S-MHIS estimator under the assumption that the normalization constant of ρ is known ([3], Section 5, $\hat{\tau}_9$). Alternatively, [9] uses an estimate of ρ_θ^a which reduces the computational cost as compared to the ρ_θ^r based approach of [3]. Again, the resulting variance reduction is experimentally demonstrated. Also, [9] noted the existence of test-function independent control variates.

Gradient importance sampling (GRIS, [25]) is closely related to S-DLIS. It uses a discretized Langevin sampling scheme together with an adaptation of the covariance matrix used for Gaussian proposals. The weighting for the estimator only uses a single time step. The main difference to S-DLIS is that GRIS introduces a novel type of sampling scheme and recycles the well-known population Monte Carlo estimator (PMC, [1]), while MCIS represents a new type of estimator for unmodified Markov chain algorithms.

Adaptive multiple importance sampling (AMIS, [6, 15]) is an algorithm and estimator in the population Monte Carlo family which uses a weighting of samples with a mixture very similar to the MCIS

estimator $\hat{\rho}_\theta$. The approach taken in AMIS is that of Rao–Blackwellization of a PMC estimator. However, the AMIS consistency proof is tailored to PMC algorithms [15] and does not apply to our Markov chain case.

Layered adaptive importance sampling (LAIS, [16]) suggests to first use the Metropolis–Hastings algorithm as a way of producing samples approximately from the target. In a second step, LAIS builds a Gaussian mixture based on the MH samples and draws a new set of samples which are corrected with importance sampling for final integral estimation. The component distributions of the Gaussian mixture do not need to use the same variance as the proposal distributions used for MH. While the LAIS estimator has a very similar form to the MHIS estimator, its two-stage approach necessitates new evaluations of the target distribution in the importance sampling stage. This is exactly what MHIS tries to avoid by using all of the proposals (for which the target density has already been evaluated) in the final integral estimation. Also, the justification for both approaches is entirely different, as LAIS does not use properties of the Markov Chain apart from the fact that it asymptotically samples from the target.

5 Numerical Experiments and Runtime Considerations

We considered two artificial target distributions and one arising from the Bayesian posterior of a Gaussian process (GP) regression model. For each reported experiment, we ran the MCMC algorithm for 10 000 iterations and repeated the sampling procedure 20 times with different random seeds. We plot mean logarithmic absolute error vs. CPU time, where the mean was taken with a sliding window and the test function was given by $f(x) = d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi(x_i)$ with $\varphi(z) = z^3$. The average over all dimensions was taken to exclude any unexpected degeneracies. We obtained similar results for further test functions, namely for $\varphi(z) = z$, $\varphi(z) = z^2$ and $\varphi(z) = \exp(z)$, and provide the plots for those in the appendix. The reported CPU time is the sum of sampling and estimate computation times.

Gaussian target. This unimodal Gaussian distribution in three dimensions is isotropic where each dimension follows the law $\mathcal{N}(5, 0.7^2)$. We expected this to be an easy target for both vanilla and all MCIS estimators.

Mixture of Gaussians target. This mixture of two Gaussians in three dimensions is given by

$$\mu = (\mathcal{N}(3 \cdot \mathbf{1}, 0.7^2 I_d) + \mathcal{N}(7 \cdot \mathbf{1}, 1.5^2 I_d)) / 2,$$

where $\mathbf{1} := (1, 1, 1)^\top$. We expected this to be an easy target for both MH and MHIS estimators, but problematic for DL and DLIS estimators because of the multimodality.

GP regression with automatic relevance determination. In this real-life problem, Gaussian process regression is applied to noise level prediction. We used data acquired by NASA through testing airfoil blade sections in an anechoic wind tunnel. The dataset provided six predictors for the noise level, of which we used four because a Laplace approximation of the posterior suggested that two of the predictors (frequency and angle of attack) have essentially no associated uncertainty. A Gaussian automatic relevance determination (ARD) kernel was used, inducing individual variances for all predictors as model parameters. The remaining parameters were the likelihood scale and the mean of the GP, resulting in a six dimensional posterior. We used independent standard normal distributions as priors on $\log(\exp(\sigma_*^2) - 1)$, $\exp(\lambda)$, and μ , where σ_*^2 are ARD variances, λ is the likelihood scale and μ the GP mean. Ground truth for the posterior was obtained using 100 000 iterations from MH with optimal scaling and the standard estimator. This was repeated three times, resulting in 300 000 overall samples for establishing ground truth.

5.1 Discretized Langevin importance sampling

We tested DLIS for both the Gaussian and the mixture of Gaussians target. We expected the multimodality of the latter to pose a particular problem for discretized Langevin, which, however, is caused by the sampling algorithm rather than the estimator used.




Figure 3: Discretized Langevin. Absolute error over CPU time for estimating $\mathbb{E}[f]$, $f(x) = d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^3$, with the standard estimator and the proposed estimators. *Left:* Gaussian target. *Right:* Mixture of Gaussians target.

Gaussian target. As expected, the Gaussian target posed no problem whatsoever to Langevin sampling with either the vanilla or DLIS estimators. However, S-DLIS failed to provide sufficient accuracy to improve over the standard estimator. On the other hand, DLIS improved estimation accuracy considerably. The mean logarithmic absolute error of $\mathbb{E}[f]$ is plotted over CPU time in Figure 3 (left). The discretization level was set to be $\theta = 0.6$. We can observe that S-DLIS and the vanilla estimator take approximately the same amount of time for sampling and estimation combined, while DLIS takes some extra time for the same amount of samples. However, if we keep the amount of CPU time fixed as opposed to the number of samples, DLIS still outperforms the vanilla estimator.

Mixture of Gaussians target. For this multimodal target, we decreased the discretization level to $\theta = 0.2$. As expected, we observe problems of the discretized Langevin algorithm when sampling from multimodal targets, as all estimators have not yet entered the stage of convergence (Figure 3, right). This demonstrates that discretized Langevin is not a good choice for sampling multimodal target distributions. Consequently, recent papers on nonasymptotic analysis of discretized Langevin schemes make unimodality assumptions [10, 8, 4]. However, for this difficult target the DLIS estimators very clearly improve upon the state of the art.

5.2 Random walk MHIS

In these experiments we used a Gaussian random walk proposal inside Metropolis–Hastings sampling and compare the standard estimator with variants of the MHIS estimator.




Figure 4: Gaussian random walk MH. Absolute error over CPU time for estimating $\mathbb{E}[f]$, $f(x) = d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d x_i^3$, with the standard estimator and the proposed estimators. *Left:* Mixture of Gaussians target. *Right:* GP target.

Mixture of Gaussians target. Gaussian random walk proposals used a noise scale of $\theta = 0.9$. The efficiency gains of using full MHIS are extreme (Figure 4 left).

GP regression target. For this six dimensional target, we used a preliminary run in order to estimate the posterior covariance Σ using the standard MCMC estimator. Another preliminary run was used to find a scaling of Σ that resulted in a near-optimal acceptance rate. We used a control variate approach to improve estimation of the random importance weights for both S-MHIS and MHIS for the results plotted in Figure 4 (right). Again, the efficiency gains of using the MHIS estimator are huge.

5.3 Runtime considerations

Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ be the overall acceptance rate and c_f, c_q, c_ρ denote the computational cost of evaluating the test function f , the proposal density q_θ and the target density ρ , respectively, at a single point. Then the prolongation factor for using MHIS instead of the vanilla MH estimator is

$$1 + \frac{(1 - \alpha)Kc_f + \alpha K^2 c_q}{\alpha K c_f + K c_\rho + 2K c_q}.$$

In other words, when evaluating the target density is computationally costly and c_ρ is large, the amount of extra time for using the MCIS instead of the vanilla estimator becomes small, and indeed goes to zero as c_ρ increases. This is the case in e.g. Bayesian inference with large datasets as evaluating the target involves evaluating the likelihood for each data point.

Using all samples for estimating ρ_θ makes the estimator quadratic in computational complexity. If the quadratic runtime is of concern, one possible remedy is S-MCIS or a middle ground of using some fixed number j of samples for estimating ρ_θ with $1 < j < K$, retaining the linear runtime (in K) of the vanilla MH estimator. However, we obtained a very CPU-efficient estimator by choosing a completely vectorized approach to implement full MCIS.

To get an intuition for the prolongation factor, observe that convergence plots for MCIS with synthetic targets (Figure 3, Figure 4 left) end at higher CPU time values, which reflects the fact that the prolongation factor when compared to the vanilla estimator is strictly larger than one. The good performance of full MCIS in this case is especially remarkable since evaluating the target was very cheap (c_ρ was small). The GP target on the other hand arises from an actual Bayesian posterior and the cost of evaluating the target is considerably higher than for the synthetic target experiments (c_ρ is large compared to c_q). This is noticeable in the plots, as the CPU time for all estimators is almost the same for the same number of samples. In other words, the prolongation factor is close to one. Of course, the runtime for full MCIS increases dramatically when code is not vectorized.

6 Conclusion and outlook

In this paper, we propose a novel type of Monte Carlo estimators when using Markov chain algorithms for sampling. Our Markov chain importance sampling estimator is based on the elementary observation that Markov chain algorithms generate (or propose) samples from some density ρ_θ that is related to, but different from, the target density ρ , and that importance sampling can be used to correct for the change of measure. For certain limits of parameters θ of the sampler, ρ_θ will converge to ρ , but generally it often is a good approximation. As ρ_θ is not available in closed form, we proposed estimating it using Monte Carlo, and in a second step estimating the integral of interest by reweighting the ρ_θ -samples for ρ with the importance sampling trick. Importantly, as a by-product we also obtain an estimator for the normalizing constant, which is an essential quantity for Bayesian model selection, model averaging and testing. We prove a law of large numbers and a central limit theorem for the MHIS estimator. Usually using the MCIS estimator does not result in a large increase in computational time, since no further target density evaluations are necessary. We studied runtime and proposed special cases of MCIS that have a linear runtime. We empirically examined the full MCIS and S-MCIS estimators and found full MCIS to be more CPU-efficient than the standard Monte Carlo estimator, sometimes to a very large extent.

Several questions are left for future work. For one, we did not study optimal tuning of the sampler for the purpose of using MCIS subsequently. Instead, we used the optimal acceptance rate literature for tuning guidelines [21], which are tailored to the standard estimator. Secondly, we believe that the problem of infinite variance that can occur in importance sampling is of no issue for MHIS, especially in the case of random walk proposals. Because ρ_θ is a convolution $q_\theta * \rho$ in this case, importance weights will always be bounded. This intuition has to be formalized and the properties of other MH proposals for MHIS have to be studied. One interesting case here would be the preconditioned

Crank-Nicolson proposal [7, 23]. Finally, an interesting direction would be to derive error bounds for finite and fixed numbers of samples as has previously been done for certain classes of target distributions and the discretized Langevin sampler with the vanilla estimator [10, 8, 4].

Acknowledgements We thank Alain Durmus, Björn Sprungk and Daniel Rudolf for discussions about different aspects of this work. Marcus Weber answered questions about shadow HMC. Christian Robert pointed out related Rao-Blackwellization literature.

Ingmar Schuster was financed by a PSL Research University postdoc grant and SFB 1114, projects A06 and B03. Ilja Klebanov was financed by the Einstein Foundation Berlin, ECMath Project CH13.

References

- [1] O. Cappé, A. Guillin, J.-M. Marin, and C. P. Robert. Population Monte Carlo. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 13(4):907–929, 2004.
- [2] B. Carlin and S. Chib. Bayesian Model Choice Via Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 1995.
- [3] G. Casella and C. P. Robert. Rao-Blackwellisation of sampling schemes. *Biometrika*, 83(1):81–94, 1996.
- [4] X. Cheng, N. S. Chatterji, P. L. Bartlett, and M. I. Jordan. Underdamped Langevin MCMC: A non-asymptotic analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.03663*, 2017.
- [5] S. Chib. Marginal likelihood from the Gibbs output. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(432):1313–1321, 1995.
- [6] J. Cornuet, J.-M. MARIN, A. Mira, and C. P. Robert. Adaptive multiple importance sampling. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 39(4):798–812, 2012.
- [7] S. L. Cotter, G. O. Roberts, A. M. Stuart, and D. White. MCMC methods for functions: modifying old algorithms to make them faster. *Statistical Science*, pages 424–446, 2013.
- [8] A. S. Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(3):651–676, 2017.
- [9] R. Douc, C. P. Robert, et al. A vanilla rao–blackwellization of metropolis–hastings algorithms. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(1):261–277, 2011.
- [10] A. Durmus, E. Moulines, et al. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 27(3):1551–1587, 2017.
- [11] P. Glasserman. *Monte Carlo methods in financial engineering*, volume 53. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [12] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner. *Geometric numerical integration: structure-preserving algorithms for ordinary differential equations*, volume 31. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [13] W. K. Hastings. Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications. *Biometrika*, 57(1):97–109, 1970.
- [14] J. A. Izaguirre and S. S. Hampton. Shadow hybrid monte carlo: an efficient propagator in phase space of macromolecules. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 200(2):581–604, 2004.
- [15] J.-M. Marin, P. Pudlo, and M. Sedki. Consistency of adaptive importance sampling and recycling schemes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2548*, 2012.
- [16] L. Martino, V. Elvira, D. Luengo, and J. Corander. Layered adaptive importance sampling. 2015.
- [17] K. Muandet, K. Fukumizu, B. Sriperumbudur, B. Schölkopf, et al. Kernel mean embedding of distributions: A review and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 10(1-2):1–141, 2017.

- [18] G. Parisi. Correlation functions and computer simulations. *Nuclear Physics B*, 180(3):378–384, 1981.
- [19] T. Radivojević and E. Akhmatkaya. Mix & Match Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.04032*, 2017.
- [20] C. Robert and G. Casella. Monte Carlo statistical methods, 2007.
- [21] G. O. Roberts, J. S. Rosenthal, et al. Optimal scaling for various Metropolis-Hastings algorithms. *Statistical Science*, 16(4):351–367, 2001.
- [22] G. O. Roberts, R. L. Tweedie, et al. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 1996.
- [23] D. Rudolf and B. Sprungk. On a generalization of the preconditioned Crank–Nicolson Metropolis algorithm. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 18(2):309–343, 2018.
- [24] D. Rudolf and B. Sprungk. On a Metropolis-Hastings importance sampling estimator, in preparation. 2018.
- [25] I. Schuster. Gradient importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05781*, 2015.
- [26] R. D. Skeel and D. J. Hardy. Practical construction of modified hamiltonians. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 23(4):1172–1188, 2001.
- [27] T. J. Sullivan. *Introduction to uncertainty quantification*, volume 63. Springer, 2015.
- [28] L. Tierney. Markov chains for exploring posterior distributions. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1701–1728, 1994.

A Proofs

Inheritance of chain properties (Theorem 4) Let $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Markov chain generated by Metropolis–Hastings (Algorithm 1). Then the augmented chain $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by (7) has the following properties.

- (i) (Z_k) has a stationary distribution with density $\pi(x, y) = \rho(x)q_\theta(y|x)$.
- (ii) (Z_k) is aperiodic, irreducible and Harris positive.
- (iii) If (X_k) is geometrically ergodic, so is (Z_k) .
- (iv) If (X_k) is uniformly ergodic, so is (Z_k) .

Proof. Property (i) follows from the definition of (Z_k) and from the fact that ρ is the stationary density of (X_k) .

Since both ρ and q_θ are globally supported by our assumptions, aperiodicity and irreducibility are straightforward. For Harris recurrence, let $A \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ with $\pi(A) > 0$. By continuity of q_θ there exist subsets $A_X, A_Y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, such that $A_X \times A_Y \subseteq A$, $\mu(A_X) > 0$ and $q_\theta(A_Y|x) > \epsilon$ for all $x \in A_X$. Since (X_k) is Harris positive by [20, Lemma 7.3], we have

$$\mathbb{P}[X_k \in A_X \text{ infinitely often}] = 1,$$

regardless of the initial value X_1 . Since $q_\theta(A_Y|x) > \epsilon$ for all $x \in A_X$, we deduce that, almost surely, Z_k will enter $A \supseteq A_X \times A_Y$ in finite time,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\min_{k \geq 1}(Z_k \in A) < \infty\right] = 1,$$

regardless of the initial value X_1 . By [20, Proposition 6.33] this proves (ii). If (X_k) is geometrically ergodic, there exists $r > 1$ such that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} r^m \|K_X^m(x, \bullet) - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} < \infty$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For any signed measure ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$ we define the signed measure $\nu \odot q_\theta$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ by

$$\nu \odot q_\theta(A \times B) := \int_A \int_B q_\theta(y|x) dy d\nu(x).$$

Since q_θ is non-negative, its Jordan decomposition $\nu \odot q_\theta = (\nu \odot q_\theta)_+ - (\nu \odot q_\theta)_-$ is given by

$$(\nu \odot q_\theta)_+ = \nu_+ \odot q_\theta, \quad (\nu \odot q_\theta)_- = \nu_- \odot q_\theta,$$

and therefore

$$\|\nu \odot q_\theta\|_{\text{TV}} = (\nu \odot q_\theta)_+(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) + (\nu \odot q_\theta)_-(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) = \nu_+(\mathbb{R}^d) + \nu_-(\mathbb{R}^d) = \|\nu\|_{\text{TV}}.$$

Here, we used the connection between the total variation norm and the Jordan decomposition of a measure, see e.g. [27]. Since X_2 is either equal to X_1 (with probability $1 - \alpha_1$) or to Y_1 (with probability α_1), this implies for each $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, $\alpha := \alpha(x, y)$ and $m \geq 1$

$$K_Z^m((x, y), \bullet) = [(1 - \alpha)K_X^{m-1}(x, \bullet) + \alpha K_X^{m-1}(y, \bullet)] \odot q_\theta,$$

$$\|K_Z^m((x, y), \bullet) - \mu \odot q_\theta\|_{\text{TV}} \leq (1 - \alpha)\|K_X^{m-1}(x, \bullet) - \mu\|_{\text{TV}} + \alpha\|K_X^{m-1}(y, \bullet) - \mu\|_{\text{TV}}$$

and thus

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} r^m \|K_Z^m((x, y), \bullet) - \mu \odot q_\theta\|_{\text{TV}} < \infty,$$

which proves property (iii). The proof of (iv) goes analogously. $\square$

Law of large number and central limit (Theorem 5) Let the chains $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $(Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be given by the MH algorithm 1, $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} = (X_k, Y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the augmented chain (7), and let the following assumptions hold:

- (i) (X_k) is geometrically ergodic.

- (ii) $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \rho_\theta} [|\phi(Y)|^{2+\epsilon}] < \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, where $\phi := f\rho/\rho_\theta$.
- (iii) $\gamma_{\text{CLT}} := \gamma_0 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \gamma_k < \infty$, where $\gamma_k := \mathbb{Cov}[\phi(Y_1), \phi(Y_{k+1})]$.

Then the importance sampling estimator S_K^{IS} given by (1) with the target approximation ρ_θ given by (2) fulfills the law of large numbers (LLN) and central limit theorem (CLT):

$$S_K^{\text{IS}}(f) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f], \quad \sqrt{K} (S_K^{\text{IS}}(f) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\gamma_{\text{CLT}}}{\sqrt{Z}}\right).$$

Proof. The ergodic theorem (see e.g. [20, Theorem 6.63]) yields for the numerator and denominator of (1):

$$\bar{\phi}_K := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \phi(Y_k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \rho_\theta}[\phi(Y)] = \int \phi(y) \rho_\theta(y) dy = \int f(y) \rho(y) dy = Z \mathbb{E}_\mu[f], \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\rho}{\rho_\theta}(Y_k) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \rho_\theta} \left[\frac{\rho}{\rho_\theta}(Y) \right] = \int \rho(y) dy = Z. \quad (9)$$

This already proves the LLN for $S_K^{\text{IS}}(f)$. Since (Z_k) is aperiodic, irreducible, Harris positive and geometrically ergodic by Theorem 4, the application of [20, Theorem 6.67] yields

$$\sqrt{K} (\bar{\phi}_K - Z \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma_{\text{CLT}}),$$

and, by Slutsky's theorem together with (9), this proves the CLT. $\square$

B Control Variates

In order to reduce the variance of the Monte-Carlo estimate $\hat{\rho}_\theta(y)$ of $\rho_\theta(y)$,

$$\hat{\rho}_\theta(y) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K q_\theta(y|X_k) \approx \rho_\theta(y),$$

we will add a control variate to the random variable $q_\theta(y|X_k)$ for all k . The advantage in the particular combination with our MCIS estimator is that using a control variate to improve the estimate of ρ_θ will improve the final integral estimation *independent* of the particular test function. This is a strong difference to the standard application of control variates, which necessitates additional computation for each new integrand. To this end, we replace $q_\theta(y|X)$ by

$$\tilde{q}_\theta(y|X, X') = q_\theta(y|X) - c (q_\theta(y|X) - q_\theta(y|X')), \quad (10)$$

where X' is the successor of X in the Metropolis Hastings algorithm, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant and the control variate has mean zero, $\mathbb{E}[q_\theta(y|X) - q_\theta(y|X')] = 0$ for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as X and X' have the same distribution (under the assumption that $X \sim \mu$).

In the following let $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be fixed. It is well-known [11, Chapter 4.1] that the optimal coefficient $c^* = c^*(y)$ is given by

$$c^* = \frac{\text{Cov}[q_\theta(y|X), q_\theta(y|X) - q_\theta(y|X')]}{\mathbb{V}[q_\theta(y|X) - q_\theta(y|X')]} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[q_\theta(y|X)^2 - q_\theta(y|X)q_\theta(y|X')]}{\mathbb{E}[(q_\theta(y|X) - q_\theta(y|X'))^2]},$$

which can easily be approximated by another Monte Carlo estimate:

$$c^* \approx \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} q_\theta(y|X_k)^2 - q_\theta(y|X_k)q_\theta(y|X_{k+1})}{\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (q_\theta(y|X_k) - q_\theta(y|X_{k+1}))^2}.$$

Note that for each evaluation point $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ (in our case $y = Y_1, \dots, Y_K$), $c^* = c^*(y)$ has to be computed *separately*. Nevertheless, the new estimator requires only little additional computational effort. This is because $q_\theta(y|X_k)$ has to be evaluated anyway for each $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $y = Y_1, \dots, Y_K$ for the overall MHIS estimator S_K^{MHIS} and no new target density or test function evaluations are necessary.

The new estimator (10) no longer guarantees non-negativity of the density estimate $\hat{\rho}_\theta$. This can be avoided by adding a control variate to the random variable $\ell(y|X) = \log q_\theta(y|X)$ instead of $q_\theta(y|X)$,

$$\tilde{\ell}(y|X, X') = \ell(y|X) - c (\ell(y|X) + \ell(y|X')).$$

The additional computation effort is negligible, as $\log q_\theta(y|X)$ has to be computed for the full MCIS estimator anyway. Of course other control variates are possible and more than one control variate can further reduce variance. However, we found that one variate posed a good tradeoff between additional computation time and variance reduction.

C Additional test functions

In this section we provide convergence plots for additional test functions. The functions used where $f(x) = d^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^d \varphi(x_i)$ with $\varphi(z) = z$, $\varphi(z) = z^2$ and $\varphi(z) = \exp(z)$

C.1 Discretized Langevin importance sampling




Figure 5: Discretized Langevin. Absolute error over CPU time for estimating expectations of several test functions with the standard estimator and the proposed estimators. Errors averaged across dimensions and 20 independent MCMC repetitions. *Left*: Gaussian target. *Right*: Mixture of Gaussians target.

C.2 Random walk MHIS




Figure 6: Gaussian random walk MH. Absolute error over CPU time for estimating expectations of several test functions with the standard estimator and the proposed estimators. Errors averaged across dimensions and 20 independent MCMC repetitions. *Left*: Mixture of Gaussians target. *Right*: GP target.

D Code

This appendix contains code for the CPU-intensive computation of $\hat{\rho}_\theta(Y_i)$ for all Y_i in the Python programming language.

```
import numpy as np
from numpy import log
from scipy.special import logsumexp

def location_mixture_logpdf(samps, prop_means, prop_weights,
                           zeroprop, contr_var = False):
    """
    CPU-efficient (i.e. fully vectorized) way to compute the
    logpdf of a weighted location mixture

    Parameters
    =====
    samps          - samples to compute the logpdf of, one per row
    prop_means     - proposal means from Metropolis-Hastings,
                    one per row (locations of the location mixture)
    prop_weights   - number of times that proposals were drawn
                    with this proposal mean, this has the same size
                    as prop_means.shape[0]
                    (i.e. number of times that the current state
                    is repeated in Metropolis-Hastings)
    zeroprop       - proposal distribution centered at zero,
                    used only for logpdf evaluations
    contr_var      - whether or not to use control variates
    """
    diff = samps - prop_means[:, np.newaxis, :]

    tmp_shape = [np.prod(diff.shape[:2]), diff.shape[-1]]
    #compute raw logpdfs
    lpdfs = zeroprop.logpdf(diff.reshape(tmp_shape))
    #get them back into shape
    lpdfs = lpdfs.reshape(diff.shape[:2])
    #compute normalization weights
    logprop_weights = log(prop_weights/prop_weights.sum())[:, np.newaxis]
    if not contr_var:
        return logsumexp(lpdfs + logprop_weights, 0)
    else:
        time0 = lpdfs + logprop_weights + log(len(prop_weights))
        time1 = np.hstack([time0[:,1:], time0[:,0:1]])
        cov = np.mean(time0**2 - time0*time1)
        var = np.mean((time0-time1)**2)
        lpdfs = lpdfs - cov/var * (time0 - time1)
        return logsumexp(lpdfs - log(len(prop_weights)), 0)
```