

Diffusion approximations and control variates for MCMC

Nicolas Brosse¹ Alain Durmus² Sean Meyn³ Éric Moulines¹
 Anand Radhakrishnan³

Abstract

A new methodology is presented for the construction of control variates to reduce the variance of additive functionals of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) samplers. Our control variates are defined through the minimization of the asymptotic variance of the Langevin diffusion over a family of functions, which can be seen as a quadratic risk minimization procedure. The use of these control variates is theoretically justified. We show that the asymptotic variances of some well-known MCMC algorithms, including the Random Walk Metropolis and the (Metropolis) Unadjusted/Adjusted Langevin Algorithm, are close to the asymptotic variance of the Langevin diffusion. Several examples of Bayesian inference problems demonstrate that the corresponding reduction in the variance is significant.

1 Introduction

Let $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(x)} dx < \infty$. This function is associated to a probability measure π on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ defined for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\pi(A) := \int_A e^{-U(x)} dx / \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-U(x)} dx .$$

We are interested in approximating $\pi(f) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \pi(dx)$, where f is a π -integrable function. The classical Monte Carlo solution to this problem is to simulate i.i.d. random variables $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with distribution π , and then to estimate $\pi(f)$ by the sample mean

$$\hat{\pi}_n(f) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(X_i) . \tag{1}$$

In most applications, sampling from π is not an option. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods provide samples from a Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with unique invariant

¹Centre de Mathématiques Appliquées, UMR 7641, Ecole Polytechnique, France.
 nicolas.brosse@polytechnique.edu, eric.moulines@polytechnique.edu

²Ecole Normale Supérieure CMLA, 61 Av. du Président Wilson, 94235 Cachan Cedex, France.
 alain.durmus@cmla.ens-cachan.fr

³University of Florida, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Gainesville, Florida.
 meyn@ece.ufl.edu, a4anandr@ufl.edu

probability π . Under mild conditions [MT09, Chapter 17], the estimator $\hat{\pi}_n(f)$ defined by (1) satisfies for any initial distribution a Central Limit Theorem (CLT)

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \tilde{f}(X_k) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\text{weakly}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\infty, d}^2(f)), \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{f} = f - \pi(f)$ and $\sigma_{\infty, d}^2(f) \geq 0$ is referred to as the asymptotic variance associated to f and $\mathcal{N}(m, \sigma^2)$ denotes a Gaussian distribution with mean m and variance σ^2 .

The aim of the present paper is to propose a new methodology to reduce the asymptotic variance of a family of MCMC algorithms. This method consists in constructing suitable control variates, *i.e.* we consider a family of π -integrable functions $\mathcal{H} \subset \{h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \pi(h) = 0\}$ and then choose $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\sigma_{\infty, d}^2(f + h) \leq \sigma_{\infty, d}^2(f)$. Reducing the variance of Monte Carlo estimators is a very active research domain: see *e.g.* [RC04, Chapter 4], [Liu08, Section 2.3], and [RK17, Chapter 5] for an overview of the main methods - see also Section 2.2.

Analysis and motivation are based on the Langevin diffusion defined by

$$dY_t = -\nabla U(Y_t)dt + \sqrt{2}dB_t, \quad (3)$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion. In the sequel, we assume that the Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE) (3) has a unique strong solution $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ for every initial condition $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Under appropriate conditions (see [Bha82, CCG12]), π is invariant for the Markov process $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and the following CLT holds:

$$t^{-1/2} \int_0^t \tilde{f}(Y_s)ds \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow +\infty]{\text{weakly}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\infty}^2(f)). \quad (4)$$

The main contribution of this paper is the introduction of a new method to compute control variates based on the expression of the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty}^2(f)$ given in (4). For any twice continuously differentiable function φ , the differential generator acting on φ is denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi = -\langle \nabla U, \nabla \varphi \rangle + \Delta \varphi. \quad (5)$$

Under appropriate conditions on φ and π , it may be shown that $\pi(\mathcal{L}\varphi) = 0$. This property suggests to consider the class of control functionals $\mathcal{H} = \{h = \mathcal{L}g : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ for the Langevin diffusion, where \mathcal{G} is a family of “smooth” functions, and minimize over \mathcal{H} , the criterion

$$h \mapsto \sigma_{\infty}^2(f + h). \quad (6)$$

The use of control functionals $h \in \mathcal{H}$ has already been proposed in [AC99] with applications to quantum Monte Carlo calculations; improved schemes have been later considered in [MSI13, PMG14] with applications to computational Bayesian inference. Although \mathcal{H} is a class of control functionals for the Langevin diffusion, the choice of controls variates minimizing the criterion (6) for some MCMC algorithms is motivated by the fact the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty, d}^2(f)$, defined in (2) and associated to the Markov chains

associated with these methods, is (up to a scaling factor) a good approximation of the asymptotic variance of the Langevin diffusion $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ defined in (4).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our methodology to minimize (6) and the construction of control variates for some MCMC algorithms. In Section 3, we state our main result which guarantees that the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty,d}^2(f)$ defined in (2) and associated with a given MCMC method is close (up to a scaling factor) to the asymptotic variance of the Langevin diffusion $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ defined in (4). We show that under appropriate conditions on U , the Metropolis Adjusted/Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA and ULA) and the Random Walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm fit the framework of our methodology. In Section 4, Monte Carlo experiments illustrating the performance of our method are presented. The proofs are postponed to Sections 5 and 6 and to the Appendix.

Notation

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the Borel σ -field of \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, let $L^1(\mu)$ be the set of μ -integrable functions for μ a probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Further, $\mu(f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) d\mu(x)$ for an $f \in L^1(\mu)$. Given a Markov kernel R on \mathbb{R}^d , for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and f integrable under $R(x, \cdot)$, denote by $Rf(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(y) R(x, dy)$. Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ be a measurable function. The V -total variation distance between two probability measures μ and ν on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is defined as $\|\mu - \nu\|_V = \sup_{|f| \leq V} |\mu(f) - \nu(f)|$. If $V = 1$, then $\|\cdot\|_V$ is the total variation denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$. For a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, define $\|f\|_V = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |f(x)| / V(x)$.

For $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define the scalar product $\langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d u_i v_i$ and the Euclidian norm $\|u\| = \langle u, u \rangle^{1/2}$. Denote by $\mathbb{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|u\| = 1\}$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, denote by $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$, $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$ and $a_+ = a \vee 0$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $[a]$ and $\lceil a \rceil$ denote respectively the floor and ceil functions evaluated in a . We take the convention that for $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, $n < p$ then $\sum_p^n = 0$, $\prod_p^n = 1$ and $\{p, \dots, n\} = \emptyset$. Define for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi(t) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-r^2/2} dr$ and $\bar{\Phi}(t) = 1 - \Phi(t)$. In addition, φ stands for the d -dimensional standard Gaussian density, *i.e.* $\varphi(z) = (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-\|z\|^2/2}$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and Ω, Ω' two open sets of $\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^{m'}$ respectively, denote by $C^k(\Omega, \Omega')$, the set of k -times continuously differentiable functions. For $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, denote by ∇f the gradient of f and by Δf the Laplacian of f . For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, denote by $D^i f$ the i -th order differential of f for $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, define $\|D^0 f(x)\| = |f(x)|$, $\|D^i f(x)\| = \sup_{u_1, \dots, u_i \in \mathbb{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)} D^i f(x)[u_1, \dots, u_i]$. For $k, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, define the semi-norm

$$\|f\|_{k,p} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d, i \in \{0, \dots, k\}} \|D^i f(x)\| / (1 + \|x\|^p).$$

Define $C_{\text{poly}}^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) = \{f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) : \inf_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \|f\|_{k,p} < +\infty\}$ and for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, we consider the semi-norm

$$\|f\|_k = \|f\|_{k,p} \text{ where } p = \min\{q \in \mathbb{N} : \|f\|_{k,q} < +\infty\}.$$

Finally, define $C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} C_{\text{poly}}^k(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$.

2 Langevin-based control variates for MCMC methods

2.1 Method

We introduce in the following our methodology based on control variates for the Langevin diffusion. In order not to obscure the main ideas of this method, we present it informally. Results which justify rigorously the related derivations are postponed to Section 3.

We consider a family of control functionals $\mathcal{G} \subset C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. There is a great flexibility in the choice of the family \mathcal{G} . We illustrate our methodology through a simple example

$$\mathcal{G}_{\text{lin}} = \{g = \langle \theta, \psi \rangle : \theta \in \Theta\} \text{ where } \psi = \{\psi_i\}_{i=1}^p, \psi_i \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}), i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, \quad (7)$$

with $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, but the method developed in this paper is by no means restricted to a linear parameterized family.

A key property of the Langevin diffusion which is the basis of our methodology is the following ‘‘carré du champ’’ property (see for example [BGL14, Section 1.6.2, formula 1.6.3]): for all $g_1, g_2 \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\pi(g_1 \mathcal{L} g_2) = \pi(g_2 \mathcal{L} g_1) = -\pi(\langle \nabla g_1, \nabla g_2 \rangle), \quad (8)$$

which reflects in particular that \mathcal{L} is a self-adjoint operator on a dense subspace of $L^2(\pi)$, the Hilbert space of square integrable function w.r.t. π . A straightforward consequence of (8) (setting $g_1 = 1$) is that $\pi(\mathcal{L} g) = 0$ for any function $g \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. This observation implies that f and $f + \mathcal{L} g$ have the same expectation with respect to π for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $g \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Therefore, as emphasized in the introduction, if the CLT (4) holds, a relevant choice of control variate for the Langevin diffusion to estimate $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, is $h^* = \mathcal{L} g^*$, where g^* is a minimizer of

$$g \mapsto \sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L} g). \quad (9)$$

In the following, we explain how this optimization problem can be practically solved.

It is shown in [Bha82] (see also [GM96] and [CCG12]) that under appropriate conditions on U and f , the solution $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ of the Langevin diffusion (3) satisfies the CLT (4) where the asymptotic variance is given by

$$\sigma_\infty^2(f) = 2\pi(\hat{f}\{f - \pi(f)\}), \quad (10)$$

and $\hat{f} \in C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies Poisson’s equation:

$$\mathcal{L} \hat{f} = -\tilde{f}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{f} = f - \pi(f). \quad (11)$$

Another expression for $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ is, using (8) and (11):

$$\sigma_\infty^2(f) = 2\pi(\hat{f}\tilde{f}) = -2\pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}) = 2\pi(\|\nabla \hat{f}\|^2). \quad (12)$$

Based on (8), (10) and (12), we see now how the minimization of (9) can be computed in practice. First, by definition (11), for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $\hat{f} - g \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ is a solution to the Poisson equation

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{f} - g) = \pi(f + \mathcal{L}g) - (f + \mathcal{L}g) .$$

Therefore, we get for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, using $\pi(\mathcal{L}g) = 0$ and (10)

$$\sigma_{\infty}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g) = 2\pi\left((\hat{f} - g) \left\{ \tilde{f} + \mathcal{L}g \right\}\right) . = 2\pi(\|\nabla\hat{f} - \nabla g\|^2) .$$

In addition, by (8) and (11), we get that $\pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}g) = -\pi(\tilde{f}g)$, and we obtain using (12) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\infty}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g) &= 2\pi(\hat{f}\tilde{f}) - 2\pi(g\tilde{f}) + 2\pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}g) - 2\pi(g\mathcal{L}g) \\ &= 2\pi(\hat{f}\tilde{f}) - 4\pi(g\tilde{f}) + 2\pi(\|\nabla g\|^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Minimizing the map (9) is equivalent to minimization of $g \mapsto -4\pi(g\tilde{f}) + 2\pi(\|\nabla g\|^2)$. It means that we might actually minimize the function $g \mapsto \sigma_{\infty}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ *without* computing the solution \hat{f} of the Poisson equation, which is in general a computational bottleneck.

When $g_{\theta} = \langle \theta, \psi \rangle \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{lin}}$, then (13) may be rewritten as:

$$\sigma_{\infty}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g_{\theta}) = 2\theta^T H \theta - 4 \langle \theta, b \rangle + \sigma_{\infty}^2(f) ,$$

where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and b are given for any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ by

$$H_{ij} = \pi(\langle \nabla \psi_i, \nabla \psi_j \rangle) \quad \text{and} \quad b_i = \pi(\psi_i \tilde{f}) .$$

Note that H is by definition a symmetric semi-positive definite matrix. If $(1, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_p)$ are linearly independent in $\mathbb{C}_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, then H is full rank and the minimizer of $\sigma_{\infty}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g_{\theta})$ is given by

$$\theta^* = H^{-1}b . \quad (14)$$

In conclusion, in addition to its theoretical interest, the Langevin diffusion (3) is an attractive model because optimization of the asymptotic variance is greatly simplified. However, we are not advocating simulation of this diffusion in MCMC applications. The main contribution of this paper is to show that the optimal control variate for the diffusion remains nearly optimal for many standard MCMC algorithms.

One example is the Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (ULA), the Euler discretization scheme associated to the Langevin SDE (3):

$$X_{k+1} = X_k - \gamma \nabla U(X_k) + \sqrt{2\gamma} Z_{k+1} ,$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is the step size and $(Z_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an i.i.d. sequence of standard Gaussian d -dimensional random vectors. The idea of using the Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to sample approximately from π has been first introduced in the physics literature by [Par81] and popularized in the computational statistics community by [Gre83] and [GM94]. As

shown below, other examples are the Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) algorithm (for which an additional Metropolis-Hastings correction step is added) but also for MCMC algorithms which do not seem to be “directly” related to the Langevin diffusion, like the Random Walk Metropolis algorithm (RWM).

To deal with these different algorithms within the same theoretical framework, we consider a family of Markov kernels $\{R_\gamma : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$, parameterized by a scalar parameter $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ where $\bar{\gamma} > 0$. For the ULA and MALA algorithm, γ is the stepsize in the Euler discretization of the diffusion; for the RWM this is the variance of the random walk proposal. For any initial probability ξ on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\xi, \gamma}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\xi, \gamma}$ the probability and the expectation respectively on the canonical space of the Markov chain with initial probability ξ and of transition kernel R_γ . By convention, we set $\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} = \mathbb{E}_{\delta_x, \gamma}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote by $(X_k)_{k \geq 0}$ the canonical process. It is assumed below that $\{R_\gamma : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$, f and \mathcal{G} satisfy the following assumptions. Roughly speaking, these conditions impose that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, the discrete CLT (2) holds for the function $f + \mathcal{L}g$, and that the associated asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ is sufficiently close to $\sigma_\infty(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ given by the continuous CLT (3), as $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$, so that control functionals for the Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be derived using the methodology we developed above for the Langevin diffusion.

(I) For each $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, R_γ has an invariant probability distribution π_γ satisfying $\pi_\gamma(|f + \mathcal{L}g|) < \infty$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

(II) For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\pi}_n(f + \mathcal{L}g) - \pi_\gamma(f + \mathcal{L}g)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{\text{weakly}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)) \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{\pi}_n(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ is the sample mean (see (1)), and $\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g) \geq 0$ is the asymptotic variance (see (2)) relatively to R_γ .

(III) For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, as $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$,

$$\gamma \sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g) = \sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g) + o(1), \quad (16)$$

$$\pi_\gamma(f + \mathcal{L}g) = \pi(f + \mathcal{L}g) + O(\gamma), \quad (17)$$

where $\sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ is defined in (10).

The verification that these assumptions are satisfied for the ULA, RWM and MALA algorithms (under appropriate technical conditions), in the case $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, is postponed to Section 3. The standard conditions (I)–(II) are in particular satisfied if, for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, R_γ is V -uniformly geometrically ergodic for some measurable function $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$, *i.e.* it admits an invariant probability measure π_γ such that $\pi_\gamma(V) < +\infty$ and there exist $C_\gamma \geq 0$ and $\rho_\gamma \in [0, 1)$ such that for any probability measure ξ on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\xi R_\gamma^n - \pi_\gamma\|_V \leq C_\gamma \xi(V) \rho_\gamma^n,$$

(see e.g. [MT09] or [DMPS18]). Condition (III) requires a specific form of the dependence of C_γ and ρ_γ on γ .

Based on (I)–(III) and (14), the estimator of $\pi(f)$ we suggest is given for $N, n, m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$\pi_{N,n,m}^{\text{CV}}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=N}^{n+N-1} (f(X_k) + \mathcal{L}g_m^*(X_k)) , \quad (18)$$

where N is the length of the burn-in period and $g_m^* \in \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} R_m(g)$ is a minimizer of the structural risk associated with (13)

$$R_m(g) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=N}^{N+m-1} \left\{ -2g(\tilde{X}_k) \tilde{f}_m(\tilde{X}_k) + \|\nabla g(\tilde{X}_k)\|^2 \right\} , \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{f}_m(x) = f(x) - m^{-1} \sum_{k=N}^{N+m-1} f(\tilde{X}_k)$. Here $(\tilde{X}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be an independent copy of (or be identical to) the Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and m is the length of the sequence used to estimate the control variate. In this article, we do not study to what extent minimizing the empirical asymptotic variance (19) leads to the minimization of the asymptotic variance of $\pi_{N,n,m}^{\text{CV}}(f)$ (18) as $n \rightarrow +\infty$; such a problem has been tackled by [BIZ18] in the i.i.d. case. To control the complexity of the class of functions \mathcal{G} , a penalty term may be added in (19). The use of a penalty term to control the excess risk in the estimation of the control variate has been proposed and discussed in [SMD18]. Concerning the choice of \mathcal{G} , the simplest case is \mathcal{G}_{lin} defined by (7), corresponding to the parametric case, and it is by far the most popular approach. It is possible to go one step further and adopt fully non-parametric approaches like kernel regression methods [OGC16] or neural networks [ZWZ18].

If the control function is a linear combination of functions, $g_\theta = \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$ where $\psi = \{\psi_i : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$, then the empirical risk (19) may be expressed as

$$R_m(g_\theta) = -2 \langle \theta, b_m \rangle + \langle \theta, H_m \theta \rangle ,$$

where for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$,

$$[b_m]_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=N}^{N+m-1} \psi_i(\tilde{X}_k) \tilde{f}_m(\tilde{X}_k) , \quad [H_m]_{ij} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=N}^{N+m-1} \left\langle \nabla \psi_i(\tilde{X}_k), \nabla \psi_j(\tilde{X}_k) \right\rangle .$$

In this simple case, an optimizer is obtained in closed form

$$\theta_m^* = H_m^+ b_m , \quad (20)$$

where H_m^+ is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of H_m .

2.2 Comparison with other control variate methods for Monte Carlo simulation

The construction of control variates for MCMC and the related problem of approximating solutions of Poisson equations are very active fields of research. It is impossible to give

credit for all the contributions undertaken in this area: see [DK12], [PMG14], [OGC16] and references therein for further background. We survey in this section only the methods which are closely connected to our approach. [Hen97] and [Mey08, Section 11.5] proposed control variates of the form $(R - \text{Id})g_\theta$ where $g_\theta := \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$ and R is the Markov kernel associated to a Markov chain $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_p)$ are known π -integrable functions. The parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is obtained by minimizing the asymptotic variance

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sigma_{\infty, \text{d}}^2(f + (R - \text{Id})g_\theta) = \min_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \pi \left(\left\{ \hat{f}_\text{d} - g_\theta \right\}^2 - \left\{ R(\hat{f}_\text{d} - g_\theta) \right\}^2 \right), \quad (21)$$

where \hat{f}_d is solution of the *discrete* Poisson equation $(R - \text{Id})\hat{f}_\text{d} = -\tilde{f}$. The method suggested in [Mey08, Section 11.5] to minimize (21) requires estimates of the solution \hat{f}_d of the Poisson equation. Temporal Difference learning is a possible candidate, but this method is complex to implement and suffers from high variance.

[DK12] noticed that if R is reversible w.r.t. π , it is possible to optimize the limiting variance (21) without computing explicitly the Poisson solution \hat{f}_d . This approach is of course closely related with our proposed method: the reversibility of the Markov kernel is replaced here by the self-adjointness of the generator of the Langevin diffusion which implies the reversibility of the semi-group.

Each of the algorithms in the aforementioned literature requires computation of $R\psi_i$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, which is in general difficult except in very specific examples. In [Hen97, Mey08] this is addressed by restricting to kernels $R(x, \cdot)$ with finite support for each x . In [DK12] the authors consider mainly Gibbs samplers in their numerical examples.

Our methodology is also related to the Zero Variance method proposed by [MSI13, PMG14, OGC16, SMD18], which uses $\mathcal{L}g$ as a control variate and chooses g by minimizing $\pi(\{f + \mathcal{L}g\}^2)$. A drawback of this method stems from the fact that the optimization criterion is theoretically justified if $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. and might significantly differ from the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)$ defined in (15). We compare the two approaches in Section 4.

3 Asymptotic expansion for the asymptotic variance of MCMC algorithms

In this Section, we provide conditions upon which the approximations (16)-(17) are satisfied for $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{G} \subset C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. We first assume that the gradient of the potential is Lipschitz:

H1. $U \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and ∇U is Lipschitz, i.e. there exists $L \geq 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|\nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y)\| \leq L \|x - y\| .$$

Denote by $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ the semigroup associated to the SDE (3) defined by $P_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}[f(Y_t)]$ where f is bounded measurable and $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a solution of (3) started at x . By construction, the target distribution π is invariant for $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$.

The conditions we consider require that $\{R_\gamma, \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$ is a family of Markov kernels such that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, R_γ approximates P_γ in a sense specified below. Let $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$ be a measurable function.

H2. (i) For any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, R_γ has a unique invariant distribution π_γ .

(ii) There exists $c > 0$ such that $\liminf_{\|x\| \rightarrow \infty} \{V(x) \exp(-c\|x\|)\} > 0$, $\pi(V) < +\infty$ and $\sup_{\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]} \pi_\gamma(V) < +\infty$.

(iii) There exist $C > 0$ and $\rho \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N}, \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}], \quad \|\delta_x R_\gamma^n - \pi_\gamma\|_V \leq C \rho^{n\gamma} V(x), \quad (22)$$

$$\text{for any } t \geq 0, \quad \|\delta_x P_t - \pi\|_V \leq C \rho^t V(x). \quad (23)$$

These conditions imply that the kernels R_γ are V -uniformly geometrically ergodic “uniformly” with respect to the parameter $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ with a mixing time going to infinity as the inverse of the stepsize γ when $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$. Note that the mixing time of P_γ is also inversely proportional to γ when $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$.

Under **H1** and **H2**, by [Kop15, Lemma 2.6], there exists a solution $\hat{f} \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ to Poisson’s equation (11) for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ which is given for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\hat{f}(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} P_t \tilde{f}(x) dt. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, [CCG12, Theorem 3.1] shows that, for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $t^{-1/2} \int_0^t \tilde{f}(Y_s) ds$ where $(Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the solution of the Langevin SDE, converges weakly to $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\infty^2(f))$ where $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ is given by (10).

Note that the assumption **H2** implies that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\text{for any } \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}], n \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad R_\gamma^n V(x) \leq C \rho^{n\gamma} V(x) + \sup_{\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]} \pi_\gamma(V), \quad (25)$$

$$\text{for any } t \geq 0, \quad P_t V(x) \leq C \rho^t V(x) + \pi(V).$$

We now introduce an assumption guaranteeing that the limit $\gamma^{-1}(R_\gamma - \text{Id})$ as $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$ is equal to the infinitesimal generator of the Langevin diffusion defined, for a bounded measurable function f and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, as $\mathcal{L}f(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \{(P_t f(x) - f(x))/t\}$, if the limit exists. This is a natural assumption if the semigroup of the Langevin diffusion evaluated at time $t = \gamma$, P_γ , and R_γ are close as $\gamma \downarrow 0^+$.

H3. There exist $\alpha \geq 1$ and a family of operators $(\mathcal{E}_\gamma)_{\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]}$ with $\mathcal{E}_\gamma : C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$R_\gamma f = f + \gamma \mathcal{L}f + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma f.$$

In addition, there exists $k_e \in \mathbb{N}$, $k_e \geq 2$ such that for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C \geq 0$ (depending only on k_e, p) such that for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]} \|\mathcal{E}_\gamma f\|_{0, q} \leq C \|f\|_{k_e, p}.$$

We show below that these conditions are satisfied for the Metropolis Adjusted / Unadjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA and ULA) algorithms (in which case γ is the stepsize in the Euler discretization of the Langevin diffusion) and also by the Random Walk Metropolis algorithm (RWM) (in which case γ is the variance of the increment distribution). We next give an upper bound on the difference between π_γ and π which implies that (17) holds. The proofs are postponed to Section 5.

Proposition 1. *Assume **H1**, **H2** and **H3** and let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $C < \infty$ such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,*

$$|\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f)| \leq C \|f\|_{k_e, p} \gamma^{\alpha-1}.$$

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 5.1. \square

The next result which is the main theorem of this Section precisely formalizes (16).

Theorem 2. *Assume **H1**, **H2** and **H3**. Then, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$*

$$\left| \frac{\gamma}{n} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} \right)^2 \right] - \sigma_\infty^2(f) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}^2 \left\{ \gamma^{(\alpha-1) \wedge 1} + V(x)/(n^{1/2} \gamma^{1/2}) \right\},$$

where $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ is defined in (10).

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 5.2. \square

We now consider the ULA algorithm. The Markov kernel R_γ^{ULA} associated to the ULA algorithm is given for $\gamma > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}(x, A) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A \left(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma} z \right) \varphi(z) dz, \quad (26)$$

where φ is the d -dimensional standard Gaussian density $\varphi : z \mapsto (2\pi)^{-d/2} e^{-\|z\|^2}$. Consider the following additional assumption.

H4. *There exist $K_1 \geq 0$ and $m > 0$ such that for any $x \notin B(0, K_1)$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\langle D^2 U(x) y, y \rangle \geq m \|y\|^2$. Moreover, there exists $M \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|D^3 U(x)\| \leq M$.*

Proposition 3. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. There exist $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ and $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$ such that **H2** is satisfied for the family of Markov kernels $\{R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$.*

Proof. The proof follows from [DBD19, Theorem 14, Proposition 24]. However, for completeness and since all the tools needed for the proof of this result are used in the study of MALA, the proof is given in Section 6.1. \square

Remark 4. Note that in fact **H2** holds for ULA under milder conditions on U using the results obtained in [Ebe15, EM18, DBD19]. For example, if **H1** holds and there exist $a_1, a_2 > 0$ and $c \geq 0$ such that

$$\langle \nabla U(x), x \rangle \geq a_1 \|x\| + a_2 \|\nabla U(x)\|^2 - c, \quad (27)$$

[DBD19, Theorem 14, Proposition 24] imply that **H2** holds with $V(x) = \exp\{(a_1/8)(1 + \|x\|^2)^{1/2}\}$.

We now establish **H3**. Let $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\gamma \in [0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Denote by $X_1 = x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}Z$ where Z is a standard d -dimensional Gaussian vector, the first step of ULA. A Taylor expansion of $\varphi(X_1)$ at x and integration show that $R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}\varphi(x) = \varphi(x) + \gamma \mathcal{L}\varphi(x) + \gamma^2 \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}\varphi(x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}\varphi(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{D}^2 \varphi(x) [\nabla U(x)^{\otimes 2}] - \frac{1}{6} \gamma \text{D}^3 \varphi(x) [\nabla U(x)^{\otimes 3}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} [\text{D}^3 \varphi(x) [\nabla U(x), Z^{\otimes 2}]] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \int_0^1 (1-t)^3 \mathbb{E} \left[\text{D}^4 \varphi(x - t\gamma \nabla U(x) + t\sqrt{2\gamma}Z) [(-\sqrt{\gamma} \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2}Z)^{\otimes 4}] \right] dt. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

A simple application of the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem implies then the following result.

Lemma 5. Assume **H1**. Then for any $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\{R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$ satisfies **H3** with $\alpha = 2$, $\mathcal{E}_\gamma = \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}$ and $k_e = 4$.

We now examine the MALA algorithm. The Markov kernel R_γ^{MALA} of the MALA algorithm, see [RT96], is given for $\gamma > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, A) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A \left(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z \right) \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)}) \varphi(z) dz \\ &\quad + \delta_x(A) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ 1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)}) \right\} \varphi(z) dz, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) &= U(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - U(x) \\ &\quad + \frac{\|z - (\gamma/2)^{1/2} \{ \nabla U(x) + \nabla U(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \}\|^2 - \|z\|^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

The analysis of the MALA algorithm is closely related to the study of the ULA algorithm. Indeed, the difference between the two Markov kernels can be expressed for any bounded measurable function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\phi(x) - R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}\phi(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{ \phi(x) - \phi(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \} \\ &\quad \times \{ 1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)}) \} \varphi(z) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since $1 - \min(1, e^{-t}) \leq |t|$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, properties of ULA can then be transferred to MALA from perturbation arguments achieved by a careful analysis of $\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}$ which is the content of the following result.

Lemma 6. Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then, for any $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, there exists $C_{1,\bar{\gamma}} < \infty$ such that for any $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, it holds

$$|\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z)| \leq C_{1,\bar{\gamma}} \gamma^{3/2} \{1 + \|z\|^4 + \|x\|^2\}.$$

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 6.2. \square

A first easy consequence of (31) using (28) is that we get for any $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi = \varphi + \gamma\mathcal{L}\varphi + \gamma^2\mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi$, with $\mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi = \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}\varphi + \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi$ and for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi(x) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\gamma^{-3/2} \left\{ 1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, Z)}) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left\{ \int_0^1 \left\langle \nabla\varphi(x - t\gamma\nabla U(x) + t\sqrt{2\gamma}Z), \sqrt{\gamma}\nabla U(x) - \sqrt{2}Z \right\rangle dt \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where Z is a d -dimensional standard Gaussian vector. Note that by the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, for any $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}\varphi$ is continuous. As a result and using Lemma 5 and Lemma 6, it follows that **H3** holds.

Lemma 7. Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then for any $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\{R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$ satisfies **H3** with $\alpha = 2$, $\mathcal{E}_\gamma = \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}$ and $k_e = 4$.

We now turn to verifying **H2**. Similarly to Lemma 7, a key tool is the decomposition of R_γ^{MALA} given by (31).

Proposition 8. Assume **H1** and **H4**. There exist $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ and $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$ such that **H2** is satisfied for the family of Markov kernels $\{R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$.

Proof. The proof is postponed to Section 6.2. \square

We now turn to the analysis of the RWM algorithm. For $\gamma > 0$, the Markov kernel R_γ^{RWM} of the RWM algorithm with a Gaussian proposal of mean 0 and variance 2γ is given for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, A) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{1}_A(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)}) \varphi(z) dz \\ &\quad + \delta_x(A) \left\{ 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)}) \varphi(z) dz \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z) = U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - U(x)$. We first consider **H3** and adapt the proof of [FHS15, Lemma 1]. To this end, consider the following decomposition for any $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}\varphi(x) - \varphi(x) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}Z) - \varphi(x) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, Z)}) - 1 \right) \left\{ \varphi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}Z) - \varphi(x) \right\} \right], \quad (32) \end{aligned}$$

where Z is a standard d -dimensional Gaussian vector. While the first term in this decomposition can be easily handled by a Taylor expansion, we rely on the following result for the second term. Define $\zeta_\gamma : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ by,

$$\zeta_\gamma(x, z) = 1 - \min\left(1, \exp\left\{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)\right\}\right) - \sqrt{2\gamma} \langle \nabla U(x), z \rangle_+ .$$

Lemma 9. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then, for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|\zeta_\gamma(x, z)| \leq \gamma \|z\|^2 \{L + 2\|\nabla U(x)\|^2 + 4\gamma L^2 \|z\|^2\} .$$

Proof. First, by a Taylor expansion and since $t \mapsto \max(0, t)$ is 1-Lipschitz, we get for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\left| \tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+ - \sqrt{2\gamma} \langle \nabla U(x), z \rangle_+ \right| \leq L\gamma \|z\|^2 ,$$

where for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a_+ = \max(0, a)$. Using that that for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\min\{1, \exp(-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z))\} = \exp(-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+)$$

and

$$\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+ - (1/2) \{\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+\}^2 \leq 1 - e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+} \leq \tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z)_+ ,$$

concludes the proof. \square

Let $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. Using a Taylor expansion, we get for all $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \varphi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - \varphi(x) \\ &= \sqrt{2\gamma} \langle \nabla \varphi(x), z \rangle + (2\gamma) \int_0^1 (1-t) D^2 \varphi(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z)[z^{\otimes 2}] dt \\ &= \sqrt{2\gamma} \langle \nabla \varphi(x), z \rangle + \gamma D^2 \varphi(x)[z^{\otimes 2}] + (\sqrt{2}/3)\gamma^{3/2} D^3 \varphi(x)[z^{\otimes 3}] \\ & \quad + (2/3)\gamma^2 \int_0^1 (1-t)^3 D^4 \varphi(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z)[z^{\otimes 4}] dt . \end{aligned}$$

In addition, since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla U(x), Z \rangle_+ \langle \nabla \varphi(x), Z \rangle] = (1/2) \langle \nabla U(x), \nabla \varphi(x) \rangle ,$$

where Z is a standard d -dimensional Gaussian vector, we get that by (32) and Lemma 9, for any $\varphi \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and $\gamma > 0$, $R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}\varphi = \varphi + \gamma \mathcal{L}\varphi + \gamma^{3/2} \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}\varphi$ where for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}\varphi(x) \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 (1-t) D^2 \varphi(x + Z_t)[Z^{\otimes 2}] dt \left\{ 2^{3/2} \langle \nabla U(x), Z \rangle_+ + 2\gamma^{-1/2} \zeta_\gamma(x, Z) \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{2}\gamma^{-1} \zeta_\gamma(x, Z) \langle \nabla \varphi(x), Z \rangle - (2/3)\sqrt{\gamma} \int_0^1 (1-t)^3 D^4 \varphi(x + Z_t)[Z^{\otimes 4}] dt \right] , \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_t = t\sqrt{2\gamma}Z$. Then, since ζ_γ is continuous and using the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, we end up with the following result.

Lemma 10. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then for any $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\{R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$ satisfies **H3** with $\mathcal{E}_\gamma = \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}$, $\alpha = 3/2$ and $k_e = 4$.*

In Appendix **A**, we establish a similar result as Proposition **3** and Proposition **8** for the RWM algorithm.

4 Numerical experiments

In this Section, we compare numerically our methodology with the Zero Variance method suggested by [MSI13], see Section **2.2**, that consists in minimizing the marginal variance $\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \pi(\{f + \mathcal{L}g\}^2)$ instead of the asymptotic variance $\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g)$. In Section **4.1**, we consider a one dimensional example where explicit calculations are possible. In Section **4.2**, we study Bayesian logistic and probit regressions. The code used to run the experiments is available at <https://github.com/nbrosse/controlvariates>.

4.1 One dimensional example

We consider an equally weighted mixture of two Gaussian densities of means $(\mu_1, \mu_2) = (-1, 1)$ and variance $\sigma^2 = 1/2$, and a test function $f(x) = x + x^3/2 + 3 \sin(x)$. The derivative of the Poisson equation (11) is in such case analytically known: $\tilde{f}'(x) = -(1/\pi(x)) \int_{-\infty}^x \pi(t) \tilde{f}(t) dt$, see Appendix **B.1** for a practical implementation.

We build a control variate $g_\theta \in \mathcal{G}_{\text{lin}} = \{\langle \theta, \psi \rangle : \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p\}$ where $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_p)$ are p Gaussian kernels regularly spaced on $[-4, 4]$, *i.e.* for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\psi_i(x) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-(x-\mu_i)^2/2}, \quad \text{where } \mu_i \in [-4, 4].$$

The optimal parameter $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ minimizing the asymptotic variance $\sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g_\theta)$ can be explicitly computed according to (14). For the Zero Variance estimator, the optimal parameter is given by

$$\theta_{\text{zv}}^* = -H_{\text{zv}}^{-1} b_{\text{zv}}, \quad (33)$$

where for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$, $[H_{\text{zv}}]_{ij} = \pi(\langle \mathcal{L}\psi_i, \mathcal{L}\psi_j \rangle)$ and $[b_{\text{zv}}]_i = \pi(\tilde{f} \mathcal{L}\psi_i)$. H_{zv} is invertible if $(\mathcal{L}\psi_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}\psi_p)$ are linearly independent in $C_{\text{poly}}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$.

The asymptotic variance $\sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g_\theta)$ for the two different parameters, θ^* and θ_{zv}^* are compared against the number of Gaussian kernels $p \in \{4, \dots, 10\}$ in Figure **1**. Note that the asymptotic variance $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$ is 92.5. We observe that the variance reduction is better for an even number p of basis functions; when $p \geq 8$, the two methods achieve an almost identical large variance reduction. These results are supported by the plots of g'_θ and $\mathcal{L}g_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{\text{zv}}^*\}$ in Figure **1**, see also Appendix **B.1**.

We fix the number of basis functions $p = 4$ and we now turn to the application to MCMC algorithms. We first define the sample mean with a burn-in period $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ by

$$\hat{\pi}_{N,n}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=N}^{N+n-1} f(X_k), \quad (34)$$




Figure 1: **Top Left.** Plot of the asymptotic variance $\sigma_\infty^2(f + \mathcal{L}g_\theta)$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $p \in \{4, \dots, 10\}$. **Top Right.** Autocovariances plot of ULA displaying $\omega_{N,n}^h(k)$ for $h = f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$, $\theta \in \{0, \theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $0 \leq k < 100$. **Bottom Left and Right.** Plots of g'_θ and $\mathcal{L}g_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $p = 6$.

	$\gamma \hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f)$	$\gamma \hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta_{zv}^*, \psi \rangle)$	$\gamma \hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta^*, \psi \rangle)$
ULA	82.06	20.74	5.33
RWM	105.2	28.19	8.41
MALA	93.27	23.40	5.00

Table 1: Values of $\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle)$, $\theta \in \{0, \theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ rescaled by the step size γ .

where $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is the number of samples. In this Section, we consider the following estimators of $\pi(f)$: $\hat{\pi}_{N,n}(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta^*, \psi \rangle)$ and $\hat{\pi}_{N,n}(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta_{zv}^*, \psi \rangle)$ where θ^* and θ_{zv}^* are given in (14) and (33) respectively. In this simple one dimensional example, the optimal parameters θ^* and θ_{zv}^* are explicitly computable; the problem of estimating them in higher dimensional models is addressed numerically in Section 4.2.

The sequence $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is generated by the ULA, MALA or RWM algorithms starting at 0, with a step size $\gamma = 10^{-2}$ for ULA and $\gamma = 5 \times 10^{-2}$ for RWM and MALA, a burn-in period $N = 10^5$ and a number of samples $n = 10^6$. For a test function $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($h = f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$, $\theta \in \{0, \theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$), we estimate the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(h)$ of $\hat{\pi}_{N,n}(h)$ by a spectral estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(h)$ with a Tukey-Hanning window, see [FJ10], given by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(h) = \sum_{k=-\lfloor n^{1/2} \rfloor - 1}^{\lfloor n^{1/2} \rfloor - 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos \left(\frac{\pi |k|}{\lfloor n^{1/2} \rfloor} \right) \right\} \omega_{N,n}^h(|k|), \quad (35)$$

$$\omega_{N,n}^h(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s=N}^{N+n-1-k} \{h(X_s) - \hat{\pi}_{N,n}(h)\} \{h(X_{s+k}) - \hat{\pi}_{N,n}(h)\}.$$

We compute the average of these estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle)$, $\theta \in \{0, \theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ over 10 independent runs of the Monte Carlo algorithm (ULA, RWM or MALA), see Table 1. We observe that minimizing the asymptotic variance improves upon the Zero Variance estimator.

A more detailed analysis can be carried out using the autocovariances plots that consist in displaying $\omega_{N,n}^h(k)$ for $h = f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$, $\theta \in \{0, \theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $0 \leq k < 100$, see Figure 1. The autocovariances plots for RWM and MALA are similar. By [DMPS18, Theorem 21.2.11], the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(h)$ is the sum of the autocovariances:

$$\sigma_{\infty, \gamma}^2(h) = \pi_{\gamma}(\tilde{h}_{\gamma}^2) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \pi_{\gamma}(\tilde{h}_{\gamma} R_{\gamma}^k \tilde{h}_{\gamma}), \quad \text{where } \tilde{h}_{\gamma} = h - \pi_{\gamma}(h).$$

The two methods are effective at reducing the autocovariances compared to the case without control variate. The zero variance estimator decreases more the autocovariance at $k = 0$ compared to our method, which is indeed the objective of θ_{zv}^* , the minimizer of $\theta \mapsto \pi((f + \mathcal{L} \langle \theta, \psi \rangle)^2)$. Using $\theta = \theta^*$ lowers more effectively the tail of the autocovariances (for k large enough) compared to $\theta = \theta_{zv}^*$. This effect is predominant and explains the results of Table 1.

4.2 Bayesian logistic and probit regressions

We illustrate the proposed control variates method on Bayesian logistic and probit regressions, see [GCS⁺14, Chapter 16], [MR07, Chapter 4]. The examples and the data sets are taken from [PMG14]. Let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in \{0, 1\}^N$ be a vector of binary response variables, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the regression coefficients, and $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ be a design matrix. The log-likelihood for the logistic and probit regressions are given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\log}(\mathbf{Y}|x, \mathbf{Z}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ Y_i Z_i^T x - \ln \left(1 + e^{Z_i^T x} \right) \right\} , \\ \ell_{\text{pro}}(\mathbf{Y}|x, \mathbf{Z}) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ Y_i \ln(\Phi(Z_i^T x)) + (1 - Y_i) \ln(\Phi(-Z_i^T x)) \right\} , \end{aligned}$$

where Z_i^T is the i^{th} row of \mathbf{Z} for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. For both models, a Gaussian prior of mean 0 and variance $\zeta^2 \text{Id}$ is assumed for x where $\zeta^2 = 100$. The unnormalized posterior probability distributions π_{\log} and π_{pro} for the logistic and probit regression models are defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\log}(x|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) &\propto \exp(-U_{\log}(x)) \quad \text{with} \quad U_{\log}(x) = -\ell_{\log}(\mathbf{Y}|x, \mathbf{Z}) + (2\zeta^2)^{-1} \|x\|^2 , \\ \pi_{\text{pro}}(x|\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}) &\propto \exp(-U_{\text{pro}}(x)) \quad \text{with} \quad U_{\text{pro}}(x) = -\ell_{\text{pro}}(\mathbf{Y}|x, \mathbf{Z}) + (2\zeta^2)^{-1} \|x\|^2 . \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma enables to check the assumptions on U_{\log} and U_{pro} required to apply Theorem 2 for the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms.

Lemma 11. *U_{\log} and U_{pro} satisfy **H1** and **H4**.*

Proof. The proof is postponed to Appendix B.2. □

Following [PMG14, Section 2.1], we compare two bases for the construction of a control variate, based on first and second degree polynomials and denoted by $\psi^{1\text{st}} = (\psi_1^{1\text{st}}, \dots, \psi_d^{1\text{st}})$ and $\psi^{2\text{nd}} = (\psi_1^{2\text{nd}}, \dots, \psi_{d(d+3)/2}^{2\text{nd}})$ respectively, see Appendix B.3 for their definitions. The estimators associated to $\psi^{1\text{st}}$ and $\psi^{2\text{nd}}$ are referred to as CV-1 and CV-2, respectively.

For the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms, we make a run of $n = 10^6$ samples with a burn-in period of 10^5 samples, started at the mode of the posterior. The step size is set equal to 10^{-2} for ULA and to 5×10^{-2} for MALA and RWM: with these step sizes, the average acceptance ratio in the stationary regime is equal to 0.23 for RWM and 0.57 for MALA, see [RGG97, RR98]. We consider $2d$ scalar test functions $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{2d}$ defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ by $f_k(x) = x_k$ and $f_{k+d}(x) = x_k^2$.

Contrary to the one dimensional case handled in Section 4.1, the optimal parameters θ^* and θ_{zv}^* corresponding to our method and to the zero variance estimator can not be computed in closed form and must be estimated. We consider then the control variate estimator $\pi_{N,n,n}^{\text{CV}}(f)$ defined in (18) where $m = n$ and $(\tilde{X}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equal to $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$; θ^*

is approximated by θ_n^* given in (20). For $k \in \{1, \dots, 2d\}$, we compute the empirical average $\hat{\pi}_{N,n}(f_k)$ defined in (34) and confront it to $\pi_{N,n,n}^{\text{CV}}(f_k)$. For comparison purposes, the zero-variance estimators of [PMG14] using the same bases of functions $\psi^{1\text{st}}$, $\psi^{2\text{nd}}$ are also computed and are referred to as ZV-1 for $\psi^{1\text{st}}$ and ZV-2 for $\psi^{2\text{nd}}$.

We run 100 independent Markov chains for ULA, MALA, RWM algorithms. The boxplots for the logistic example are displayed in Figure 2 for x_1 and x_1^2 . Note the impressive decrease in the variance using the control variates for each algorithm ULA, MALA and RWM. It is worthwhile to note that for ULA, the bias $|\pi(f) - \pi_\gamma(f)|$ is reduced dramatically using the CV-2 estimator. It can be explained by the fact that for n large enough, $g_{\theta_n^*} = \langle \theta_n^*, \psi^{2\text{nd}} \rangle$ approximates well the solution \hat{f} of the Poisson equation $\mathcal{L}\hat{f} = -\hat{f}$. We then get

$$\pi_\gamma(f) + \pi_\gamma(\mathcal{L}g_{\theta_n^*}) \approx \pi_\gamma(f) - \pi_\gamma(\hat{f}) = \pi(f).$$

To have a more quantitative estimate of the variance reduction, we compute for each algorithm and test function $h \in C_{\text{poly}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, the spectral estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(h)$ defined in (35) of the asymptotic variance. The average of these estimators $\hat{\sigma}_{N,n}^2(f + \mathcal{L}\langle \theta, \psi \rangle)$ for $\theta \in \{0, \theta_n^*, [\theta_{\text{zv}}^*]_n\}$ over the 100 independent runs of the Markov chains for the logistic regression are reported in Table 2. $[\theta_{\text{zv}}^*]_n$ is an empirical estimator of θ_{zv}^* , see [PMG14] for its construction. The Variance Reduction Factor (VRF) is defined as the ratio of the asymptotic variances obtained by the ordinary empirical average and the control variate (or zero-variance) estimator. We again observe the considerable decrease of the asymptotic variances using control variates. In this example, our approach produces slightly larger VRFs compared to the zero-variance estimators. We obtain similar results for the probit regression; see Appendix B.3.

5 Proofs of Proposition 1 and Theorem 2

In the proof the notation $A(\gamma, n, x, f) \lesssim B(\gamma, n, x, f)$ means that there exist $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, and $C < \infty$ such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A(\gamma, n, x, f) \leq CB(\gamma, n, x, f)$.

We preface the proofs by a technical result which follows from [Kop15, Lemma 2.6, Proposition 2.7] and (24) establishing the regularity of solutions of Poisson's equation.

Proposition 12. *Assume **H1** and **H2** and let $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. For all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, there exists $\hat{f} \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathcal{L}\hat{f} = -\tilde{f}$, where $\tilde{f} = f - \pi(f)$, \mathcal{L} is the generator of the Langevin diffusion defined in (5). In addition, for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $C \geq 0$, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\|\hat{f}\|_{k,q} \leq C\|f\|_{k,p}$.*

5.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Under **H1** and **H2**, by Proposition 12, there exists $q_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1} \leq C\|f\|_{k_e, p}$, where $\mathcal{L}\hat{f} = -\tilde{f}$, $\tilde{f} = f - \pi(f)$. Under **H3**, we




Figure 2: Boxplots of x_1, x_1^2 using the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms for the logistic regression. The compared estimators are the ordinary empirical average (O), our estimator with a control variate (18) using first (CV-1) or second (CV-2) order polynomials for ψ , and the zero-variance estimators of [PMG14] using a first (ZV-1) or second (ZV-2) order polynomial bases. The plots in the second column are close-ups for CV-2 and ZV-2.

		MCMC	CV-1-MCMC		CV-2-MCMC		ZV-1-MCMC		ZV-2-MCMC	
		Var.	VRF	Var.	VRF	Var.	VRF	Var.	VRF	Var.
x_1	ULA	2	33	0.061	3.2e+03	6.2e-4	33	0.061	3e+03	6.6e-4
	MALA	0.41	33	0.012	2.6e+03	1.6e-4	30	0.014	2.5e+03	1.7e-4
	RWM	1.3	33	0.039	2.6e+03	4.9e-4	32	0.04	2.7e+03	4.8e-4
x_2	ULA	10	57	0.18	8.1e+03	1.3e-3	53	0.19	7.4e+03	1.4e-3
	MALA	2.5	59	0.042	7.7e+03	3.2e-4	54	0.046	7.3e+03	3.4e-4
	RWM	5.6	52	0.11	5.6e+03	1.0e-3	50	0.11	5.6e+03	1.0e-3
x_2	ULA	10	56	0.18	7.3e+03	1.4e-3	52	0.19	6.7e+03	1.0e-35
	MALA	2.4	58	0.041	6.8e+03	3.5e-4	52	0.045	6.5e+03	3.7e-4
	RWM	5.6	45	0.13	5.1e+03	1.0e-31	42	0.13	5.1e+03	1.0e-31
x_4	ULA	13	26	0.5	3.9e+03	3.3e-3	22	0.59	3.4e+03	3.8e-3
	MALA	3.1	25	0.12	3.6e+03	8.7e-4	21	0.14	3.3e+03	9.5e-4
	RWM	7.5	19	0.4	2.5e+03	3.0e-3	18	0.43	2.4e+03	3.0e-31
x_1^2	ULA	4.6	10	0.46	5.5e+02	8.4e-3	9.3	0.49	4.8e+02	9.5e-3
	MALA	0.98	9.6	0.1	4.6e+02	2.1e-3	8.6	0.11	4.2e+02	2.3e-3
	RWM	3	8.3	0.36	4.3e+02	6.9e-3	8	0.37	4.3e+02	6.9e-3
x_2^2	ULA	29	11	2.6	5.2e+02	0.055	10	2.8	4.7e+02	0.062
	MALA	7	11	0.64	5.2e+02	0.013	10	0.68	4.8e+02	0.014
	RWM	16	9.1	1.8	4.4e+02	0.037	8.8	1.8	4.3e+02	0.037
x_3^2	ULA	46	11	4.1	6.7e+02	0.069	10	4.5	5.9e+02	0.079
	MALA	11	11	0.97	6e+02	0.018	10	1	5.6e+02	0.019
	RWM	26	9	2.9	4.3e+02	0.061	8.6	3.1	4.2e+02	0.062
x_4^2	ULA	5.1e+02	14	37	8.2e+02	0.62	12	43	6.9e+02	0.73
	MALA	1.2e+02	14	9	7.9e+02	0.15	12	10	7.1e+02	0.17
	RWM	2.9e+02	11	27	5.8e+02	0.51	10	29	5.6e+02	0.53

Table 2: Estimates of the asymptotic variances for ULA, MALA and RWM and each parameter x_i , x_i^2 for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and of the variance reduction factor (VRF) on the example of the logistic regression.

have for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$R_\gamma \hat{f} = \hat{f} + \gamma \mathcal{L} \hat{f} + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f} = \hat{f} - \gamma \{f - \pi(f)\} + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}. \quad (36)$$

Integrating (36) w.r.t. π_γ , we obtain that $\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f) = \gamma^{\alpha-1} \pi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f})$. Under **H3**, there exists $q_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}\|_{0, q_2} \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1}$. By **H2**, we get $|\pi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f})| \leq \pi_\gamma(|\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}|) \lesssim \|\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}\|_{0, q_2}$, which concludes the proof.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is divided into two parts. In the first part which gathers Lemma 13, Lemma 14 and Lemma 15, we establish preliminary and technical results. In particular, we derive in Lemma 13 an elementary bound on the second order moment of the estimator $\hat{\pi}_n(f)$ defined in (1), where $(X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov chain of kernel R_γ . The arguments are based solely on the study of R_γ and rely on **H2**. In a second part, using our preliminary results, the proof of Theorem 2 is then derived.

Lemma 13. *Assume **H1** and **H2**. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\|f\|_{V^{1/2}} < +\infty$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} \right)^2 \right] \lesssim \gamma^{-1} \|f\|_{V^{1/2}}^2 \{n + \gamma^{-1} V(x)\}.$$

Proof. Note that under **H2**-(iii), by [DMPS18, Definition D.3.1-(i)] and Jensen inequality,

$$\|\delta_x R_\gamma^n - \pi_\gamma\|_{V^{1/2}} \lesssim \rho^{n\gamma/2} V^{1/2}(x). \quad (37)$$

We have for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} \right)^2 \right] \\ \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{s=0}^{n-1-k} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [(f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)) (f(X_{k+s}) - \pi_\gamma(f))] . \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

For $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and $s \in \{0, \dots, n-1-k\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [(f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)) (f(X_{k+s}) - \pi_\gamma(f))] = \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [(f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)) (R_\gamma^s f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f))] .$$

By (37), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [(f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)) (f(X_{k+s}) - \pi_\gamma(f))]| \\ \lesssim \|f\|_{V^{1/2}} \rho^{\gamma s/2} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [|f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)| V^{1/2}(X_k)] \\ \lesssim \|f\|_{V^{1/2}}^2 \rho^{\gamma s/2} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [V(X_k)] , \end{aligned}$$

using that $V \geq 1$ and $|f(x) - \pi_\gamma(f)| \leq \|f\|_{V^{1/2}}(V^{1/2}(x) + \bar{\pi})$ where $\bar{\pi} = \sup_{\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]} \pi_\gamma(V) \lesssim 1$. By (25), we get

$$|\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [(f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f))(f(X_{k+s}) - \pi_\gamma(f))]| \lesssim \|f\|_{V^{1/2}}^2 \rho^{\gamma s/2} \left\{ \rho^{k\gamma} V(x) + \bar{\pi} \right\} .$$

Combining it with (38), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} \right)^2 \right] \lesssim \frac{\|f\|_{V^{1/2}}^2}{1 - \rho^{\gamma/2}} \left\{ \frac{V(x)}{1 - \rho^\gamma} + n\bar{\pi} \right\} .$$

Using that $1 - \rho^{\beta\gamma} \geq \beta\gamma \log(1/\rho)\rho^{\beta\gamma}$ for all $\beta \in (0, 1]$ concludes the proof. \square

Define for any $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, such that $R_\gamma f^2(x) < +\infty$,

$$m_\gamma(x) = \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [\{f(X_1) - R_\gamma f(x)\}^2] .$$

Lemma 14. *Assume **H1** and **H3**. For all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $m_\gamma \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and in addition for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $\|m_\gamma\|_{0, q} \lesssim \gamma \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2$.*

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$. By **H3**, for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq m_\gamma(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [\{f(X_1) - f(x) - \gamma \mathcal{L}f(x) - \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma f(x)\}^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [\{f(X_1) - f(x)\}^2] - \gamma^2 \{\mathcal{L}f(x) + \gamma^{\alpha-1} \mathcal{E}_\gamma f(x)\}^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [\{f(X_1) - f(x)\}^2] . \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Besides, for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [\{f(X_1) - f(x)\}^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [f^2(X_1)] + f^2(x) - 2f(x)\mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} [f(X_1)] \\ &= \gamma \mathcal{L}(f^2)(x) + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma(f^2)(x) - 2\gamma f(x)\mathcal{L}f(x) - 2\gamma^\alpha f(x)\mathcal{E}_\gamma f(x) \\ &= \gamma \left\{ 2\|\nabla f(x)\|^2 + \gamma^{\alpha-1} (\mathcal{E}_\gamma(f^2)(x) - 2f(x)\mathcal{E}_\gamma f(x)) \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Then, combining this result and (39), under **H3**, $m_\gamma \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and since $k_e \geq 2$, there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|m_\gamma\|_{0, q} \lesssim \gamma \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2$. \square

Lemma 15. *Assume **H1**, **H2** and **H3**. Then for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) - \pi(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}^2 \gamma^{\alpha-1} , \tag{40}$$

$$\sigma_\infty^2(f) = -2\pi(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) \lesssim \|f\|_{2, p}^2 , \tag{41}$$

where for any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, \hat{f} is the solution of Poisson's equation (11) (see Proposition 12).

Proof. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. By Proposition 12 and H1, there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{k_e+2,q} \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2,p} \text{ and } \|U\|_{k_e+1,q} \lesssim 1. \quad (42)$$

In addition, using Proposition 1, we have

$$|\pi_\gamma(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}) - \pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f})| \lesssim \gamma^{\alpha-1} \|\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}\|_{k_e,3q}.$$

Using that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_{k,p_1,p_2} \geq 0$ such that for any $g_1, g_2 \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, $\|fg\|_{k,p_1+p_2} \leq C_{k,p_1,p_2} \|f\|_{k,p_1} \|g\|_{k,p_2}$ by the general Leibniz rule, we get by definition of \mathcal{L} (5),

$$\left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}) - \pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}) \right| \lesssim \gamma^{\alpha-1} \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e,q} \|\mathcal{L}\hat{f}\|_{k_e,2q} \lesssim \gamma^{\alpha-1} \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e+2,q}^2 \|U\|_{k_e+1,q}.$$

The proof of (40) then follows from (42). Similarly, by H2,

$$\sigma_\infty^2(f) = -2\pi(\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}) \lesssim \|\hat{f}\mathcal{L}\hat{f}\|_{0,3q} \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_{0,q} \|\mathcal{L}\hat{f}\|_{0,2q} \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_{2,q}^2 \|U\|_{1,q},$$

since $\|U\|_{1,q} \leq \|U\|_{k_e+1,q} \lesssim 1$. Using that $\|\hat{f}\|_{2,q} \leq \|f\|_{2,p}$ concludes the proof of (41). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $f \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$, let $\hat{f} \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ be the solution of Poisson's equation $\mathcal{L}\hat{f} = -\tilde{f}$ (see Proposition 12). Using H3, we get for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$R_\gamma \hat{f} = \hat{f} + \gamma \mathcal{L}\hat{f} + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f} = \hat{f} - \gamma \{f - \pi_\gamma(f)\} + \gamma^\alpha \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f} - \gamma \{\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f)\}, \quad (43)$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} &= \frac{\hat{f}(X_0) - \hat{f}(X_n)}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \hat{f}(X_{k+1}) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_k) \right\} \\ &\quad + \gamma^{\alpha-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}(X_k) - \gamma^{1-\alpha} (\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f)) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Consider the following decomposition based on (44),

$$n^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{x,\gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \{f(X_k) - \pi_\gamma(f)\} \right)^2 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^4 A_i^f(x, n, \gamma),$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^f(x, n, \gamma) &= \frac{\gamma^{2(\alpha-1)}}{n} \mathbb{E}_{x,\gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\{ \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}(X_k) - \gamma^{1-\alpha} (\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f)) \right\} \right)^2 \right], \\ A_2^f(x, n, \gamma) &= (n\gamma^2)^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{x,\gamma} \left[(\hat{f}(X_0) - \hat{f}(X_n))^2 \right], \\ A_3^f(x, n, \gamma) &= (n\gamma^2)^{-1} \mathbb{E}_{x,\gamma} \left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \hat{f}(X_{k+1}) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_k) \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

and by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$(1/2) \left| A_4^f(x, n, \gamma) \right| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 3} A_i^f(x, n, \gamma)^{1/2} A_j^f(x, n, \gamma)^{1/2}. \quad (45)$$

We bound below $\left| A_i^f(x, n, \gamma) \right|$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$. By Proposition 12, there exists $q_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1} \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e, p}, \quad (46)$$

which combined with **H2-(iii)** and (25) yield for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$A_2^f(x, n, \gamma) \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_V^2 V(x)/(n\gamma^2) \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2 V(x)/(n\gamma^2). \quad (47)$$

For any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, by (43) and since $\mathcal{L}\hat{f} = -\tilde{f}$, $\pi_\gamma(\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}) = \gamma^{1-\alpha} \{\pi_\gamma(f) - \pi(f)\}$. Under **H3**, there exists $q_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $\|\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}\|_{V^{1/2}} \lesssim \|\mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}\|_{0, q_3} \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1} \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e, p}$ by (46). Hence, applying Lemma 13 and using $\alpha \geq 3/2$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^f(x, n, \gamma) &\lesssim \frac{\gamma^{2(\alpha-1)}}{n} \frac{\|f\|_{k_e, p}^2}{\gamma} \left(n + \frac{V(x)}{\gamma} \right) \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2 \{1 + V(x)/(n\gamma)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Since $(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \hat{f}(X_{k+1}) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a $\mathbb{P}_{x, \gamma}$ -square integrable martingale, we get that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$A_3^f(x, n, \gamma) = \gamma^{-2} \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g_\gamma(X_k) \right], \quad (49)$$

where

$$g_\gamma(x) = \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_1) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(x)\}^2 \right]. \quad (50)$$

Lemma 14 shows that $g_\gamma \in C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and that there exists $q_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|g_\gamma\|_V \lesssim \|g_\gamma\|_{0, q_2} \lesssim \gamma \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1}^2 \lesssim \gamma \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2$. Applying (22), we get that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x, \gamma} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g_\gamma(X_k) \right] - \pi_\gamma(g_\gamma) \right| \\ \lesssim \|g_\gamma\|_V (n\gamma)^{-1} V(x) \lesssim n^{-1} \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2 V(x). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We now show that $\pi_\gamma(g_\gamma)$ is approximately equal to $\gamma \sigma_\infty^2(f)$. Observe that by (50) and since π_γ is invariant for R_γ , for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\gamma(g_\gamma) &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_1) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_1) - \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_0) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Using that π_γ is the invariant distribution for R_γ again and (43), we have for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_1) - \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right] &= 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\hat{f}(X_0) \{\hat{f}(X_0) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_0)\} \right] \\ &= -2\gamma \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) - 2\gamma^\alpha \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}).\end{aligned}\quad (53)$$

In the next step, we consider separately the cases $\pi_\gamma = \pi$ and $\pi_\gamma \neq \pi$. If $\pi = \pi_\gamma$, then

$$-\pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) = (1/2)\sigma_\infty^2(f). \quad (54)$$

If $\pi_\gamma \neq \pi$, Lemma 15 shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) + (1/2)\sigma_\infty^2(f) \right| &= \left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) - \pi(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) \right| \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2,p}^2 \gamma^{\alpha-1}.\end{aligned}\quad (55)$$

Using **H3**, (25) and $\left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e,p}^2$ in (53), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_1) - \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right] + 2\gamma \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{L} \hat{f}) \right| \\ = 2\gamma^\alpha \left| \pi_\gamma(\hat{f} \mathcal{E}_\gamma \hat{f}) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e,p}^2 \gamma^\alpha.\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

Similarly, using **H2-(ii)**, (25), (43), (5), **H3** and (46), it holds since $k_e \geq 2$ that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi_\gamma, \gamma} \left[\{\hat{f}(X_0) - R_\gamma \hat{f}(X_0)\}^2 \right] \lesssim \|\hat{f}\|_{k_e, q_1}^2 \gamma^2 \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e, p}^2 \gamma^2.$$

Combining this result with (54) or (55) and (56) in (52) and using that $\|f\|_{k_e, p} \leq \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}$, we obtain

$$\left| \pi_\gamma(g_\gamma) - \gamma \sigma_\infty^2(f) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}^2 \gamma^{\alpha \wedge 2}.$$

Plugging this inequality and (51) in (49), we obtain for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$,

$$\left| A_3^f(x, n, \gamma) - \gamma^{-1} \sigma_\infty^2(f) \right| \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}^2 \left\{ \gamma^{(\alpha-2) \wedge 0} + (n\gamma^2)^{-1} V(x) \right\}. \quad (57)$$

Note that since $\alpha \geq 1$, by (41) and (57),

$$A_3^f(x, n, \gamma) \lesssim \|f\|_{k_e+2, p}^2 \left\{ \gamma^{-1} + (n\gamma^2)^{-1} V(x) \right\}.$$

Combining it with (45), (47) and (48) conclude the proof. \square

6 Geometric ergodicity for the ULA and MALA algorithms

In this Section, we show that (22) in **H2** is satisfied for the family of Markov kernel $\{R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$ and $\{R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}} : \gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]\}$, with $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, associated to the ULA and MALA algorithms (see (26) and (29)). Assume that there exist $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^d, [1, +\infty))$ and $a > 0$ and $b \geq 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}V \leq -aV + b. \quad (58)$$

Then, [RT96, Theorem 2.2] and [MT93, Theorem 4.5] show that $\pi(V) < +\infty$ and (23) is satisfied. It is standard to show that (58) holds under **H4** but this result is given below for completeness.

We begin the proof by two technical lemmas, Lemmas 16 and 17 which are used repeatedly throughout this Section. In this Section, we assume without loss of generality that $\nabla U(0) = 0$. Note that under **H1** and **H4**, $m \leq L$.

Lemma 16. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then there exists $K_2 \geq 0$ such that for any $x \notin B(0, K_2)$, $\langle \nabla U(x), x \rangle \geq (m/2) \|x\|^2$ and in particular $\|\nabla U(x)\| \geq (m/2) \|x\|$.*

Proof. Using **H1** and **H4**, we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq K_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla U(x), x \rangle &= \int_0^{K_1/\|x\|} \text{D}^2 U(tx)[x^{\otimes 2}] dt + \int_{K_1/\|x\|}^1 \text{D}^2 U(tx)[x^{\otimes 2}] dt \\ &\geq m \|x\|^2 \{1 - K_1(1 + L/m)/\|x\|\}, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the first statement. The second statement is obvious. \square

Lemma 17. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/(4L))$ and $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|z\| \leq \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\gamma})$, it holds*

$$\left\| x + t\{-\gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\} \right\| \geq \|x\|/2.$$

Proof. Let $t \in [0, 1]$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/(4L))$ and $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|z\| \leq \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\gamma})$. Using the triangle inequality and **H1**, we have since $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\left\| x + t\{-\gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\} \right\| \geq (1 - \gamma L) \|x\| - \sqrt{2\gamma} \|z\|.$$

The conclusion then follows from $\gamma \leq 1/(4L)$ and $\|z\| \leq \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\gamma})$. \square

We now show that (58) holds.

Proposition 18. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then, for any $\eta \in (0, m/8]$, (58) holds with $V = V_\eta$, $a = 2\eta$ and*

$$b = 2\eta \exp(\eta \{K_2^2 \vee 4(d+1)/m\}) [d+1 + (2\eta + L) \{K_2^2 \vee 4(d+1)/m\}],$$

where K_2 is defined in Lemma 16.

Proof. Let $\eta \in (0, m/8]$. By (5), for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{L}V_\eta(x)/(2\eta V_\eta(x)) = -\langle \nabla U(x), x \rangle + d + 2\eta \|x\|^2 .$$

By Lemma 16, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $x \geq \max(K_2, 2\sqrt{(d+1)/m})$,

$$\mathcal{L}V_\eta(x)/(2\eta V_\eta(x)) \leq -\{(m/2) - 2\eta\} \|x\|^2 + d \leq -1 ,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Therefore, to check **H2**, it remains to show that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, for $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, R_γ^{ULA} (resp. R_γ^{MALA}) has an invariant distribution π_γ (resp. π) and there exists $\bar{\eta} > 0$ such that $\pi_\gamma(V_{\bar{\eta}}) < +\infty$ and (22) holds with $V = V_{\bar{\eta}}$.

To this end, we establish minorization and drift conditions on $R_\gamma = R_\gamma^{\text{ULA}}$ and $R_\gamma = R_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}$, see e.g. [DMPS18, Chapter 19] with an explicit dependence with respect to the parameter γ . More precisely, assume that

(I) there exist $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $b < +\infty$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$

$$R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}} \leq \lambda^\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}} + \gamma b ; \tag{59}$$

(II) there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x, x' \in \{V_{\bar{\eta}} \leq \widetilde{M}\}$,

$$\|R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}(x, \cdot) - R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}(x', \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon) ,$$

where

$$\widetilde{M} > \left(\frac{4b\lambda^{-\bar{\gamma}}}{\log(1/\lambda)} - 1 \right) \vee 1 .$$

Then, (I) implies by [DM17, Lemma 1] that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} V_{\bar{\eta}} \leq \lambda V_{\bar{\eta}} + b\lambda^{-\bar{\gamma}} / \log(1/\lambda) . \tag{60}$$

Therefore, applying [DMPS18, Theorem 19.4.1] to $R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}$ for $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ using (II) and (60), it follows that (22) holds with $V = V_{\bar{\eta}}$ and $\pi_\gamma(V_{\bar{\eta}}) < +\infty$. Accordingly, it is enough to show that conditions (I) and (II) hold. This is achieved for ULA in Proposition 20 and Proposition 19 in Section 6.1 and relying on these results and the analysis of ULA, the Markov kernel of MALA is shown to fulfill (I) and (II) in Proposition 26 and Proposition 24 in Section 6.2.

For ease of notations, we denote in this Section R_γ^{MALA} by R_γ and R_γ^{ULA} by Q_γ for any $\gamma > 0$.

6.1 Geometric ergodicity for the ULA algorithm

Proposition 19. *Assume **H1**. Then for any $K \geq 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$, and $\gamma \in (0, 1/L]$ we have*

$$\|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon).$$

with $\varepsilon = 2\Phi\left(-\frac{1}{2}(1 + 1/L)^{1/2}(3L)^{1/2}K\right)$.

Proof. By **H1** for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\|x - y - \gamma\{\nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y)\}\|^2 \leq (1 + \gamma\kappa(\gamma))\|x - y\|^2$$

where $\kappa(\gamma) = (2L + L^2\gamma)$. The proof follows from [DBD19, Corollary 5]. \square

Proposition 20. *Assume **H1** and **H4** and let $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, m/(4L^2)]$. Then, for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,*

$$Q_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \leq \exp\left(-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4\right) V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + b_{\bar{\eta}}\gamma \mathbb{1}_{B(0, K_3)}(x),$$

where $\bar{\eta} = \min(m/16, (8\bar{\gamma})^{-1})$, $K_3 = \max(K_2, 4\sqrt{d/m})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\bar{\eta}} &= [\bar{\eta}\{m/4 + (1 + 16\bar{\eta}\bar{\gamma})(4\bar{\eta} + 2L + \bar{\gamma}L^2)\} K_3^2 + 4\bar{\eta}d] \\ &\quad \times \exp[\bar{\gamma}\bar{\eta}\{m/4 + (1 + 16\bar{\eta}\bar{\gamma})(4\bar{\eta} + 2L + \bar{\gamma}L^2)\} K_3^2 + (d/2)\log(2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$. First since for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\eta}\left\|x - \gamma\nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\right\|^2 - \|z\|^2/2 \\ &= -\frac{1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma}{2}\left\|z - \frac{2(2\gamma)^{1/2}\bar{\eta}}{1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma}\{x - \gamma\nabla U(x)\}\right\|^2 + \frac{\bar{\eta}}{1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma}\|x - \gamma\nabla U(x)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies since $1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &= (2\pi)^{-d/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left(\bar{\eta}\left\|x - \gamma\nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\right\|^2 - \|z\|^2/2\right) dz \\ &= (1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-d/2} \exp\left(\bar{\eta}(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1}\|x - \gamma\nabla U(x)\|^2\right). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

We now distinguish the case when $\|x\| \geq K_3$ and $\|x\| < K_3$.

By **H4** and Lemma 16, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq K_3 \geq K_2$, using that $\bar{\eta} \leq m/16$ and $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma} \leq m/(4L^2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1}\|x - \gamma\nabla U(x)\|^2 - \|x\|^2 \\ &\leq \gamma\|x\|^2(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1}(4\bar{\eta} - m + \gamma L^2) \leq -\gamma(m/2)\|x\|^2(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (62) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq \exp\left(-\gamma\bar{\eta}(m/2)(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1}\|x\|^2 - (d/2)\log(1 - 4\bar{\eta}\gamma)\right) V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\gamma\bar{\eta}\{-(m/2)\|x\|^2 + 4d\}\right) V_{\bar{\eta}}(x), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used for the last inequality that $-\log(1-t) \leq 2t$ for $t \in [0, 1/2]$ and $4\bar{\eta}\gamma \leq 1/2$. The proof of the statement then follows since $\|x\| \geq K_3 \geq 4\sqrt{d/m}$.

In the case $\|x\| < K_3$, by (62), H1 and since $(1-t)^{-1} \leq 1+4t$ for $t \in [0, 1/2]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (1-4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1} \|x - \gamma \nabla U(x)\|^2 - \|x\|^2 &\leq \gamma(1-4\bar{\eta}\gamma)^{-1} \{4\bar{\eta} + 2L + \gamma L^2\} \|x\|^2 \\ &\leq \gamma(1+16\bar{\eta}\gamma) \{4\bar{\eta} + 2L + \gamma L^2\} \|x\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x)/V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4} \\ &+ \exp \left[\gamma\bar{\eta} \{m/4 + (1+16\bar{\eta}\gamma)(4\bar{\eta} + 2L + \gamma L^2)\} \|x\|^2 - (d/2) \log(1-4\bar{\eta}\gamma) \right] - 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is then completed using that for any $t \geq 0$, $e^t - 1 \leq te^t$, for any $s \in [0, 1/2]$, $-\log(1-s) \leq 2s$ and $4\bar{\eta}\gamma \leq 1/2$. \square

6.2 Geometric ergodicity for the MALA algorithm

We first provide a decomposition in γ of $\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}$ defined in (30). For any $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by [DMS17, Lemma 24]¹, we have that

$$\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) = \sum_{k=2}^6 \gamma^{k/2} A_{k,\gamma}(x, z) \quad (63)$$

where, setting $x_t = x + t\{-\gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,\gamma}(x, z) &= 2 \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[z^{\otimes 2}](1/2-t) dt \\ A_{3,\gamma}(x, z) &= 2^{3/2} \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[z \otimes \nabla U(x)](t-1/4) dt, \\ A_{4,\gamma}(x, z) &= - \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[\nabla U(x)^{\otimes 2}] t dt + (1/2) \left\| \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[z] dt \right\|^2 \\ A_{5,\gamma}(x, z) &= -(1/2)^{1/2} \left\langle \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[\nabla U(x)] dt, \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[z] dt \right\rangle \\ A_{6,\gamma}(x, z) &= (1/4) \left\| \int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x_t)[\nabla U(x)] dt \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Since $\int_0^1 \text{D}^2 U(x)[z^{\otimes 2}](1/2-t) dt = 0$, we get setting $x_t = x + t\{-\gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{2,\gamma}(x, z) &= \sqrt{\gamma} \int \int_0^1 \text{D}^3 U(sx_t + (1-s)x) \left[z^{\otimes 2} \otimes \{-\gamma^{1/2} \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2}z\} \right] (1/2-t) t ds dt. \quad (64) \end{aligned}$$

¹Note that with the notation of [DMS17], MALA corresponds to HMC with only one leapfrog step and step size equals to $(2\gamma)^{1/2}$

The proof follows from $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{D}^2 U(x)\| \leq L$ and $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|\mathbf{D}^3 U(x)\| \leq M$. \square

Lemma 21. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then, for any $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, m^3/(4L^4)]$ there exists $C_{2,\bar{\gamma}} < \infty$ such that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\|x\| \geq \max(2K_1, K_2)$ and $\|z\| \leq \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\gamma})$, where K_2 is defined in Lemma 16, it holds*

$$\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) \leq C_{2,\bar{\gamma}} \gamma \|z\|^2 \{1 + \|z\|^2\}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\|x\| \geq \max(2K_1, K_2)$ and $\|z\| \leq \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\gamma})$. Using (63), we get setting

$$A_{4,0,\gamma}(x, z) = \int_0^1 \mathbf{D}^2 U(x_t) [\nabla U(x)^{\otimes 2}] t dt,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) &\leq 2\gamma A_{2,\gamma}(x, z) - \gamma^2 A_{4,0,\gamma}(x, z) \\ &\quad + (2\gamma)^{3/2} L^2 \|z\| \|x\| + (\gamma^2/2) L^2 \|z\|^2 + (\gamma^5/2)^{1/2} L^3 \|z\| \|x\| + (\gamma^3/4) L^4 \|x\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

By **H4**, Lemma 16 and Lemma 17, we get for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \max(2K_1, K_2)$,

$$A_{4,0,\gamma}(x, z) \geq (m/2)^3 \|x\|^2. \quad (66)$$

Combining this result with (64), (66) in (65), we obtain using $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma} \leq m^3/(4L^4)$

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) &\leq 2\gamma M \left\{ \sqrt{2\gamma} \|z\|^3 + \gamma L \|z\|^2 \|x\| \right\} - \gamma^2 (m^3/2^4) \|x\|^2 \\ &\quad + (2\gamma)^{3/2} L^2 \|z\| \|x\| + (\gamma^2/2) L^2 \|z\|^2 + (\gamma^5/2)^{1/2} L^3 \|z\| \|x\|, \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $ab \leq (\varepsilon/2)a^2 + 1/(2\varepsilon)b^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z) &\leq \gamma \|z\|^2 \left\{ 2^{1/2} L^2 \varepsilon^{-1} + (\gamma/2) L^2 + 2^{-3/2} \gamma^{3/2} L^3 \varepsilon^{-1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2^3 \gamma)^{1/2} M \|z\| + \gamma M L \varepsilon^{-1} \|z\|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad + \|x\|^2 \gamma^2 \left[\varepsilon \left\{ L M + 2^{1/2} L^2 + 2^{-3/2} \bar{\gamma}^{1/2} L^3 \right\} - m^3/2^4 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\varepsilon = (m^3/2^4) \{L M + 2^{1/2} L^2 + 2^{-3/2} \bar{\gamma}^{1/2} L^3\}^{-1}$ concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 22. *Assume **H1**, **H4** and let $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, m/(4L^2)]$. Then, for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|y\|^2 Q_\gamma(x, dy) \leq \{1 - (m\gamma)/2\} \|x\|^2 + \tilde{b}\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}(0, K_4)}(x),$$

where Q_γ is the Markov kernel of ULA defined in (26),

$$K_4 = \max \left(K_2, 2\sqrt{(2d)/m} \right), \quad \tilde{b} = 2d + K_4^2 (\bar{\gamma} L^2 + 2L + m/2).$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. By **H1**, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|y\|^2 Q_\gamma(x, dy) \leq 2\gamma d + \|x\|^2 (1 + \gamma^2 L^2) - 2\gamma \langle \nabla U(x), x \rangle .$$

We distinguish the case when $\|x\| \geq K_4$ and $\|x\| < K_4$. If $\|x\| \geq K_4 \geq K_2$, by Lemma 16, and since $\gamma \leq \bar{\gamma} \leq m/(4L^2)$, $\|x\| \geq K_4 \geq 2\sqrt{(2d)/m}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|y\|^2 Q_\gamma(x, dy) &\leq \|x\|^2 \left[1 - \gamma \left\{ m - \gamma L^2 - (2d)/\|x\|^2 \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \|x\|^2 \{1 - \gamma m/2\} . \end{aligned}$$

If $\|x\| < K_4$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|y\|^2 Q_\gamma(x, dy) \leq \|x\|^2 \{1 - \gamma m/2\} + \gamma \|x\|^2 (\gamma L^2 + 2L + m/2) + 2\gamma d ,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 23. *Assume **H1** and **H4** and let $\bar{\gamma} \in (0, m/(4L^2)]$. Then, there exist $C_{3,\bar{\gamma}}, C_{4,\bar{\gamma}} \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, we have*

$$\|\delta_x Q_\gamma - \delta_x R_\gamma\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C_{3,\bar{\gamma}} \gamma^{3/2} (1 + \|x\|^2) , \quad (67)$$

$$\|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C_{4,\bar{\gamma}} \gamma^{1/2} (1 + \|x\|^2) . \quad (68)$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$. We first show that (67) holds and then use this result to prove (68). Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and measurable function. Then, by (26) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|Q_\gamma f(x) - R_\gamma f(x)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{f(x - \gamma \nabla U(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - f(x)\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \{1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)})\} \varphi(z) dz \right| \\ &\leq 2 \|f\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left| 1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)}) \right| \varphi(z) dz \\ &\leq 2 \|f\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x, z)| \varphi(z) dz . \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion of (67) then follows from an application of Lemma 6.

We now turn to the proof of (68). Consider the following decomposition

$$\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} = \sum_{k=0}^{[1/\gamma]-1} \delta_x Q_\gamma^k \{Q_\gamma - R_\gamma\} R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]-k-1} .$$

Therefore using the triangle inequality, we obtain that

$$\|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{[1/\gamma]-1} \|\delta_x Q_\gamma^k \{R_\gamma - Q_\gamma\} R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]-k-1}\|_{\text{TV}}. \quad (69)$$

We now bound each term in the sum. Let $k \in \{0, \dots, [1/\gamma] - 1\}$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and measurable function. By (67), we obtain that

$$\left| \delta_x \{R_\gamma - Q_\gamma\} R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]-k-1} f \right| \leq C_{3, \bar{\gamma}} \|f\|_\infty \gamma^{3/2} \{1 + \|x\|^2\}$$

and therefore using Lemma 22, we get

$$\left| \delta_x Q_\gamma^k \{R_\gamma - Q_\gamma\} R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]-k-1} f \right| \leq C_{3, \bar{\gamma}} \|f\|_\infty \gamma^{3/2} \{1 + (1 - m\gamma/2)^k \|x\|^2 + 2\tilde{b}/m\}.$$

Plugging this result in (69), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} &\leq C_{3, \bar{\gamma}} \gamma^{3/2} \sum_{k=0}^{[1/\gamma]-1} \{1 + (1 - m\gamma/2)^k \|x\|^2 + 2\tilde{b}/m\} \\ &\leq C_{3, \bar{\gamma}} \gamma^{1/2} \{1 + 2(\|x\|^2 + \tilde{b})/m\}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 24. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. Then for any $K \geq 0$ there exist $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$, and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ we have*

$$\|\delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon). \quad (70)$$

Proof. First note that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma > 0$, by the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} &\leq \|\delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\quad + \|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\delta_y R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

We now give some bounds for each term on the right hand side for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$ for a fixed $K \geq 0$ and $\gamma \leq 1/L$. By Proposition 19, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$ and $\gamma \leq 1/L$,

$$\|\delta_x Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_1). \quad (72)$$

In addition, by Lemma 23, there exists $C \geq 0$ such that for any $\gamma \in (0, m/(4L^2)]$, and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|z\| \leq K$,

$$\|\delta_z Q_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_z R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C\gamma^{1/2}(1 + K^2).$$

Combining this result with (72) in (71), we obtain that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$, $\gamma \in (0, m/(4L^2)]$,

$$\left\| \delta_x R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} - \delta_y R_\gamma^{[1/\gamma]} \right\| \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_1) + 2C\gamma^{1/2}(1 + K^2).$$

Therefore, we obtain that for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \vee \|y\| \leq K$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, (70) holds with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon_1/2$ taking

$$\bar{\gamma} = m/(4L^2) \wedge \left[\varepsilon_1^2 (2C(1+K^2))^{-2} \right].$$

□

Lemma 25. *Let $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq 20\sqrt{2\bar{\gamma}d}$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{B}(0, \|x\|/(4\sqrt{2\bar{\gamma}}))} \varphi(z) dz \leq \exp(-\|x\|^2/(128\gamma)).$$

Proof. Let $x > 0$. By [LM00, Lemma 1],

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\|^2 \geq 2\{\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{x}\}^2) \leq \mathbb{P}(\|Z\|^2 \geq d + 2\sqrt{dx} + 2x) \leq e^{-x},$$

where Z is a d -dimensional standard Gaussian vector. Setting $t = 2\{\sqrt{d} + \sqrt{x}\}^2$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\|^2 \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\left\{d + t/2 - \sqrt{2td}\right\}\right),$$

and for $\sqrt{t} \geq 5\sqrt{d}$, we get $\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| \geq \sqrt{t}) \leq e^{-t/4}$ which gives the result. □

Proposition 26. *Assume **H1** and **H4**. There exist $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, $\varpi > 0$, and $K_5, \bar{b} \geq 0$ such that for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \leq (1 - \varpi\gamma)V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + \bar{b}\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}(0, K_5)}(x),$$

where R_γ is the Markov kernel of MALA defined by (29) and $\bar{\eta}$ is given by (61).

Proof. Let $\bar{\gamma}_1 = m/(4L^2)$. By (31) and Proposition 20, for any $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq Q_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)})\} \varphi(z) dz \\ &\leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + b_{\bar{\eta}}\gamma \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{B}(0, K_3)}(x) \\ &\quad + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{1 - \min(1, e^{-\tau_\gamma^{\text{MALA}}(x,z)})\} \varphi(z) dz, \end{aligned}$$

where K_3 and $b_{\bar{\eta}}$ are given in (61). Let

$$\bar{\gamma}_2 = \min\left(1, \bar{\gamma}_1, m^3/(4L^4)\right), \quad K_1 = \max\left(1, 2K_1, K_2, K_3, 20\sqrt{2\bar{\gamma}_2 d}\right).$$

Then, by Lemma 21 and Lemma 25, there exist $C_1 \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq K_1$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \left\{ C_1\gamma + \exp(-\|x\|^2/(128\gamma)) \right\} \\ &\leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \left\{ C_1\gamma + \exp(-1/(128\gamma)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that there exists $C_2 \geq 0$ such that $\sup_{t \in (0,1)} \{t^{-1} \exp(-1/(128t))\} \leq C_2$ we get for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq K_1$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_2]$,

$$R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma\|x\|^2/4} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \gamma \{C_1 + C_2\} .$$

Let

$$K_2 = \max \left(K_1, 4(C_1 + C_2)^{1/2} (\bar{\eta}m)^{-1/2} \right) , \quad \bar{\gamma}_3 = \min \left(\bar{\gamma}_2, 4 \{m\bar{\eta}K_2^2\}^{-1} \right) .$$

Then, since for any $t \in [0, 1]$, $e^{-t} \leq 1 - t/2$, we get for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq K_2$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_3]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq e^{-\bar{\eta}m\gamma K_2^2/4} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \gamma \{C_1 + C_2\} \\ &\leq [1 - \gamma \{\bar{\eta}mK_2^2/8 - C_1 - C_2\}] V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) \\ &\leq \{1 - \gamma\bar{\eta}mK_2^2/16\} V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) . \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

In addition, by Lemma 6, using that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 - \min(1, e^{-t}) \leq |t|$, there exists $C_3 \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \leq K_2$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_3]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) &\leq V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + b_{\bar{\eta}} \gamma \mathbb{1}_{B(0, K_3)}(x) + C_3 \gamma^{3/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \{1 + \|x\|^2 + \|z\|^4\} \varphi(z) dz \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma\bar{\eta}mK_2^2/16) V_{\bar{\eta}}(x) + \gamma\bar{\eta}mK_2^2 e^{\bar{\eta}K_2^2}/16 + \gamma b_{\bar{\eta}} \\ &\quad + C_3 \gamma \bar{\gamma}_3^{1/2} \{1 + K_2^2 + C_4\} , \end{aligned}$$

where $C_4 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \|z\|^4 \varphi(z) dz$. Combining this result and (73) completes the proof. \square

References

- [AC99] Roland Assaraf and Michel Caffarel. Zero-variance principle for Monte Carlo algorithms. *Physical review letters*, 83(23):4682, 1999.
- [Apo69] Tom M Apostol. *Calculus: Multi Variable Calculus and Linear Algebra, with Applications to Differential Equations and Probability*. John Wiley & Sons, 1969.
- [BGL14] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, volume 348 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [Bha82] R. N. Bhattacharya. On classical limit theorems for diffusions. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A (1961-2002)*, 44(1):47–71, 1982.

- [BIZ18] D. V. Belomestny, L. S. Iosipoi, and N. K. Zhivotovskiy. Variance reduction in monte carlo estimators via empirical variance minimization. *Doklady Mathematics*, 98(2):494–497, Sep 2018.
- [Bor13] KC Border. Notes on the implicit function theorem. 2013.
- [CCG12] Patrick Cattiaux, Djalil Chafaï, and Arnaud Guillin. Central limit theorems for additive functionals of ergodic Markov diffusions processes. *ALEA*, 9(2):337–382, 2012.
- [CCM11] S. H. Chang, P. C. Cosman, and L. B. Milstein. Chernoff-type bounds for the Gaussian error function. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 59(11):2939–2944, November 2011.
- [DBD19] V. De Bortoli and A. Durmus. Convergence of diffusions and their discretizations: from continuous to discrete processes and back. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09808*, 2019.
- [DK12] P. Dellaportas and I. Kontoyiannis. Control variates for estimation based on reversible Markov chain Monte Carlo samplers. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(1), 2012.
- [DM17] Alain Durmus and Éric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted Langevin algorithm. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 27(3):1551–1587, 06 2017.
- [DMPS18] R. Douc, E. Moulines, P. Priouret, and P. Soulier. *Markov chains*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, 2018.
- [DMS17] A. Durmus, E. Moulines, and E. Saksman. On the convergence of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00166*, 2017.
- [Ebe15] Andreas Eberle. Reflection couplings and contraction rates for diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, pages 1–36, 2015.
- [EM18] A. Eberle and M. B. Majka. Quantitative contraction rates for markov chains on general state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07033*, 2018.
- [FHS15] Max Fathi, Ahmed-Amine Homman, and Gabriel Stoltz. Error analysis of the transport properties of Metropolized schemes. *ESAIM: Proc.*, 48:341–363, 2015.
- [FJ10] James M. Flegal and Galin L. Jones. Batch means and spectral variance estimators in Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(2):1034–1070, 04 2010.
- [GCS⁺14] Andrew Gelman, John B Carlin, Hal S Stern, David B Dunson, Aki Vehtari, and Donald B Rubin. *Bayesian data analysis*, volume 2. CRC press Boca Raton, FL, 2014.

- [GM94] U. Grenander and M. I. Miller. Representations of knowledge in complex systems. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 56(4):549–603, 1994. With discussion and a reply by the authors.
- [GM96] Peter W. Glynn and Sean P. Meyn. A Liapunov bound for solutions of the Poisson equation. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(2):916–931, 04 1996.
- [GR14] Izrail Solomonovich Gradshteyn and Iosif Moiseevich Ryzhik. *Table of integrals, series, and products*. Academic press, 2014.
- [Gre83] U. Grenander. Tutorial in pattern theory. Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, 1983.
- [Hen97] Shane G Henderson. *Variance reduction via an approximating markov process*. PhD thesis, Department of Operations Research, Stanford University, 1997. Available at <http://people.orie.cornell.edu/shane/pubs/thesis.pdf>.
- [Kop15] M. Kopec. Weak backward error analysis for overdamped Langevin processes. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(2):583–614, 2015.
- [Liu08] Jun S Liu. *Monte Carlo strategies in scientific computing*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [LM00] B. Laurent and P. Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(5):1302–1338, 10 2000.
- [Mey08] Sean Meyn. *Control techniques for complex networks*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- [MR07] Jean-Michel Marin and Christian Robert. *Bayesian core: a practical approach to computational Bayesian statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [MSI13] Antonietta Mira, Reza Solgi, and Daniele Imparato. Zero variance Markov chain Monte Carlo for Bayesian estimators. *Statistics and Computing*, 23(5):653–662, 2013.
- [MT93] Sean P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of Markovian processes. III. Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):518–548, 1993.
- [MT09] S. Meyn and R. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2nd edition, 2009.
- [OGC16] Chris J. Oates, Mark Girolami, and Nicolas Chopin. Control functionals for Monte Carlo integration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, pages n/a–n/a, 2016.

- [Par81] G. Parisi. Correlation functions and computer simulations. *Nuclear Physics B*, 180:378–384, 1981.
- [PMG14] Theodore Papamarkou, Antonietta Mira, and Mark Girolami. Zero variance differential geometric Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms. *Bayesian Anal.*, 9(1):97–128, 03 2014.
- [RC04] C. P. Robert and G. Casella. *Monte Carlo statistical methods*. Springer Texts in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2004.
- [RGG97] G. O. Roberts, A. Gelman, and W. R. Gilks. Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 7(1):110–120, 1997.
- [RK17] R. Y. Rubinstein and D. P. Kroese. *Simulation and the Monte Carlo method*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2017. Third edition [of MR0624270].
- [RR98] Gareth O. Roberts and Jeffrey S. Rosenthal. Optimal scaling of discrete approximations to Langevin diffusions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 60(1):255–268, 1998.
- [RT96] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, 2(4):341–363, 1996.
- [SMD18] Leah F South, Antonietta Mira, and Christopher Drovandi. Regularised zero-variance control variates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05073*, 2018.
- [ZWZ18] Zhanxing Zhu, Ruosi Wan, and Mingjun Zhong. Neural Control Variates for Variance Reduction. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1806.00159, May 2018.

A Random Walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm

We show (59) for the RWM algorithm. For that purpose, consider the following additional assumption on U .

S1. *There exist $\chi, \tilde{K} > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \tilde{K}$,*

$$\|\nabla U(x)\| \geq \chi^{-1}, \quad \|\mathbf{D}^3 U(x)\| \leq \chi \|\mathbf{D}^2 U(x)\|, \quad \|\mathbf{D}^2 U(x)\| \leq \chi \|\nabla U(x)\|$$

and $\lim_{\|x\| \rightarrow +\infty} \|\mathbf{D}^2 U(x)\| / \|\nabla U(x)\|^2 = 0$.

Lemma 27. *Assume that $U \in C_{\text{poly}}^3(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and **S1**. There exists $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, R_γ^{RWM} satisfies the drift condition (59) with $V = \exp(U/2)$.*

The proof requires several intermediate results. In the sequel, C is a positive constant which can change from line to line but does not depend on γ . We first introduce some notation and state two technical lemmas. For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, denote by $\|M\|_{\text{F}}$ the Frobenius norm of M . For a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, define by $A^c = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K > 0$, we denote by $\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{d}}(x, K)$ (respectively $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_{\tilde{d}}(x, K)$), the open (respectively close) ball centered at x of radius K . When the dimension d of the state space \mathbb{R}^d is unambiguous, they are respectively denoted by $\mathbf{B}(x, K)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{B}}(x, K)$. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma > 0$, define the acceptance region

$$\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}} = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : \tau_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}(x, z) \leq 0 \right\}. \quad (74)$$

For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma > 0$, define $G : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for all $t \geq 0$ by

$$G(t) = 1/2 + 2e^{t^2/2}\bar{\Phi}(t) - e^{2t^2}\bar{\Phi}(2t). \quad (75)$$

Lemma 28. *There exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, t_0]$, $G(t) \leq 1 - (t^2/2)$ and the function G is non-increasing.*

Proof. We have for all $t \geq 0$,

$$G'(t) = 2te^{t^2/2} \left\{ \bar{\Phi}(t) - 2e^{(3t^2)/2}\bar{\Phi}(2t) \right\} \quad (76)$$

and $G'(0) = 0$, $G''(0) = -1$ so there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, t_0]$, $G(t) \leq 1 - (t^2/2)$, which is the first statement of the lemma. Regarding the second statement, by an integration by parts, we have for all $s > 0$

$$\bar{\Phi}(s) = \frac{e^{-s^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}s} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_s^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-u^2/2}}{u^2} du$$

and using a change of variables $u = v + t$, we get for all $t > 0$

$$\bar{\Phi}(t) - 2e^{(3t^2)/2}\bar{\Phi}(2t) = \int_t^{+\infty} \left\{ \frac{2e^{t(t-v)}}{(v+t)^2} - \frac{1}{v^2} \right\} \frac{e^{-v^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dv.$$

We now show that $\bar{\Phi}(t) - 2e^{(3t^2)/2}\bar{\Phi}(2t) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ which will finish the proof using (76). We distinguish the case $t \geq 0.4$ and $t \in [0, 0.4]$. For $t \geq 0.4$, define $h_t : [t, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given for all $v \geq t$ by

$$h_t(v) = 2\ln(1 + t/v) - \ln(2) - t^2 + vt .$$

We show in the sequel that $h_t(v) \geq 0$ for all $v \geq t \geq 0.4$, which implies $\bar{\Phi}(t) - 2e^{(3t^2)/2}\bar{\Phi}(2t) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0.4$. We have for all $v \geq t$

$$h'_t(v) = t\{-2/\{v(t+v)\} + 1\}$$

and h_t is decreasing on $[t, v_{\min} \vee t]$ and increasing on $[v_{\min} \vee t, +\infty)$ where $v_{\min} = (-t + \sqrt{t^2 + 8})/2$. Note that $v_{\min} \geq t$ is equivalent to $t \leq 1$ and for all $t \geq 1$, $h_t(t) = \ln(2) > 0$. Define $\ell : (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given for all $t \in (0, 1]$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(t) = h_t(v_{\min}) &= 2\ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{t^2 + 8} + t}{\sqrt{t^2 + 8} - t}\right) - \ln(2) + (t/2)\left(-3t + \sqrt{t^2 + 8}\right) \\ &= 5\ln(2) - 4\ln\left(-t + \sqrt{t^2 + 8}\right) + (t/2)\left(-3t + \sqrt{t^2 + 8}\right) . \end{aligned}$$

We have for all $t \in (0, 1]$

$$\ell'(t) = -3t + \sqrt{t^2 + 8} \geq 0 ,$$

ℓ is non-decreasing and $\ell(0.4) > 0$, which implies that for all $t \in [0.4, 1]$ and $v \geq t$, $h_t(v) \geq 0$. Therefore, $G'(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0.4$.

For $t \in [0, 0.4]$, we use the following lower and upper bounds by [CCM11, Theorems 1 and 2] for all $s \geq 0$

$$\frac{\sqrt{e}}{3\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-(3/4)s^2} \leq \bar{\Phi}(s) \leq (1/2)e^{-s^2/2}$$

and we get for all $t \in [0, 0.4]$

$$2e^{(3t^2)/2}\bar{\Phi}(2t) - \bar{\Phi}(t) \geq e^{-t^2/2} \left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{e}}{3\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-t^2} - \frac{1}{2} \right\} .$$

The right hand side is decreasing on $[0, 0.4]$ and positive because

$$(2\sqrt{e}e^{-(0.4)^2})/(3\sqrt{\pi}) - (1/2) \geq 0.02 ,$$

which implies that $G'(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in [0, 0.4]$. □

Lemma 29. *Assume that $U \in C^3_{\text{poly}}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and **S 1**. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \widetilde{M}$ and $K > 0$. For all $\gamma > 0$ and $z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K)$, we have*

$$\left\| D^2 U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \right\| \leq \|D^2 U(x)\| \{1 + C(K)\}$$

$$\text{where } C(K) = (C\chi K)^{1/2}\gamma^{1/4}e^{C\chi\sqrt{\gamma}K/2} .$$

Proof. Let $z \in \overline{B}(0, K)$. Define $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ by $f(t) = D^2 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z) - D^2 U(x)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. We have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|f(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \left\langle f(t), D^3 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z) \cdot \sqrt{2\gamma}z \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}}$$

where for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$

$$\left(D^3 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z) \cdot \sqrt{2\gamma}z \right)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_{ijk} U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z) \sqrt{2\gamma}z_k.$$

Using the equivalence of norms in finite dimension and **S1**, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \|f(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \right| &\leq C \|f(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \left\| D^3 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z) \right\| \sqrt{2\gamma} \|z\| \\ &\leq C \chi \left(\|f(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \|D^2 U(x)\|^2 \right) \sqrt{\gamma} \|z\| \end{aligned}$$

which gives by Grönwall's inequality,

$$\|f(1)\|^2 \leq \|D^2 U(x)\|^2 \left(e^{C\chi\sqrt{\gamma}\|z\|} - 1 \right).$$

Using $(e^s - 1)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{s}e^{s/2}$ for all $s \geq 0$, we get the result. \square

We now proceed to the proof of Lemma 27. Note that we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_{\gamma}^{\text{RWM}} V(x)}{V(x)} &= \int_{\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}}} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}} \frac{e^{-\|z\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} dz \\ &\quad + \int_{(\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c} \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} \right\} \frac{e^{-\|z\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} dz \quad (77) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}}$ is defined in (74).

Intuition behind the proof Before giving the proof of the lemma, we sketch here the analysis of a simple case in one dimension where $U(x) = a|x|$ (with a proper regularization near 0), $a > 0$ and let $x > 0$ be large enough. By (77), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_{\gamma}^{\text{RWM}} V(x)}{V(x)} &\approx \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-a\sqrt{\gamma/2}z} \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz \\ &\quad + \int_0^{+\infty} \left\{ 1 + e^{-a\sqrt{\gamma/2}z} - e^{-a\sqrt{2\gamma}z/2} \right\} \frac{e^{-z^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dz \\ &= (1/2) + 2e^{a^2\gamma/4} \bar{\Phi}(\sqrt{\gamma/2}a) - e^{a^2\gamma} \bar{\Phi}(\sqrt{2\gamma}a) \\ &= G(a\sqrt{\gamma/2}) \approx 1 - (\gamma a^2)/4 + O(\gamma^{3/2} a^3) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Figure illustrating the definitions of $\text{cone}(0, \theta_\gamma)$, $b(z_{-1})$, $c(z_{-1})$ and $\varphi(z_{-1})$.

and the expected contraction in $1 - C\gamma$. The proof below is devoted to make this intuition rigorous and the main steps are a localization argument, a comparison to the one dimensional case and an upper bound on the remainder terms.

In the sequel, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \widehat{M}$ where \widehat{M} is given by **S1**.

Step 1: restriction to $\overline{B}(0, K_\gamma)$ Define for all $\gamma > 0$

$$K_\gamma = \{8 \log((1/\gamma) \vee 1) + 2d \log(2)\}^{1/2}. \quad (78)$$

Let Z be a standard d -dimensional Gaussian vector. By Markov's inequality and (78), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| \geq K_\gamma) \leq e^{-K_\gamma^2/4} \mathbb{E}[e^{\|Z\|^2/4}] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{K_\gamma^2}{4} + \frac{d}{2} \log(2)\right) \leq \gamma^2. \quad (79)$$

Using $\pi(x)/\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \leq 1$ for $z \in \mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}}$,

$$1 + \sqrt{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)/\pi(x)} - \pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)/\pi(x) \leq 5/4$$

for $z \in (\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c$, (77) and (79), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}} V(x)}{V(x)} &\leq (5/4)\gamma^2 + \int_{\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}}} \mathbb{1}_{\overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)}(z) \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}} \frac{e^{-\|z\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} dz \\ &+ \int_{(\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c} \mathbb{1}_{\overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)}(z) \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} \right\} \frac{e^{-\|z\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} dz . \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Step 2: splitting $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)$ into $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma) \cap \mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma) \cap (\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c$ In this paragraph, we introduce several geometric quantities illustrated with Figure 3. Define $\bar{\gamma} > 0$ by

$$\max \left\{ (C\chi K_{\bar{\gamma}})^{1/2} \bar{\gamma}^{1/4} \exp(C\chi \bar{\gamma}^{1/2} K_{\bar{\gamma}}/2), (3/2)\sqrt{2\bar{\gamma}} K_{\bar{\gamma}} \chi \right\} = 1/2 , \quad (81)$$

where C is the positive constant given in Lemma 29. Denote by

$$C_1 = (C\chi K_{\bar{\gamma}})^{1/2} \bar{\gamma}^{1/4} \exp(C\chi \bar{\gamma}^{1/2} K_{\bar{\gamma}}/2) \in [0, 1/2] . \quad (82)$$

Let $e_1(x) = \nabla U(x) / \|\nabla U(x)\|$ and consider the decomposition $z = (z_1, \dots, z_d)$ of z in an orthonormal basis $(e_1(x), e_2(x), \dots, e_d(x))$ of \mathbb{R}^d . For all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $z_{-1} = (z_2, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. For all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$, define $\theta_\gamma \in [0, \pi/4]$ by

$$\tan \theta_\gamma = 2\sqrt{2\gamma} K_\gamma \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|} (1 + C_1) \in [0, 1] . \quad (83)$$

Denote by

$$\text{cone}(0, \theta_\gamma) = \left\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^d : |z_1| \leq (\tan \theta_\gamma) \|z_{-1}\| \right\} .$$

Define $b, c : \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $z_{-1} \in \overline{\mathbf{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$ by

$$b(z_{-1}) = (K_\gamma^2 - \|z_{-1}\|^2)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad c(z_{-1}) = (\tan \theta_\gamma) \|z_{-1}\| . \quad (84)$$

By Lemma 29 with $K = K_\gamma$, we have for all $z \in \overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$\left\| D^2 U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \right\| \leq \|D^2 U(x)\| (1 + C_1) . \quad (85)$$

where C_1 is given in (82). By Taylor's theorem, we have for all $z \in \overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - U(x) = \sqrt{2\gamma} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1 + 2r_\gamma(z) \quad (86)$$

where $r_\gamma : \overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined for all $z \in \overline{\mathbf{B}}(0, K_\gamma)$ by

$$r_\gamma(z) = \gamma \int_0^1 (1-t) D^2 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z)[z^{\otimes 2}] dt . \quad (87)$$

By (83), (85) and (87), we have for all $z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) \cap \text{cone}(0, \theta_\gamma)^c$

$$\begin{aligned} 4r_\gamma(z) &\leq 2\gamma K_\gamma \|D^2 U(x)\| (1 + C_1) (|z_1| + \|z_{-1}\|) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2\gamma} \|\nabla U(x)\| (1/2) \tan \theta_\gamma \{1 + (\tan \theta_\gamma)^{-1}\} |z_1| \leq \sqrt{2\gamma} \|\nabla U(x)\| |z_1|. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

By (86) and (88), we obtain for all $z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) \cap \text{cone}(0, \theta_\gamma)^c$, $z \neq 0$,

$$\left\{ U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) - U(x) \right\}_{z_1} > 0. \quad (89)$$

Moreover, by S1 and (85), we have for all $z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle e_1(x), \nabla U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \right\rangle - \|\nabla U(x)\| &= \sqrt{2\gamma} \int_0^1 D^2 U(x + t\sqrt{2\gamma}z)[z, e_1(x)] dt, \\ \left| \left\langle e_1(x), \nabla U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \right\rangle - \|\nabla U(x)\| \right| &\leq \sqrt{2\gamma}(1 + C_1)\chi K_\gamma \|\nabla U(x)\| \end{aligned}$$

and $\langle e_1(x), \nabla U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \rangle > 0$. By a version of the implicit function theorem given in Proposition 30, there exists $\varphi : \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous such that for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) : U(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) = U(x) \right\} \\ = \left\{ (\varphi(z_{-1}), z_{-1}) : z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

Combining (89) and (90), we obtain for all $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}]$,

$$\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}} \cap \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) = \left\{ z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) : z_1 \leq \varphi(z_{-1}) \right\}, \quad (91)$$

$$(\mathbf{A}_{x,\gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c \cap \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) = \left\{ z \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}(0, K_\gamma) : z_1 \geq \varphi(z_{-1}) \right\}, \quad (92)$$

and for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$, $|\varphi(z_{-1})| \leq c(z_{-1})$. These properties and definitions are summarized in Figure 3.

Step 3: intermediate upper bound on $R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(x)/V(x)$ Using (80) and the definitions of b and φ , see (84), (90), (91) and (92), we have

$$\frac{R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(x)}{V(x)} \leq (5/4)\gamma^2 + \int_{z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)} g_\gamma(z_{-1}) \frac{e^{-\|z_{-1}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}} dz_{-1} \quad (93)$$

where $g_\gamma : \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} g_\gamma(z_{-1}) &= \int_{-b(z_{-1})}^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge b(z_{-1})} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}}} dz_1 \\ &+ \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{b(z_{-1})} \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1. \end{aligned}$$

For all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$, we decompose $g_\gamma(z_{-1})$ in $g_\gamma(z_{-1}) = A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1})$ where $A_1(z_{-1})$ and $A_2(z_{-1})$ are defined by

$$A_1(z_{-1}) = \int_{-b(z_{-1})}^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1 \\ + \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0}^0 \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \quad (94)$$

$$A_2(z_{-1}) = \int_0^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0) \wedge b(z_{-1})} \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1 \\ + \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{b(z_{-1})} \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1. \quad (95)$$

Combining it with (93), we obtain

$$\frac{R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}} V(x)}{V(x)} \leq (5/4)\gamma^2 + \int_{z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)} \{A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1})\} \frac{e^{-\|z_{-1}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}} dz_{-1}. \quad (96)$$

By (86) and (94), we have for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$A_1(z_{-1}) = A_{11}(z_{-1}) + A_{12}(z_{-1}) + A_{13}(z_{-1}) + A_{14}(z_{-1}) \quad (97)$$

where

$$A_{11}(z_{-1}) = \int_{-b(z_{-1})}^0 e^{\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\ A_{12}(z_{-1}) = \int_{-b(z_{-1})}^{-b(z_{-1}) \vee -c(z_{-1})} e^{\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1 + r_\gamma(z)} \left\{ 1 - e^{-r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\ A_{13}(z_{-1}) = \int_{-b(z_{-1}) \vee -c(z_{-1})}^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0} e^{\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1 + r_\gamma(z)} \left\{ 1 - e^{-r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\ A_{14}(z_{-1}) = \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0}^0 \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} - \frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)} \right. \\ \left. - e^{\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1.$$

By (86) and (95), we have for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$A_2(z_{-1}) = A_{21}(z_{-1}) + A_{22}(z_{-1}) + A_{23}(z_{-1}) + A_{24}(z_{-1}) + A_{25}(z_{-1}) \\ + \int_0^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0) \wedge b(z_{-1})} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x)}{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}} - 1 - e^{-\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \right. \\ \left. + e^{-\sqrt{2\gamma}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1 \quad (98)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{21}(z_{-1}) &= \int_0^{b(z_{-1})} \left\{ 1 + e^{-\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} - e^{-\sqrt{2\gamma}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\
A_{22}(z_{-1}) &= \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{c(z_{-1}) \wedge b(z_{-1})} e^{-\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1 - r_\gamma(z)} \left\{ 1 - e^{r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\
A_{23}(z_{-1}) &= \int_{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{c(z_{-1}) \wedge b(z_{-1})} e^{-\sqrt{2\gamma}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \left\{ 1 - e^{-2r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\
A_{24}(z_{-1}) &= \int_{c(z_{-1}) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{b(z_{-1})} e^{-\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1 - r_\gamma(z)} \left\{ 1 - e^{r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1, \\
A_{25}(z_{-1}) &= \int_{c(z_{-1}) \wedge b(z_{-1})}^{b(z_{-1})} e^{-\sqrt{2\gamma}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1} \left\{ 1 - e^{-2r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1.
\end{aligned}$$

By (91), $\{\pi(x)/\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)\}^{1/2} \leq 1$ for all $z_1 \in [0, \varphi(z_{-1}) \vee 0]$. Hence, the last term in the right hand side of (98) is nonpositive and we get

$$A_2(z_{-1}) \leq A_{21}(z_{-1}) + A_{22}(z_{-1}) + A_{23}(z_{-1}) + A_{24}(z_{-1}) + A_{25}(z_{-1}). \quad (99)$$

Combining (97) and (99), we obtain for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{B}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1}) &\leq A_{11}(z_{-1}) + A_{21}(z_{-1}) + A_{12}(z_{-1}) + A_{13}(z_{-1}) + A_{14}(z_{-1}) \\
&\quad + A_{22}(z_{-1}) + A_{23}(z_{-1}) + A_{24}(z_{-1}) + A_{25}(z_{-1}). \quad (100)
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4: upper bound on $A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1})$ We upper bound each term in the right hand side of (100) and we first consider the terms $A_{11} + A_{21}$. Define $a : (0, \tilde{\gamma}] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $\tilde{\gamma} \in (0, \tilde{\gamma}]$ and $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\tilde{x}\| \geq \tilde{M}$ by

$$a(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{x}) = \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}/2} \|\nabla U(\tilde{x})\|. \quad (101)$$

We have for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{B}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$,

$$A_{11}(z_{-1}) + A_{21}(z_{-1}) \leq G(a(\gamma, x)) \quad (102)$$

where G is defined in (75).

We now consider the remainder terms $A_{12}(z_{-1}), A_{13}(z_{-1}), A_{14}(z_{-1}), A_{22}(z_{-1}), A_{23}(z_{-1}), A_{24}(z_{-1})$ and $A_{25}(z_{-1})$ in (100). Let $z_{-1} \in \bar{B}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$. By definition of $c(z_{-1})$, see (84), we have for all $z_1 \in [-b(z_{-1}), -c(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})]$, $z \notin \text{cone}(0, \theta_\gamma)$, and by (88)

$$\sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1 + r_\gamma(z) \leq (1/2) \sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1.$$

Combining it with $1 - e^s \leq |s|$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, (85) and (87), we get

$$A_{12}(z_{-1}) \leq C \int_{-b(z_{-1})}^{-c(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})} e^{(1/2)\sqrt{\gamma/2}\|\nabla U(x)\|z_1\gamma} \|D^2 U(x)\| \|z\|^2 \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1.$$

Considering the upper bound $\|z\|^2 \leq K_\gamma^2$ or the decomposition $\|z\|^2 = z_1^2 + \|z_{-1}\|^2$, we obtain

$$A_{12}(z_{-1}) \leq C\gamma \|D^2 U(x)\| \min \left\{ K_\gamma^2 e^{a(\gamma, x)^2/8} \bar{\Phi}(a(\gamma, x)/2), (\|z_{-1}\|^2 + 1) \right\}$$

where $a(\gamma, x)$ is defined in (101), and using for all $t > 0$, $e^{t^2/8} \bar{\Phi}(t/2) \leq \sqrt{2}/(\sqrt{\pi}t)$, we get

$$A_{12}(z_{-1}) \leq C \min \left(\sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^2 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|}, (\|z_{-1}\|^2 + 1) \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|^2} a(\gamma, x)^2 \right). \quad (103)$$

Similarly, we have the same upper bound (103) for $A_{24}(z_{-1})$ and $A_{25}(z_{-1})$.

Using for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 - e^s \leq \min(1, |s|)$, $\pi(x)/\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z) \leq 1$ for $z \in \mathbf{A}_{x, \gamma}^{\text{RWM}}$, (83), (84), (85), (86), (87) and (91), we have for all $z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbf{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{13}(z_{-1}) &\leq \int_{-b(z_{-1}) \vee -c(z_{-1})}^{(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0} \min(1, |r_\gamma(z)|) \frac{e^{-z_1^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{1/2}} dz_1 \\ &\leq c(z_{-1}) \min(1, C \|D^2 U(x)\| \gamma K_\gamma^2) \\ &\leq C \sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^2 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|} \min(1, C \|D^2 U(x)\| \gamma K_\gamma^2) \\ &\leq C \min \left(\sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^2 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|}, \sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^4 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|^2}{\|\nabla U(x)\|^3} a(\gamma, x)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where $a(\gamma, x)$ is defined in (101). Similarly, we have the same upper bound (104) for $A_{22}(z_{-1})$ and $A_{23}(z_{-1})$.

Concerning $A_{14}(z_{-1})$, note first that by definition of $\varphi(z_{-1})$, see (90), (91), (92), and (86), (87) we have for all $z_1 \in [(\varphi(z_{-1}) \vee -b(z_{-1})) \wedge 0, 0]$

$$2r_\gamma(z) \geq \left| \sqrt{2\gamma} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1 \right|. \quad (105)$$

Using $1 - e^s \leq |s|$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sqrt{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)/\pi(x)} \leq 1$ for all $z \in (\mathbf{A}_{x, \gamma}^{\text{RWM}})^c$, (85), (87) and (105), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ 1 - e^{\sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1} \right\} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi(x + \sqrt{2\gamma}z)}{\pi(x)}} \left\{ 1 - e^{-\sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1 - r_\gamma(z)} \right\} \\ &\leq \min \left(1, \sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| |z_1| \right) \\ &\quad + \min \left(1, \left| \sqrt{\gamma/2} \|\nabla U(x)\| z_1 + r_\gamma(z) \right| \right) \\ &\leq C \min \left(1, \gamma \|D^2 U(x)\| K_\gamma^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (83), (84) and using $|\varphi(z_{-1})| \leq c(z_{-1})$, we obtain

$$A_{14}(z_{-1}) \leq C \min \left(\sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^2 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|}{\|\nabla U(x)\|}, \sqrt{\gamma} K_\gamma^4 \frac{\|D^2 U(x)\|^2}{\|\nabla U(x)\|^3} a(\gamma, x)^2 \right) \quad (106)$$

where $a(\gamma, x)$ is defined in (101).

Step 5: conclusion Let $\epsilon = (1/4) \min(1, t_0^2)$ where t_0 is defined in Lemma 28. Let $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ be defined by $C\sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}K_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2\chi \max\left(1, K_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2\chi^2\right) = \epsilon$ where C is the maximum of the positive constants given in (103), (104) and (106). Define then $\bar{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma} \wedge \tilde{\gamma} \wedge t_0^2 \wedge \min(1, \chi^2/2)/10$ where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is given in (81). By S1, there exists $\bar{M} \geq \widetilde{M}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \bar{M}$, $Cd\|D^2U(x)\|/\|\nabla U(x)\|^2 \leq \epsilon$, where C is given in (103).

By (103), (104) and (106), we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \bar{M}$ and $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(x, K_\gamma)} \{A_{12}(z_{-1}) + A_{13}(z_{-1}) + A_{14}(z_{-1}) + A_{22}(z_{-1}) \\ & \quad + A_{23}(z_{-1}) + A_{24}(z_{-1}) + A_{25}(z_{-1})\} \frac{e^{-\|z_{-1}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}} dz_{-1} \\ & \leq \min(\epsilon, \epsilon a(\gamma, x)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

where $a(\gamma, x)$ is defined in (101). We consider now two cases:

- if $a(\gamma, x) > t_0$, by (100), (102), (107) and Lemma 28, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \bar{M}$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)} \{A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1})\} \frac{e^{-\|z_{-1}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}} dz_{-1} \\ & \leq 1 - (t_0^2/2) + \epsilon \leq 1 - (t_0^2/4) \leq 1 - (1/4)\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

- if $a(\gamma, x) \in (0, t_0]$, by (100), (102), (107), Lemma 28 and S1, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \bar{M}$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{z_{-1} \in \bar{\mathbb{B}}_{d-1}(0, K_\gamma)} \{A_1(z_{-1}) + A_2(z_{-1})\} \frac{e^{-\|z_{-1}\|^2/2}}{(2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}} dz_{-1} \\ & \leq 1 - (1/2 - \epsilon)a(\gamma, x)^2 \leq 1 - \frac{\gamma \|\nabla U(x)\|^2}{8} \leq 1 - \frac{\chi^{-2}\gamma}{8}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining it with (96), we obtain for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \geq \bar{M}$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$,

$$R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(x)/V(x) \leq 1 - \min(1, \chi^{-2}/2)\gamma/8.$$

Besides, denote by

$$A = \sup_{y, \|y\| \leq \bar{M}} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}V(y)}{V(y)} + \bar{\gamma}_1^{1/2} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(y)}{V(y)} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 10, we have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|x\| \leq \bar{M}$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$, $R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(x)/V(x) \leq 1 + \gamma A$. We get then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\gamma}_1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_\gamma^{\text{RWM}}V(x) & \leq \left(1 - \frac{\min(1, \chi^{-2}/2)\gamma}{8}\right) V(x) \\ & \quad + \gamma \left(A + \frac{\min(1, \chi^{-2}/2)}{8}\right) V(x) \mathbb{1}\{\|x\| \leq \bar{M}\} \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.

A version of the implicit function theorem

The following proposition is taken from [Apo69, Theorem 7.21] and [Bor13, Theorem 6].

Proposition 30. *Let K be a compact metric space and $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathsf{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Assume that there exist $M \geq m > 0$ such that for all $z \in \mathsf{K}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \neq y$,*

$$m \leq \frac{f(x, z) - f(y, z)}{x - y} \leq M . \quad (108)$$

Then, there exists a unique continuous function $\xi : \mathsf{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying for all $z \in \mathsf{K}$, $f(\xi(z), z) = 0$.

Proof. Denote by $C(\mathsf{K})$ the set of real continuous functions on K . By standard arguments, $C(\mathsf{K})$ is complete under the uniform norm defined for all $g_1, g_2 \in C(\mathsf{K})$ by $\|g_1 - g_2\|_\infty = \sup_{z \in \mathsf{K}} \|g_1(z) - g_2(z)\|$. Define $\psi : C(\mathsf{K}) \rightarrow C(\mathsf{K})$ for all $g \in C(\mathsf{K})$ and $z \in \mathsf{K}$ by

$$\psi(g)(z) = g(z) - (1/M)f(g(z), z) .$$

By (108), we have for all $g, h \in C(\mathsf{K})$ and $z \in \mathsf{K}$,

$$|\psi(g)(z) - \psi(h)(z)| \leq \{1 - (m/M)\} |g(z) - h(z)|$$

and $\|\psi(g) - \psi(h)\|_\infty \leq \{1 - (m/M)\} \|g - h\|_\infty$. ψ is a contraction on $C(\mathsf{K})$ and has a unique fixed point ξ in $C(\mathsf{K})$ which satisfies $f(\xi(z), z) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathsf{K}$. \square

B Additional results for the numerical experiments

B.1 One dimensional example: from theory to practice

We consider the setup of Section 4.1. In order to be able to numerically integrate, we truncate the integrals to a finite interval $[-a, a]$ for $a > 0$, *i.e.* we approximate $\pi(f)$, \hat{f}' , $\pi(\psi'_i \psi'_j)$, $\pi(\tilde{f} \psi_i)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(f) &\approx \int_{-a}^a f(t) \pi(t) dt , \\ \hat{f}'(x) &\approx -(1/\pi(x)) \int_{-a}^x \pi(t) \left\{ f(t) - \int_{-a}^a f(u) \pi(u) du \right\} dt , \\ \pi(\psi'_i \psi'_j) &\approx \int_{-a}^a \pi(t) \psi'_i(t) \psi'_j(t) dt , \\ \pi(\tilde{f} \psi_i) &\approx \int_{-a}^a \left\{ f(t) - \int_{-a}^a f(u) \pi(u) du \right\} \psi_i(t) dt . \end{aligned}$$

a	3	4	5	6
approx. of $\sigma_\infty^2(t)$	89.28	92.41	92.45	92.45
approx. of $[\theta^*]_1$	-30.19	-34.37	-34.42	-34.42
approx. of $[\theta_{zv}^*]_1$	-27.70	-28.57	-28.56	-28.56

Table 3: Approximations of $\sigma_\infty^2(t)$, $[\theta^*]_1$ and $[\theta_{zv}^*]_1$, function of the truncation boundary a .




Figure 4: Plot of π .

We consider several values for $a \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and we expect that when $\int_{-a}^a \pi(t) dt$ is close to 1, the truncation is a good approximation of the true quantity. We are particularly interested in the value of the asymptotic variance of the Langevin diffusion $\sigma_\infty^2(f) = 2\pi(\hat{f}\tilde{f})$ and the optimal parameters θ^* , θ_{zv}^* defined in (14) and (33). Approximations of these quantities are reported in Table 3 for different truncation boundaries $a \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$; concerning θ^* and θ_{zv}^* which are p -dimensional vectors, we only list their first coordinate, $[\theta^*]_1$ and $[\theta_{zv}^*]_1$. We observe that truncating the integrals to $a = 5$ is sufficient to obtain valid and stable results. It is coherent with the fact that most of the mass of π is contained in this interval, see Figure 4.

It is worth to point out that, although the quantities of interest to construct a control variate, *i.e.* $\sigma_\infty^2(f)$, θ^* , θ_{zv}^* , can be accurately estimated by truncating the integrals, others, like \hat{f}' , highly depend on the truncation boundary a . We plot in Figure 5 several approximations of \hat{f}' , by truncating the integrals to $a \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$. Note that by an integration by parts, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} \hat{f}'(x)/x^2 = C$, with $C > 0$. These plots highlight that




Figure 5: Plots of \hat{f}' for $a \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$.

truncating the integrals has a significant impact on the approximation of \hat{f}' .

In Figures 6 and 7, we plot g'_θ and $\mathcal{L}g_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{z^v}^*\}$ where $g_\theta = \langle \theta, \psi \rangle$, $\psi = \{\psi_i\}_1^p$ are defined in (4.1) and $p \in \{4, \dots, 10\}$. It illustrates that \hat{f}' and \tilde{f} are better approximated for even p ; for $p \geq 8$, g'_{θ^*} , $g'_{\theta_{z^v}^*}$ and $\mathcal{L}g_{\theta^*}$, $\mathcal{L}g_{\theta_{z^v}^*}$ are very close and the two methods obtain similar variance reductions.




Figure 6: Plots of g'_θ and $\mathcal{L}g_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $p \in \{4, 5, 6\}$.




Figure 7: Plots of g'_θ and $\mathcal{L}g_\theta$ for $\theta \in \{\theta^*, \theta_{zv}^*\}$ and $p \in \{7, \dots, 10\}$.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 11

We have for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla U_{\log}(x) &= -Z^T \Upsilon + \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i / (1 + e^{-Z_i^T x}) + x / \varsigma^2, \\ D^2 U_{\log}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{e^{-Z_i^T x}}{(1 + e^{-Z_i^T x})^2} Z_i Z_i^T + \text{Id} / \varsigma^2, \\ D^3 U_{\log}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{e^{-Z_i^T x}}{(1 + e^{-Z_i^T x})^2} \left\{ 2 \frac{e^{-Z_i^T x}}{1 + e^{-Z_i^T x}} - 1 \right\} Z_i^{\otimes 3}.\end{aligned}$$

Using for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that $0 < e^{-Z_i^T x} / (1 + e^{-Z_i^T x})^2 \leq 1/4$, U_{\log} is strongly convex, gradient Lipschitz and satisfies **H1**, (27), **H4** and **S1**.

For U_{pro} , define $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_-$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ by $h(t) = \ln(\Phi(t))$. We have for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}h'(t) &= \frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)}, \quad h''(t) = -\frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \left\{ t + \frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \right\}, \\ h^{(3)}(t) &= \frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \left\{ 2 \left(\frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} \right)^2 + 3t \frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} + t^2 - 1 \right\}\end{aligned}$$

and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla U_{\text{pro}}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ (1 - \Upsilon_i) h'(-Z_i^T x) - \Upsilon_i h'(Z_i^T x) \right\} Z_i + x / \varsigma^2, \\ D^2 U_{\text{pro}}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ -(1 - \Upsilon_i) h''(-Z_i^T x) - \Upsilon_i h''(Z_i^T x) \right\} Z_i Z_i^T + \text{Id} / \varsigma^2, \\ D^3 U_{\text{pro}}(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ (1 - \Upsilon_i) h^{(3)}(-Z_i^T x) - \Upsilon_i h^{(3)}(Z_i^T x) \right\} Z_i^{\otimes 3}.\end{aligned}$$

By an integration by parts, we have for all $t < 0$

$$t + \frac{\Phi'(t)}{\Phi(t)} = -\frac{t}{\Phi(t)} \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{e^{-s^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi s^2}} ds$$

and $t + \Phi'(t)/\Phi(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $t < 0$ and $s = -t > 0$. We have $\Phi(t) = \bar{\Phi}(s) = \text{erfc}(s/\sqrt{2})/2$ where $\text{erfc} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the complementary error function defined for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\text{erfc}(u) = (2/\sqrt{\pi}) \int_u^{+\infty} e^{-v^2} dv$. By [GR14, Section 8.25, formula 8.254], we have the following asymptotic expansion for $s \rightarrow +\infty$

$$\bar{\Phi}(s) = \frac{e^{-s^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi s}} (1 - s^{-2} + 3s^{-4} + O(s^{-6})).$$

Using that $\Phi'(t) = (2\pi)^{-1/2}e^{-t^2/2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we get asymptotically for $t \rightarrow -\infty$ and $s = -t \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\Phi'(t)/\Phi(t) = s(1 + s^{-2} - 2s^{-4} + O(s^{-6})) \quad (109)$$

and $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} h''(t) = -1$. There exists then $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $-C \leq h''(t) \leq 0$. U_{pro} is then strongly convex, gradient Lipschitz and satisfies **H1** and (27). By (109), we have for $t \rightarrow -\infty$ and $s = -t \rightarrow +\infty$, $h^{(3)}(t) = O(s^{-1})$. U_{pro} satisfies then **H4** and **S1**.

B.3 Additional results for the Bayesian logistic and probit regressions

We first define the basis of functions ψ^{1st} and ψ^{2nd} based on first and second order polynomials respectively. Let $\psi^{\text{1st}} = (\psi_1^{\text{1st}}, \dots, \psi_d^{\text{1st}})$ be given for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\psi_i^{\text{1st}}(x) = x_i$ and $\psi^{\text{2nd}} = (\psi_1^{\text{2nd}}, \dots, \psi_{d(d+3)/2}^{\text{2nd}})$ be given for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_k^{\text{2nd}}(x) &= x_k \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad \psi_{k+d}^{\text{2nd}}(x) = x_k^2 \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \\ \psi_k^{\text{2nd}}(x) &= x_i x_j \quad \text{for } k = 2d + (j-1)(d-j/2) + (i-j) \text{ and all } 1 \leq j < i \leq d. \end{aligned}$$

ψ^{1st} and ψ^{2nd} are in $C_{\text{poly}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ and are linearly independent in $C(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$.

We provide additional plots for the logistic regression, see Figure 8 and Figure 9, and the results for the Bayesian probit regression presented in Section 4, see Table 4, Figure 10 and Figure 11. They are similar to the results obtained for the Bayesian logistic regression.




Figure 8: Boxplots of x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 using the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms for the logistic regression. The compared estimators are the ordinary empirical average (O), our estimator with a control variate (18) using first (CV-1) or second (CV-2) order polynomials for ψ , and the zero-variance estimator of [PMG14] using a first (ZV-1) or second (ZV-2) order polynomial basis.




Figure 9: Boxplots of $x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2, x_4^2$ using the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms for the logistic regression. The compared estimators are the ordinary empirical average (O), our estimator with a control variate (18) using first (CV-1) or second (CV-2) order polynomials for ψ , and the zero-variance estimator of [PMG14] using a first (ZV-1) or second (ZV-2) order polynomial basis.




Figure 10: Boxplots of x_1, x_2, x_3 using the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms for the probit regression. The compared estimators are the ordinary empirical average (O), our estimator with a control variate (18) using first (CV-1) or second (CV-2) order polynomials for ψ , and the zero-variance estimator of [PMG14] using a first (ZV-1) or second (ZV-2) order polynomial basis.




Figure 11: Boxplots of x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2 using the ULA, MALA and RWM algorithms for the probit regression. The compared estimators are the ordinary empirical average (O), our estimator with a control variate (18) using first (CV-1) or second (CV-2) order polynomials for ψ , and the zero-variance estimator of [PMG14] using a first (ZV-1) or second (ZV-2) order polynomial basis.

		MCMC	CV-1-MCMC		CV-2-MCMC		ZV-1-MCMC		ZV-2-MCMC	
		Variance	VRF	Variance	VRF	Variance	VRF	Variance	VRF	Variance
x_1	ULA	2.1	24	0.089	2.9e+03	0.00073	20	0.11	2.7e+03	0.00078
	MALA	0.41	22	0.019	2.7e+03	0.00015	18	0.023	2.6e+03	0.00016
	RWM	1.2	23	0.05	2.2e+03	0.00054	21	0.056	2.2e+03	0.00053
x_2	ULA	27	24	1.1	2.8e+03	0.0099	18	1.5	2.4e+03	0.011
	MALA	6.4	24	0.27	2.9e+03	0.0022	19	0.34	2.6e+03	0.0025
	RWM	13	18	0.72	1.8e+03	0.0073	16	0.81	1.8e+03	0.0075
x_3	ULA	11	24	0.47	6.7e+03	0.0017	18	0.62	6.3e+03	0.0018
	MALA	2.6	23	0.11	7e+03	0.00037	18	0.14	6.8e+03	0.00038
	RWM	5.5	18	0.3	4.3e+03	0.0013	16	0.34	4.3e+03	0.0013
x_1^2	ULA	0.75	3.5	0.22	1.6e+02	0.0048	2.8	0.26	1.3e+02	0.0057
	MALA	0.15	3.5	0.043	1.5e+02	0.001	2.8	0.053	1.3e+02	0.0011
	RWM	0.43	2.6	0.16	1.2e+02	0.0035	2.4	0.18	1.2e+02	0.0037
x_2^2	ULA	4.7e+02	9.3	51	1.4e+03	0.33	7.5	63	1.2e+03	0.4
	MALA	1.1e+02	9.1	12	1.5e+03	0.073	7.6	14	1.3e+03	0.085
	RWM	2.2e+02	7.7	29	1e+03	0.22	6.9	33	9.8e+02	0.23
x_3^2	ULA	1.1e+02	9.8	11	9.7e+02	0.11	7.9	14	7.9e+02	0.14
	MALA	24	9.7	2.5	9.8e+02	0.025	8.1	3	8.5e+02	0.029
	RWM	52	7.9	6.7	6.1e+02	0.086	7.1	7.4	5.9e+02	0.088

Table 4: Estimates of the asymptotic variances for ULA, MALA and RWM and each parameter x_i , x_i^2 for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and of the variance reduction factor (VRF) on the example of the probit regression.