
CHEBYSHEV PARTICLES

Xiongming Dai

Division of Computer Science and Engineering
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
{xdai2}@email

Gerald Baumgartner

Division of Computer Science and Engineering
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA
{gb}@email

ABSTRACT

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) provides a feasible method for inferring Hidden Markov models, however, it is often computationally prohibitive, especially constrained by the curse of dimensionality, as the Monte Carlo sampler traverses randomly taking small steps within uncertain regions in the parameter space. We are the first to consider the posterior distribution of the objective as a mapping of samples in an infinite-dimensional Euclidean space where deterministic submanifolds are embedded and propose a new criterion by maximizing the weighted Riesz polarization quantity, to discretize rectifiable submanifolds via pairwise interaction. We study the characteristics of Chebyshev particles and embed them into sequential MCMC, a novel sampler with a high acceptance ratio that proposes only a few evaluations. We have achieved high performance from the experiments for parameter inference in a linear Gaussian state-space model with synthetic data and a non-linear stochastic volatility model with real-world data.

Keywords Markov chain Monte Carlo · Hidden Markov models · Riesz

1 Introduction

Markov chain Monte Carlo methods [1, 2] allow researchers to replace the unobserved latent variables with simulated variables for Bayesian analysis [3, 4]. It relieves the burden of evaluating the likelihood function unconditionally on the unobserved latent variables to allow a focus on the conditional likelihood function [5, 6, 7]. However, although the sample is drawn after a “burn-in” period, it is still uncertain whether the sample is the output at convergence [8]. Using the output of an MCMC algorithm that has not converged may lead to incorrect inferences on the target distribution at hand. In addition, the idea behind a Monte Carlo sampler is to randomly “walk around” in the parameter space, which may lead to a low acceptance rate of samples and generate duplicates, especially for a high dimensional space [8]. Thus, an adequate amount of samples are obtained at the expense of a large computational effort.

Points on a design space that minimize certain energy functions often have desirable properties such as good separation and adequate covering and sparsely reflect special representations of the space [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. Here, we consider the posterior distribution of the objective function as a mapping of samples in an infinite-dimensional Euclidean space, where deterministic submanifolds are embedded, and propose a new criterion by maximizing weighted Riesz polarization quantity to discretize rectifiable submanifolds via particle interaction. This gives rise to equilibrium points that are useful for a variety of applications, especially for high-dimensional sampling. We study the characteristics of deterministic points, termed Chebyshev particles, and embed them into the MCMC. We propose a new sampler with few evaluations and a high acceptance ratio. In our experiments, we have achieved high performance for parameter inference in a linear Gaussian state-space model with synthetic data as well as a non-linear stochastic volatility model with real-world data.

In this paper, we concentrate on the analysis of our new criterion, and on how to improve the acceptance ratio of MCMC with fewer evaluations of constraints. We present an efficient algorithm to deterministically sample the target distribution by maximizing the weighted Riesz polarization quantity, from which the particles sparsely represent rectifiable geometrical manifolds with few samplings for approximating the objective posterior distribution.

In Section 2, we present a brief introduction to the discrete energy on rectifiable sets. Here, we develop our new criterion by maximizing the weighted Riesz polarization quantity and focus on the bounds and asymptotic behavior, and covering radius. For Section 3, we propose a novel sampler, where Chebyshev particles are embedded and the discretized deterministic submanifolds inherit the special representations of the sampling space. Then, we present the pipeline for sequentially sampling the Chebyshev particles and for embedding them into the particle Metropolis-Hastings algorithm for hidden Markov models. In Section 4, we validate the algorithm with practical experiments and present their performance and error analysis. The summary of our contributions is outlined in Section 5.

2 Weighted Riesz Polarization Criterion

In this section, we provide the main idea of the discrete energy on rectifiable high-dimensional manifolds and propose a new criterion by maximizing the weighted Riesz polarization quantity. We then study the asymptotic behavior of the corresponding configuration, the bounds and the covering radius for this quantity.

2.1 Discrete Weighted Riesz Polarization

Let Ω denote a compact set in \mathbb{R}^d whose d -dimensional Borel measure, $\mathbb{B}_d(\Omega) \subset (\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, is finite, and K denote a bi-Lipschitz mapping from $\Omega \times \Omega$ to \mathbb{R}^d , for a collection of $n (\geq 2)$ distinct points of configuration in Ω , let $X_{1:n} = x_1, \dots, x_n$, we define the energy of $X_{1:n}$ to be

$$E(X_{1:n}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n K(x_i, x_j) = \sum_{i \neq j} K(x_i, x_j), \quad (1)$$

and let

$$\mathcal{E}(\Omega, n) := \inf\{E(X_{1:n}) : X_{1:n} \subset \Omega, |X_{1:n}| = n\} \quad (2)$$

be the minimal discrete n -point energy of the configuration in Ω , where $|X_{1:n}|$ represents the cardinality of the set $X_{1:n}$. (I) For $K(x_i, x_j) = -\log \|x_i - x_j\|$, it was first proposed by M.Fekete who explored the connection between polynomial interpolation and discretized manifolds [14]. In computational complexity theory, Smale [15] proposed the 7th problem in his list of "Mathematical problems for the next century" that how to design a polynomial time algorithm for generating "nearly" optimal logarithmic energy points $X_{1:n}^*$, also called Fekete points, on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 that satisfy $E(X_{1:n}^*) - \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{S}^2, n) \leq C_1 \cdot \log n$ for some universal constant C_1 ; (II) when $K(x_i, x_j) = \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m}$, $m \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $\mathcal{E}_m(\Omega, n)$ denote the Riesz m -energy, by Taylor's formula, for any $m \in (0, +\infty)$, we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{E}_m(\Omega, n) = \lim_{m \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{n(n-1) + m\mathcal{E}_{\log}(\Omega, n) + \mathcal{O}(m)}{m} = \mathcal{E}_{\log}(\Omega, n). \quad (3)$$

Consequently, the Fekete points set $X_{1:n}^{(m)}$ can be considered as limiting cases of point sets that minimize the discrete Riesz energy, which is widely used to discretize manifolds via particle interactions in Euclidean space [12, 16].

From the perspective of statistical high-dimensional sampling, we consider d sufficiently large and propose the maximum weighted Riesz polarization criterion with

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega) = \max_{\Omega} \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}}, \quad \omega(x_i, x_j) \propto e^{[\alpha \cdot \gamma(x_i) \gamma(x_j) + \beta \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}}. \quad (4)$$

As $m \rightarrow \infty$, the formulation is convex under mild conditions, the denominator approximates $\|x_i - x_j\|$, thus, our criterion inherits the properties of Riesz energy, termed as weighted Riesz polarization criterion. To obtain a finite collection of point sets that are distributed according to a specified non-uniform density such as might be used as points for weighted integration or design of complex surfaces where more points are required in regions with higher curvature, we introduce $\omega(x_i, x_j)$ in (4), where $\gamma(x) \propto -\ln f(x)$, $\|x_i - x_j\|$ is included to ensure that is locally bounded for $\alpha = -1$, β is the local discrepancy coefficient and is positive to balance off the local conflict with the distributed points when short-range interactions between points are the dominator. Thus, given a proper distribution $f(x)$, we can use $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$ to generate a sequence of n -point configurations that are "well-separated" and have asymptotic distribution $f(x)$.

Our weighted Riesz polarization $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega, N)$ is continuous and derivable with respect to the parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ from (4), it provides a more flexible and versatile framework when we discretize the submanifolds via particle interactions.

¹In this paper $C_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ denote different constants.

2.2 Asymptotics for Extremal Weighted Riesz Polarization Criterion

Properties of $\omega(x_i, x_j)$: (I) $\omega(x_i, x_j)$ is continuous as a function of $\gamma(x) \propto -\ln f(x)$ when $\beta \leq \beta_0$; it is a positive constant when $\beta \geq \beta_1$; (II) There exists a neighborhood set P' , where $x'_i, x'_j \in P', \omega(x'_i, x'_j)$ is bounded and larger than zero; (III) $\omega(x_i, x_j)$ is bounded on any closed and compact metric space Ω .

Assume the compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for high dimension $m > d$, we define the generalized Borel measure on sets $\mathbb{S} \subset \Omega$ with $\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S}) := \int_{\mathbb{S}} \omega(x_i, x_j) d\mathcal{U}_d(x)$. It is bounded and the corresponding normalized form: $u_d^m(\mathbb{S}) := \mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})/\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega)$.

Measure Metric Consider a high dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 2$, for $m > d$, let $\mu(\sigma\text{-algebra}) := \cup_{d=2}^{\infty} \{\|x_i - x_j\|^d\}$, represent a Borel measure from the σ -algebra on Ω , a measure ϕ in Ω_i is a non-negative σ -algebra set function defined on $\mu(\sigma\text{-algebra})$ and finite on all compact sets $\Omega_i \subset \Omega, i \in [1, n]$. If $\phi < \infty$, then the measure ϕ is called finite. Generally, for the smallest σ -algebra, containing all compact subsets of Ω_i .

We have the following novel version of the Poppy-Seed Bagel Theorem [17] for the maximum weighted Riesz polarization using the measure theoretics [18].

Theorem 2.2.1. Given a distribution $f(x)$ with respect to a compact and d -rectifiable set Ω embedded in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d, \omega(x_i, x_j) > 0$ is bounded and continuous on the closed Borel sets $\mathbb{S} \subset \Omega \times \Omega$, for $m > d$, the configuration on Ω from $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$ where the N -point interacts via the $K_\beta(x_i, x_j)$ potential, have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} = \frac{C_2}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}}. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S}) > 0$, any configuration $X_{1:n}, n > 1$ generated by asymptotically maximizing the weighted Riesz polarization is uniformly distributed with respect to \mathcal{U}_d , that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n \|x_i - x_j\| = u_d^m(\mathbb{S}). \quad (6)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2.1 We divide the proof of Theorem 2.2.1 into two parts; The proof works by induction with Lemma 2.2.2 for (4) in the main text, and Lemmas 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6 and 2.2.7 for (5) in the main text. The second part will introduce the subadditivity and superadditivity properties using the measure theoretics [18].

Lemma 2.2.2. Given a distribution $f(x)$ with respect to d -rectifiable set Ω embedded in Euclidean space, $\omega(x_i, x_j) > 0$ is bounded and continuous on the closed Borel sets $\mathbb{S} \subset \Omega \times \Omega$, for $m > d$ and $\beta \in (-\infty, \beta_0] \cup [\beta_1, +\infty), \beta_0, \beta_1, C_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, the maximal weighted Riesz polarization configuration on Ω from $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$ where the n -point interacts via the $K_\beta(x_i, x_j)$ potential, have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_0} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} = \frac{C_3}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_1} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} = \frac{C_3}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}}. \quad (7)$$

Proof $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$ is strictly decreasing as β increases, this monotonicity makes it possible to analyze the asymptotics and extend it into high-dimensional sampling on the compact space Ω under mild assumptions. Let $h(\beta') := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta'} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$,

$$h(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n [K_\beta(x_i, x_j)]^{\frac{1}{m}}.$$

$K_\beta(x_i, x_j)$ is also strictly decreasing as β increases, we firstly focus on $\beta \in (-\infty, \beta_0] \cup [\beta_1, +\infty), \beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, then relax this assumption later, define

$$K_{\beta'}(x_i, x_j) := \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta'} \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m}, \omega(x_i, x_j) > 0,$$

if $\beta \leq \beta_0$ is sufficiently small such that

$$\gamma(x_i)\gamma(x_j) \gg \beta_0 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|, \quad (8)$$

then,

$$K_{\beta_0^-}(x_i, x_j) := \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_0^-} K_\beta(x_i, x_j) = \frac{e^{[-\gamma(x_i)\gamma(x_j)]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}}}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m}. \quad (9)$$

From Taylor's theorem

$$e^z = 1 + z + \frac{z^2}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{z^{k'}}{k'!}, k' \rightarrow \infty, z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $z = [-\gamma(x_i)\gamma(x_j)]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}$, substitute (8) into (9),

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\beta_0^-}(x_i, x_j) &= \frac{1 + z + \frac{z^2}{2!} + \cdots + \frac{z^{k'}}{k'!}}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \geq \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} + \frac{[-\beta_0 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} + \cdots \\ &\quad + \frac{[-\beta_0 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{mk'}{2d}}}{k'! \|x_i - x_j\|^m}. \end{aligned}$$

For $m > d$, the right-hand side terms are belonging to the classical Riesz-kernel model, from the Poppy-Seed Bagel Theorem [17], there exists a C_4 ,

$$K_{\beta_0^-}(x_i, x_j) = \frac{C_4}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{m}{d}}} \cdot n^{1+\frac{m}{d}}.$$

Thus,

$$h(\beta_0^-) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n [K_{\beta_0^-}(x_i, x_j)]^{\frac{1}{m}} = \frac{C_4}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}} \cdot n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}.$$

Similarly, if $\beta \geq \beta_1$ is sufficiently large such that $\gamma(x_i)\gamma(x_j) \ll \beta_1 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|$, then

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\beta_1^+}(x_i, x_j) &:= \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \beta_1^+} K_{\beta}(x_i, x_j) = \frac{e^{[\beta_1 \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}}}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} = \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} + \frac{[\beta_1 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{m}{2d}}}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \\ &\quad + \cdots + \frac{[\beta_1 \cdot \|x_i - x_j\|]^{-\frac{mk'}{2d}}}{k'! \|x_i - x_j\|^m}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

It provides a flexible framework to prove the asymptotics of the proposed weighted Riesz polarization criterion for (10) that we will frequently use for the following lemma and related proof.

For $m > d$, the right-hand side terms belong to the classical Riesz-kernel model, from the Poppy-Seed Bagel Theorem [17], there exists a C_5 ,

$$K_{\beta_1^+}(x_i, x_j) = \frac{C_5}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{m}{d}}} \cdot n^{1+\frac{m}{d}}.$$

Thus,

$$h(\beta_1^+) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n [K_{\beta_1^+}(x_i, x_j)]^{\frac{1}{m}} = \frac{C_5}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}} \cdot n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}. \tag{11}$$

As $h(\beta)$ is strictly decreasing, and continuous and derivative for $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, Consequently, There exists a C_3 ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\beta}(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} = \frac{C_3}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S})]^{\frac{1}{d}}}.$$

Thus, (7) holds.

From Lemma 2.2.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the approximation of $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}(\Omega)$ is not correlated with β . That is, we are assuming that β approximates a specific real value, and for the convenience of introducing Taylor's theorem to derive, it does not affect the final limit value of $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}(\Omega)$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Analogous to the proof of classical Poppy-Seed Bagel Theorem [17], we define

$$\mathcal{M}(d) := 1 + \frac{m}{d}, n \geq 2.$$

$\lambda(n) := n^{\mathcal{M}(d)}$, for $n \geq 2$, $\lambda(1) := 1$. And define

$$\psi_{m,d}(\Omega) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega)}{\lambda(n)}, \tag{12}$$

let $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega) = \inf(\psi_{m,d}(\Omega))$, $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega) = \sup(\psi_{m,d}(\Omega))$ and decompose the d -rectifiable set Ω into different subsets Ω_i , $i \in \mathbb{R}^+$, satisfying $\cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Omega_i = \Omega$.

Lemma 2.2.3. [17] $\exists \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathcal{M}(d)$ is continuous and derivative for $d \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the function $U(t) = \min\{\alpha_1 t^{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}, \alpha_2 (1-t)^{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}\}$ has the maximum for $t \in [0, 1]$ where occurs at the points $t^* := \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}}$

$$\text{with } U(t^*) = \left[\alpha_2^{\frac{-1}{1-\mathcal{M}(d)}} + \alpha_1^{\frac{-1}{1-\mathcal{M}(d)}} \right]^{1-\mathcal{M}(d)}.$$

The proof is straightforward from the first order derivative of the function $\frac{dU(t)}{dt} = 0$ [17].

We will introduce the subadditivity and superadditivity properties as follows.

Lemma 2.2.4. $\exists \Omega_j, \Omega_k \subset \Omega$, and $\Omega_j, \Omega_k \not\subset \emptyset$, $j \neq k$, $\mathcal{M}(d) > 1$ is continuous and derivative for $d \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $\alpha_3 = \frac{1}{1-\mathcal{M}(d)}$ for $m > d$,

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \leq \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}. \quad (13)$$

Proof If $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)$ or $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)$ equals zero, or one of the quantities $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)$ or $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)$ approximates infinite, as the size of set increase, $\mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega)$ will increase, the lemma holds.

Hereafter we follow an argument in [17], we consider the general case of $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega_j) \in (0, \infty)$, $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega_k) \in (0, \infty)$, the distance of two set is defined with $r := \|a_i - b_j\|$, $a_i \in \Omega_j$, $b_j \in \Omega_k$, $i, j \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Motivated by Lemma 2.2.3 with $\alpha_1 = \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)$ and $\alpha_2 = \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)$, for a given n units, let $X_{1:n}^{(i)} \cap \Omega_j$ and $X_{1:n}^{(i)} \setminus \Omega_j$ be configurations of $N_j := \lfloor \tilde{p} \cdot n \rfloor$ and $N_k := n - N_j$ points, respectively, where

$$\tilde{p} = \frac{\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)^{-\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)^{-\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)^{-\alpha_3}}, \quad (14)$$

and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the floor function of x . Let $X_{j,k} = X_{1:n}^{\Omega_j} \cup X_{1:n}^{\Omega_k}$, from the measure theory [17, 18] the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) &\geq \mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(X_{j,k}) \geq \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in \Omega_j} \sum_{y \in X_{j,k}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}, \inf_{x \in \Omega_k} \sum_{y \in X_{j,k}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right\} \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in \Omega_j} \sum_{y \in X_{1:N}^{\Omega_j}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}, \inf_{x \in \Omega_k} \sum_{y \in X_{1:N}^{\Omega_k}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right\} \\ &= \min \{ \mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_j), \mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_k) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{n^{\frac{m}{d}+1}} \\ &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ \left(\frac{N_j}{n} \right)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_j)}{N_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1}}, \left(\frac{N_k}{n} \right)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_{\beta}^m(\Omega_k)}{N_k^{\frac{m}{d}+1}} \right\} \\ &\geq \min \{ \tilde{p}^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j), (1-\tilde{p})^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

When $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j) = \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k) = \infty$, (16) implies that $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) = \infty$ and (13) follows trivially. When $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j) = \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k) < \infty$, inequality (16) becomes $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) \geq (1-\tilde{p})^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)$, we get $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) \geq \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)$ when $\tilde{p} \rightarrow 0$, which implies (13). When both $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j) < \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k) < \infty$, we deduce from (16) and combine with (14) we can get

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) \geq [\psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\text{inf}}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}.$$

Thus, Lemma 2.2.4 holds.

Lemma 2.2.5. $\exists \Omega_j, \Omega_k \subset \Omega$, and $\Omega_j, \Omega_k \not\subset \emptyset$, $j \neq k$, $\mathcal{M}(d) > 1$ is continuous and derivative for $d \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $\alpha_3 = \frac{1}{1-\mathcal{M}(d)}$ for $m > d$,

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \geq \psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\text{sup}}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, if $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j), \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) \geq 0$ and at least one of these oracles is finite, then for any infinite subset N' of \mathbb{N} and any sequence $\{X_{1:n}\}_{n \in N'}$ of n -point configurations in $\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(X_{1:n})}{\lambda(n)} = (\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3})^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}} \quad (18)$$

holds, for a given n units, let $X_{1:n}^{(i)} \cap \Omega_j$ and $X_{1:n}^{(i)} \setminus \Omega_j$ be configurations of $N_j := \lfloor p_j \cdot n \rfloor$ and $N_k := n - N_j$ points, respectively, we have

$$p_j = \frac{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}}. \quad (19)$$

Proof When $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) = \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) < \infty$, p_j would be 0, while when $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) < \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) = \infty$, p_j would be 1. We assume $\psi_{m,d}^{\inf}(\Omega)$ is bounded on the compact set Ω_j and Ω_k . Let \tilde{N} be an infinite subsequence such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \tilde{N}} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{n^{\mathcal{M}(d)}} := \psi_{m,d}^{\inf}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k).$$

Then, inspired by [17, 18], for any $n \in N'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(X_{1:n}) &= \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in \Omega_j} \sum_{y \in X_{1:n}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}, \inf_{x \in \Omega_k} \sum_{y \in X_{1:n}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in \Omega_j} \left(\sum_{y \in X_{1:n} \cap \Omega_j} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} + \sum_{y \in X_{1:n} \cap \Omega_k} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \inf_{x \in \Omega_k} \left(\sum_{y \in X_{1:n} \cap \Omega_j} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} + \sum_{y \in X_{1:n} \cap \Omega_k} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \min \left\{ \inf_{x \in \Omega_j} \sum_{y \in X_{1:n}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|}, \inf_{x \in \Omega_k} \sum_{y \in X_{1:n}} \frac{\omega(x,y)}{\|x-y\|} \right\} + n \cdot \|\omega(x,y)\| \\ &\leq \min \{ \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j), \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_k) \} + n \cdot \|\omega(x,y)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) &= \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{n^{\frac{m}{d}+1}} \\ &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ \left(\frac{N_j}{n} \right)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j)}{N_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1}}, \left(\frac{N_k}{n} \right)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_k)}{N_k^{\frac{m}{d}+1}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

When $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) < \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) = \infty$ from (20), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{N_j}{n} \right)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j)}{N_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1}} \leq p_j^{-\alpha_3+1} \cdot \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) \leq \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) \\ &= \left[\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Similarly, when $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) = \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) < \infty$, we obtain

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) \leq (1-p_j)^{-\alpha_3+1} \cdot \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) \leq \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) = \left[\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}. \quad (22)$$

Thus, both (21) and (22) imply (13).

When $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) < \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) < \infty$, (20) can be rewritten into

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k) \leq \min \left\{ p_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j), (1-p_j)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) \right\}. \quad (23)$$

From Lemma 2.2.3, for the bounded N_j and N_k , it follows that

$$\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \geq \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}.$$

Thus, (13) holds. Combining (13) with (18), we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{\lambda(n)} = \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}. \quad (24)$$

Assume both $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)$ are finite, from (18) and (23) with Lemma 2.2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{\lambda(n)} \\ & \leq \min \left\{ p_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j), (1-p_j)^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k) \right\} \\ & \leq \left[\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From Lemma 2.2.3, we obtain

$$p_j = \frac{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}},$$

as claimed in (19). When $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) < \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} = \infty$, from (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) &= \left[\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} \right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega_j \cup \Omega_k)}{\lambda(n)} \\ &\leq p_j^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) \leq \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

which can only be held if

$$p_j = \frac{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}} = 1. \quad (27)$$

Similarly, when $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j) = \infty$ and $\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3} < \infty$, we obtain

$$p_j = \frac{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_j)^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_k)^{\alpha_3}} = 0. \quad (28)$$

Thus, (19) holds.

Lemma 2.2.6. Suppose that $m > d$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact set with $0 < \mu(\Omega) < \infty$, $\mathcal{M}(d) > 1$ is continuous and derivative for $d \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Furthermore, suppose that for any compact subset $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$, the limit $\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ exists and is given by

$$\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_i) = \frac{C_6}{\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega_i)^{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}}.$$

Then, $\psi_{m,d}(\Omega)$ exists and is given by

$$\psi_{m,d}(\Omega) = \frac{C_6}{\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega)^{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}}. \quad (29)$$

Moreover, if a sequence of n -point configurations $X_{1:n}$ is asymptotically weighted Riesz polarization maximizing on the set Ω and $\mu(\Omega) > 0$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1, i \neq j}^n \|x_i - x_j\| \rightarrow u_d^m(\mathbb{S}). \quad (30)$$

Proof To prove (29), we firstly decompose the entire metric space Ω into extremely small disconnected parts with diameter less than $\epsilon > 0$, according to the property of Borel metrics, then

$$\sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \mathcal{U}_d(P) \leq \mathcal{U}_d(\Omega). \quad (31)$$

Hereafter we follow an argument in [17], we define a sufficiently small space Ω_i as follows. We consider the hyperplane Ω' consisting of all points, $(-l, l)$ is a cube embedded in Ω' , we discretize the cube with tiny intervals for j -th ordinate,

$-l = h_0^j < h_1^j \cdots < h_k^j = l, j \in i^{d'}, d' \in (1, d), i = (i_1, i_2 \cdots, i_N), k$ is sufficiently large, $\exists \left\| h_k^j - h_{k-1}^j \right\| < \epsilon$ such that (31) holds. Ω_i can be written as

$$\Omega_i := [h_{i_1}^1, h_{i_1+1}^1) \times \cdots \times [h_{i_N^{d'}-1}^{d'}, h_{i_N^{d'}}^{d'}).$$

For $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$, if $\omega(x_i, x_j)$ is bounded, let

$$\bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i} = \sup_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \omega(x_i, x_j), \text{ and } \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i} = \inf_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \omega(x_i, x_j),$$

we introduce the radial basis functions $\varphi(\cdot)$ to approximate the corresponding bounded $\omega(x_i, x_j)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) &= \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \bar{\omega}_P \varphi(\|x_i - x_j\|), \\ \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) &= \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \underline{\omega}_P \varphi(\|x_i - x_j\|). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

From Lemma 2.2.5, and (17), there exists a C_6 satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega)^{\alpha_3} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_i)^{\alpha_3} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) \cdot \psi_{m,d}^{\sup}(\Omega_i) \right]^{\alpha_3} = C_6 \sum_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}^{\alpha_3} \cdot \mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i) \\ &\geq C_6 \int_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j)^{\alpha_3} d\mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2.2.4 and (13), similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{m,d}^{\inf}(\Omega)^{\alpha_3} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{m,d}^{\inf}(\Omega_i)^{\alpha_3} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) \cdot \psi_{m,d}^{\inf}(\Omega_i) \right]^{\alpha_3} = C_6 \sum_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}^{\alpha_3} \cdot \mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i) \\ &\leq C_6 \int_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j)^{\alpha_3} d\mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i). \end{aligned}$$

Given a sufficiently small P , for (32), use the equation limit, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) &= \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \bar{\omega}_P \varphi(\|x_i - x_j\|) = \omega_{\Omega}(x_i, x_j), \\ \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j) &= \sum_{P \in \Omega_i} \underline{\omega}_P \varphi(\|x_i - x_j\|) = \omega_{\Omega}(x_i, x_j). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\omega(x_i, x_j)$ is continuous on Ω , both $\int_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \bar{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j)^{\alpha_3} d\mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i)$ and $\int_{x_i, x_j \in \Omega_i} \underline{\omega}_{\Omega_i}(x_i, x_j)^{\alpha_3} d\mathcal{U}_d(\Omega_i)$ converge to $\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega)$. Consequently, the limit $\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_i), i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ exists and can be given by

$$\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_i) = \frac{C_6}{\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega_i)^{\mathcal{M}(d)-1}}.$$

By the Fatou's Lemma and Monotone Convergence Theorem, Thus, (29) holds on Ω .

To prove (30), suppose that $X_{1:n}$ is an asymptotically weighted Riesz polarization maximizing sequence of n -point configuration on Ω , the corresponding signed finite Borel measures $\cup_{i=1}^n \mu_d^m(\Omega_i)$ in \mathbb{R}^d converges weak* to a signed finite Borel measure $\mu_d(\Omega)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, (30) is equivalent to the assertion that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \cup_{i=1}^n \mu_d^m(\Omega_j) = \mu_d(\mathbb{S})$$

holds for any almost σ -algebra subset on Ω , let $\Omega_{\sigma} = \cup_{i=1}^n \Omega_i$ be a subset of σ -algebra on Ω , for any Borel subset $\Omega_{\sigma} \subset \Omega$. Since Ω_{σ} and Ω/Ω_{σ} are the compact subsets of Ω , suppose $\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_{\sigma}) = \frac{C_7}{\mu(\Omega_{\sigma})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}}$ and $\psi_{m,d}(\Omega/\Omega_{\sigma}) = \frac{C_7}{\mu(\Omega/\Omega_{\sigma})^{-\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}}$, for the asymptotically weighted Riesz polarization maximal sequence $X_{1:n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{E^m(X_{1:n})}{\lambda(n)} &= C_7 \cdot (\mu(\Omega))^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}} = C_7 \cdot (\mu(\Omega_{\sigma}) + \mu(\Omega/\Omega_{\sigma}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}} \\ &= [\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_{\sigma})^{\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}(\Omega/\Omega_{\sigma})^{\alpha_3}]^{\frac{1}{\alpha_3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (17) in Lemma 2.2.5 and (29) which holds for Ω_σ and Ω/Ω_σ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n p_j = \frac{\psi_{m,d}(\Omega/\Omega_\sigma)^{-\alpha_3}}{\psi_{m,d}(\Omega_\sigma)^{-\alpha_3} + \psi_{m,d}(\Omega/\Omega_\sigma)^{-\alpha_3}} = \frac{\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega_\sigma)}{\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega_\sigma) + \mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega/\Omega_\sigma)} = \mu_d^m(\mathbb{S}).$$

Thus, (30) holds.

2.3 Bounds and Asymptotics

To derive the asymptotics, we will first provide the lower and upper estimates of the Borel measure in a restricted compact space for the maximum weighted Riesz polarization quantity and then prove the asymptotics on \mathbb{S}^2 .

Theorem 2.3.1. If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an infinite compact set, then

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) \geq \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^{m+1}} \right\}. \quad (33)$$

If $\mathcal{U}_d^m(\mathbb{S}) > 0$, then there exists a constant $C_8 > 0$ depending only on m such that

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) \leq \frac{C_8}{m-d+1} n^{\frac{m+1}{d}}. \quad (34)$$

Proof Inspired by [19], define

$$D_n(\Omega) = \min_{X_1, \dots, X_n \in \Omega} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^{m+1}}, \quad (35)$$

we obtain [19]

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^{m+1}} \geq n \cdot D_n(\Omega). \quad (36)$$

From the definition (36) and (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) &\geq \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\} \geq \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^{m+1}} \right\} \geq n \cdot D_n(\Omega) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^{m+1}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Thus, (33) holds.

Inspired by [20, 21], to prove (34), let $X_{1:n} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a configuration of n points on Ω that maximize the weighted Riesz polarization. Let $r_n = C_9 n^{-\frac{1}{d}}$, $\Omega_i := \Omega \setminus B(x, r_n)$, where $B(x, r_n)$ is the open ball in \mathbb{R}^d with center x and radius r_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(x, r_n) \cap \Omega) &\leq C_9 r_n^d, \\ \mu(\Omega) &\geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(B(x_j, r_n)) \geq 1 - C_9 n r_n^d. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The inequality of the quantity $\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega)$ can be expressed by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) &\leq \frac{\|\omega(x_i, x_j)\|}{\mu(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega_i} \sum_{j=1}^n \|x - x_j\|^{-(m+1)} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - C_9 n r_n^d} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{\Omega_i} \|x - x_j\|^{-(m+1)} d\mu(x). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

From [20], we obtain the integral inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\Omega_i} \|x - x_j\|^{-(m+1)} d\mu(x) &= \int_0^\infty \mu \left\{ x \in \Omega_i : \|x - x_j\|^{-(m+1)} > t \right\} dt \\
 &\leq 1 + \int_1^{r_n^{-(m+1)}} \mu(B(x_j, t^{-\frac{1}{m+1}}) \cap \Omega) dt \\
 &\leq 1 + C_9 \int_1^{r_n^{-(m+1)}} t^{-\frac{d}{m+1}} dt,
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

when n is sufficiently large such that $r_n^{-(m+1)} > 1$. For $m > d$, thus (39) follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) &\leq \frac{n}{1 - C_9 n r_n^d} (1 + C_9 \int_1^{r_n^{-(m+1)}} t^{-\frac{d}{m+1}} dt) \leq \frac{n}{1 - C_9 n r_n^d} (1 + C_9 \int_1^{r_n^{-(m+1)}} t^{-\frac{d}{m+1}} dt) \\
 &= \frac{n}{1 - C_9 n r_n^d} \cdot \frac{(m+1)(r_n^{d-m-1} - 1)}{m-d+1} \leq \frac{C_8}{m-d+1} n^{\frac{m+1}{d}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Thus, (34) holds.

Regarding the asymptotic behavior of the weighted Riesz polarization as m approximate the d , we have

Theorem 2.3.2. For $m > d$, if $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^d$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow d^+} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{m+1}{d}}} = \infty. \tag{42}$$

Proof From [20], let $\mathcal{E}(\Omega) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m}$, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\Omega)}{n \log n} \geq \frac{c_d}{u_d(\mathbb{S}^d)} = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{d+1}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi d} \cdot \Gamma(\frac{d}{2})} := \tau_d, \tag{43}$$

when $m = d$. Let $\Omega = \mathbb{S}^d$, we have the estimate for $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$ [21]

$$\mu(B(x, r) \cap \mathbb{S}^d) \leq \tau_d r^d, \tag{44}$$

and for $m > d$, from the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{\Omega \setminus B(x_j, r_n)} \|x - x_j\|^{-(m+1)} d\mu(x) &= d\tau_d 2^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \int_{-1}^{1 - \frac{r_n^2}{2}} (1-t)^{-\frac{m+1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} - 1} (1+t)^{\frac{d}{2} - 1} dt \\
 &\leq d\tau_d 2^{-\frac{m+1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} - 1} \int_{-1}^{1 - \frac{r_n^2}{2}} (1-t)^{-\frac{m+1}{2} + \frac{d}{2} - 1} dt \\
 &= \frac{d\tau_d}{m+1-d} [r^{-m-1+d} - 2^{-p-1+d}], r < 2,
 \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Substitute (45) into (39), we have

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) \leq \frac{n}{1 - C_9 n r_n^d} \cdot \frac{d\tau_d}{m+1-d} \cdot r^{-m-1+d}. \tag{46}$$

The optimal value for r_n is

$$r_n = \left(\frac{m+1-d}{nm\tau_d + n\tau_d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}}. \tag{47}$$

Substitute (47) and (46) into (42), the inequality holds.

2.4 Covering Radius

In this section, we state and prove the bound of the covering radius. And extend to deal with the weak* limit distribution of best-covering n -point configurations on rectifiable sets Ω . Suppose that Ω is a compact infinite metric space with Euclidean metric $r(x, y) = \|x - y\|$, $\Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, we define the covering radius of an n -point configuration $X_{1:n}$ in a metric space (Ω, r) as $\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) := \max_{x \in \Omega} \min_{i=1, \dots, n} r(x, x_i)$. From the geometrical perspective, the

covering radius of $X_{1:n}$ can be considered as the minimal radius of n adjacent closed balls centered at $X_{1:n}$ whose union contains the entire Ω . Among finite element analysis and approximation theory, this quantity is known as the best approximation of the set Ω by the configuration $X_{1:n}$ [17]. The optimal values of this quantity are also of interest and we define the minimal n -point covering radius of a set Ω as

$$\rho_n(\Omega) := \min\{\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) : X_{1:n} \subset \Omega\}.$$

$\rho_n(\Omega)$ is also called an n -point best-covering configuration for Ω [10].

Theorem 2.4.1. Suppose the compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ with $\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega) > 0$, there exists a positive constant C_{10} such that for any n -point configuration $X_{1:n}^*$ that is optimal for $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$, we have $\rho(X_{1:n}^*, \Omega) \leq C_{10} \cdot n^{-\frac{m-2d}{d \cdot (m-d)}}$, where $C_{10} \propto \left(\frac{m}{m-d}\right)^{\frac{1}{m-d}}$.

Proof Since $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ is a compact set, there exists a finite family of set $\{\Omega_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n'$, with the following properties: (1) $\Omega = \{\cup \Omega_i\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n'$, and the interiors of the sets Ω_i are disjoint where the measure $\mu(\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j)_{i \neq j} = 0$. (2) There exist positive constants C_{11} and C_{12} , that does not depend on n , and the point $x_i \in \Omega_i$, such that $B(x_i, C_{11}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}}) \cap \Omega \subset \Omega_i \subset B(x_i, C_{12}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}})$. Since $\Omega_i \subset B(x_i, n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}})$, there exists a α' such that the number of points from $X_{1:n}^*$ is $\#\{\Omega_i \cap X_{1:n}^*\} \leq \alpha' n$, where $0 < \alpha' < 1$.

Hereafter we follow an argument in [22]. Let $y \in \Omega$ be such that $\min_{x_k \in X_{1:n}^*} |y - x_k| = \rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega)$. Assume $\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) \geq C_{13}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}}$, for every $x_i \in \{\{X_{1:n}^*\} \cap \Omega_i\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |y - x| &\leq |y - x_i| + |x_i - x| \leq |y - x_i| + 2C_{12}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}} \leq |y - x_i| + \frac{2C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) \\ &\leq \frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}|y - x_i|, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

which implies

$$|y - x_j|^{-m} \leq \frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}} \cdot \min_{x \in \Omega_i} |y - x|^{-m}. \quad (49)$$

The corresponding lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} |y - x| &\geq |y - x_i| - |x_i - x| \geq |y - x_i| - 2C_{12}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}} \leq |y - x_i| - \frac{C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) \\ &\geq \frac{C_{13} - C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Consequently, $\Omega \cap B(y, \frac{C_{13}-C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega)) \subset \Omega \setminus \cup_{x_i \in X_{1:n}^*} \Omega_i$. For each $x_i \in \Omega_i$, from (49), we get

$$\frac{1}{|y - x_i|^m} \leq \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^m \frac{1}{\mu(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega_i} \frac{d\mu(x)}{|y - x|^m}. \quad (51)$$

Since $B(x_i, C_{12}n^{-\frac{1}{d}-\frac{1}{m}}) \cap \Omega \subset \Omega_i$, we get $\mu(\Omega) \geq C_{12} \cdot n^{-1}$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta^m(\Omega) &= C_{12} \cdot n^{\frac{m}{d}+1} \leq n \cdot \sum_{x_i \in X_{1:n}^*} \frac{1}{|y - x_i|^m} \leq n \cdot \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^m \sum_{x_i \in X_{1:n}^*} \frac{1}{\mu(\Omega_i)} \int_{\Omega_i} \frac{d\mu(x)}{|y - x|^m} \\ &\leq n^2 \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^m \int_{B(y, \frac{C_{13}-C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega))} \frac{d\mu(x)}{|y - x|^m} \\ &\leq \frac{m}{m-d} \cdot \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^m \cdot n^2 \cdot \left(\frac{C_{13} - C_{12}}{C_{13}}\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega)\right)^{d-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

which implies

$$[\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega)]^{m-d} \leq \frac{m}{m-d} \cdot \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^m \cdot n^{-\frac{m-2d}{d}}, \quad (53)$$

we get

$$\rho(X_{1:n}, \Omega) \leq \left(\frac{m}{m-d}\right)^{\frac{1}{m-d}} \cdot \left(\frac{2C_{12} + C_{13}}{C_{13}}\right)^{\frac{m}{m-d}} \cdot n^{-\frac{m-2d}{d \cdot (m-d)}}. \quad (54)$$

A good estimate on the constant C_{10} for large values of m yields the following theorem regarding the asymptotic behavior of $\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.4.2. Suppose the compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ or $\Omega = [0, 1]^d$. The quantities as defined in **Theorem 2.2.1**, the following limits exist as positive real numbers and satisfy

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{[\mathcal{U}_d^m(\Omega)]^{\frac{1}{d}}} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \right) = \frac{1}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{\frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega)}. \quad (55)$$

Proof If $A \subset \mathbb{S}^d$, there exist positive constant C_{11} and C_{12} such that $C_{11}n^{-\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{m}} \leq \rho_n(\Omega) \leq C_{12}n^{-\frac{1}{d} - \frac{1}{m}}$. Observe that

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega) \geq \inf_{y \in \Omega} \sum_{x_i \in X_{1:n}^*} \frac{1}{|y - x_i|^{\frac{1}{m} + 1}} = \frac{1}{\max_{y \in \Omega} \min_{x_i \in X_{1:n}^*} |y - x_i|^{\frac{1}{m} + 1}} = \rho_n(\Omega)^{-1 - \frac{1}{m}} \geq C_{13}n^{\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{m}}. \quad (56)$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \geq \frac{1}{\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n^{\frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{m}} \rho_n(\Omega))}, \quad (57)$$

which implies

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (n^{\frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega))}. \quad (58)$$

Using the same argument as [22], we now take an arbitrary point $y \in \Omega$ such that

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, n} |y - x_j| = \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*), \quad (59)$$

and set $B_i := B(y, i \cdot \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*)) \setminus B(y, (i-1) \cdot \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*))$, where $i \geq 2$. Since $X_{1:n}^* \cap B(y, \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*)) = \emptyset$, we have $X_{1:n}^* \subset \bigcup_{i=2}^{\infty} B_i$. For any $i \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega) &= \max_{\Omega} \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}} \leq \max_{\Omega} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &\leq |\omega(x_i, x_j)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \max_{\Omega} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{1}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &\leq |\omega(x_i, x_j)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \max \left(\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in X_{1:n}^* \cap B_i} \frac{1}{|y - x|^m} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}}. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

By the property of B_n , for any $x \in B_i$, we have $|y - x| \geq (i-1) \cdot \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*)$, which implies

$$\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega) \leq |\omega(x_i, x_j)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \cdot \left[\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} i^d \cdot (i-1)^{-1} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}} \cdot \rho_n(X_{1:n}^*)^{-1}. \quad (61)$$

Dividing by $n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}$, since $\rho_n(X_{1:n}^*) \geq \rho_n(\Omega)$, we get

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \leq \frac{|\omega(x_i, x_j)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \cdot \left[\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} i^d \cdot (i-1)^{-1} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega)}, \quad (62)$$

which implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \leq \frac{|\omega(x_i, x_j)|^{\frac{1}{m}} \cdot \left[\sum_{i=2}^{\infty} i^d \cdot (i-1)^{-1} \right]^{\frac{1}{m}}}{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega) \right)}. \quad (63)$$

As $m \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega) \right)}. \quad (64)$$

(58) and (64) imply that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega) \right)$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \right)$ exist and satisfy

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega)}{n^{\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{d}}} \right) = \frac{1}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{\frac{1}{d}} \rho_n(\Omega)}. \quad (65)$$

Thus, (55) holds.

3 Weighted Chebyshev Particles MCMC

In this section, we will develop a new sampler, where the propagation of particles is derived from weighted Riesz polarization maximizing, since this quantity inherits some properties of the Chebyshev constant, these samplers are called Chebyshev Particles, the sample inherits the special features presented in Section 2 when traversing in a discretized deterministic submanifolds of parameter space via pairwise interactions. We further extend it to sequential sampling in the particle Metropolis-Hastings framework for the inference of hidden Markov models, where the acceptance ratio is approximated by a pseudo-marginal Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.

3.1 Sequential Chebyshev Particles Sampling

Finding the optimal designs of configurations is nondeterministic, especially for high dimensions, where point-by-point traversal results in exponential growth in computational load. A number of optimization algorithms were proposed for the optimal design of different configurations. Park [23] proposed a 2-stage exchange and Newton-type for optimal designs which minimize the integrated mean squared error and maximize entropy, respectively. Ye [24] further extended it by the column-pairwise algorithm. Morris and Mitchell [25] adapted simulated annealing [26] to explore the unit in a reachable domain. Inspired by [25] and [27], we propose a constrained one-point-per-time greedy algorithm for developing the sequential designs of weighted Riesz particles as follows.

(I) The choice of the initial point is crucial since it is closely related to sampling the subsequent points. For the sake of numerical stability, we take the particle with the largest average value as the initial point. We have the expectation, $\mathbb{E}(x) = \int_0^x x f(x) dx, x \in \Omega$. The maximum point x_0 can be obtained by $x_0 = \arg_x [\max \mathbb{E}(x)]$.

(II) After we get the initial point x_0 , we will generate x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n sequentially. Suppose we have n points using (4). Then the $(n+1)$ th point can be obtained by

$$x_{n+1} = \arg_x \mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega, N) = \arg \max_x \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n \frac{\omega(x_i, x_j)}{\|x_i - x_j\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}}. \quad (66)$$

(III) If $|x_{n+1} - x_n| \geq r_{\min}(x_{1:n}^*)$, we further develop an acceptance criterion for x_{n+1} : Given $u \sim U(u | 0, 1)$, if $\frac{|x_{n+1} - x_n|}{|x_n|} \geq u$, we accept x_{n+1} ; otherwise, we reject it.

(IV) After we get n points, we can use some statistical techniques such as regression or kriging to estimate the underlying manifold, where the density can be updated with $\hat{f}(x)$, and $\gamma(x) = \hat{\gamma}(x)$, we can recursively continue to generate different configurations of discrete manifolds.

3.2 Pseudo-marginal Metropolis–Hastings Sampling

Consider a hidden Markov model, described by $X_t \sim f_\theta(X_t | X_{t-1}), Y_t | X_t \sim g_\theta(y_t | X_t)$, given $x_0, X_t (t = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ is a latent variable to be observed, the measurements Y_t are assumed to be conditionally independent given X_t , the most objective is to estimate $\{X_{1:t}, \theta\}$. The Particle Metropolis-Hastings [28], proposed an MCMC method to randomly "walk around" in the assumed measurable θ space and thus draw samples from the approximated posterior $\hat{p}(X_{1:t}, \theta | y_{1:t})$, whose closed-form $p(X_{1:t}, \theta | y_{1:t}) = p(\theta | y_{1:t}) \cdot p(X_{1:t} | y_{1:t}, \theta)$ is unreachable and cannot be evaluated pointwise exactly.

We will introduce how Chebyshev particles are embedded for the following steps: For the parameter that locates at $\{\theta, X_{1:t}\}$, a new parameter $\{\theta', X'_{1:t}\}$ is proposed from a proposal $q(\theta', X'_{1:t} | \theta, X_{1:t})$ with the probability of acceptance

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(X'_{1:t}, \theta' | y_{1:t})q(\theta, X_{1:t} | \theta', X'_{1:t})}{p(X_{1:t}, \theta | y_{1:t})q(\theta', X'_{1:t} | \theta, X_{1:t})} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(y_{1:t} | \theta')p(\theta')q(\theta | \theta')}{p(y_{1:t} | \theta)p(\theta)q(\theta' | \theta)} \right\}. \quad (67)$$

The optimal importance density function that minimizes the variance of importance weights, conditioned upon X_{t-1}^i and y_t has been shown [29] to be

$$q(X_t | X_{t-1}^i, y_t)_{opt} = p(X_t | X_{t-1}^i, y_t) = \frac{p(y_t | X_t, X_{t-1}^i)p(X_t | X_{t-1}^i)}{p(y_t | X_{t-1}^i)}.$$

While sampling from $p(y_t | X_t, X_{t-1}^i)$ may not be straightforward. As $X_{1:t}$ belongs to the "deterministic" part of the discrete manifolds of the space, $X_{1:t} \in \Omega$, the choice of importance density $q(X_t | y_t, X_{t-1}^{a_t^{(i)}})$ is from the real configuration of the minimum energy, where $a_t^{(i)}$ denotes the ancestor of particle X_t^i . If $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} q(X_t | y_t, X_{t-1}^{a_t^{(i)}}) = p(X_t | X_{t-1}^i, y_t)$. Thus, our proposal converges to the optimal importance density. We can obtain a stochastic estimator of $p(y_{1:T} | \theta)$. This likelihood can be estimated by the weights

$$\hat{p}_\theta(y_{1:T}) = \prod_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{1}{N_x} \sum_{i=1}^{N_x} \frac{p(X_t | X_{t-1}^i, y_t)}{q(X_t | y_t, X_{t-1}^{a_t^{(i)}})} \right). \quad (68)$$

It can be shown [30] that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{p}_\theta(y_{1:T})] = p_\theta(y_{1:T})$. The variance of the weights will be very small, this would be verified by the following experiments.

Combine (67) and (68), we can get the estimated acceptance ratio

$$\hat{\alpha} = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\hat{p}(y_{1:t} | \theta')p(\theta')q(\theta | \theta')}{\hat{p}(y_{1:t} | \theta)p(\theta)q(\theta' | \theta)} \right\}.$$

4 Experiments

In this part, we will introduce the simulations where Chebyshev particles are embedded into the sequential Monte Carlo and its extension to Bayesian analysis for both the linear and non-linear models. We ran the experiments on an HP Z200 workstation with an Intel Core i5 and an #82 – 18.04.1 – Ubuntu SMP kernel. The code is available at <https://github.com/986876245/ChebyshevParticles>.

4.1 Linear Gaussian State Space Model

The linear model is expressed by:

$$x_t | x_{t-1} \sim g(x_t | x_{t-1})dx_t, \quad y_t | x_t \sim f(y_t | x_t)dy_t + e_o.$$

Where $g(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \phi x_{t-1} + e_v$, the noise from tracking $e_v \sim N(0, \delta_v^2)$, the noise from observations $e_o \sim N(0, \delta_o^2)$. Here we use (66), to compute $\hat{x}_{0:T}^N$, and $\hat{p}_\theta^N(y_{1:T})$ with Riesz particles instead for few evaluations.

$$g(\hat{x}_t | \hat{x}_{t-1}) = \arg \mathcal{E}_\beta(\Omega, N') = \arg \max_x \min_{x_i, x_j} \left\{ \sum_{x \neq \hat{x}_i, i=1}^{t-1} \frac{\omega(\hat{x}_i, x)}{\|\hat{x}_i - x\|^m} \right\}^{\frac{1}{m}},$$

$$\omega(\hat{x}_i, x) \propto e^{[\gamma(\hat{x}_i)\gamma(x) + \beta\|\hat{x}_i - x\|]^{-\frac{m}{2\beta}}}.$$

For the linear Gaussian state space model, an optimal proposal distribution to propagate the particles $x_t^i, i = 1, N$ can be derived [31] from

$$p_\theta^{\text{opt}}(x_t^i | x_{t-1}^i, y_t) \propto g_\theta(y_t | x_t^i)f_\theta(x_t^i | x_{t-1}^i) = \mathbb{N}(x_t^i; \sigma^2[\sigma_o^{-2}y_t + \sigma_v^{-2}\phi x_{t-1}^i], \sigma^2)$$

with $\sigma^{-2} = \sigma_v^{-2} + \sigma_o^{-2}$. To ensure the stability of the algorithm and try to minimize the variance of the incremental particle weights at the current time step, we set $\gamma(x) \propto p_\theta^{\text{opt}}(x_t^i | x_{t-1}^i, y_t)$. The latent state x_t can be estimated with an

unbiased quantity $\hat{x}_t^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_t^i$, here, N is the number of particles for estimating the state, N' is the number of Chebyshev particles for discretizing the submanifolds. In order for the Chebyshev particles to be fully sampled, we give the indices with the remainder of N divided by N' , ($N > N'$) for the specific particles x_t^i .

We first conduct experiments with different Chebyshev particles to discretize the submanifolds. These particles will approach different straight lines when they are mapped to a particular space shown in Figure 1 and satisfy uniform distribution from theorem 1, the parameters of the objective for Chebyshev particles: $\{\beta = 1, m = 40, d = 1\}$.




Figure 1: Theoretical Quantiles for 40, 120 and 200 Chebyshev particles.

Then, we embed these particles into sequential Monte Carlo, the states recursively interact in the Chebyshev particles set \mathbb{P} , to compare with the ground truth, we provide a simulated data record from the model with $T = 250$ observations with initial value $\phi = 0.75, \delta_v = 1.00, \delta_o = 0.10$ and $\hat{x}_0 = 0$. The estimated log-bias and log-MSE for the Chebyshev particles embedded in sequential Monte Carlo when varying the number of particles N are shown in Table 1.

Here, we extend Chebyshev particles into the pseudo-marginal Metropolis-Hastings algorithm provided in Section 3.2 for the Bayesian parameter inference of hidden Markov models. We estimate the posterior for $\phi, \phi \in (-1, 1)$ describes the persistence of the state, and keep $\delta_v = 1.00, \delta_e = 0.10$ fixed, the prior for $\phi_0 = 0.75$, and specify the number of




Figure 2: Posterior estimate, burning process and ACF for different step size: $h_1 = 0.05, h_2 = 0.1, h_3 = 0.5$.

Number of particles(N)	10	20	50	100	200	5000	1000
log-bias	-3.76	-4.05	-4.47	-4.87	-5.24	-5.69	-5.98
log-MSE	-6.95	-7.67	-8.48	-9.28	-10.01	-10.89	-11.48

Table 1: The log-bias and the log-MSE of the filtered states under 200 Chebyshev particles for varying N.

Chebyshev particles in the set as 100, which is far less than the iterations (≥ 2000), from this point, we have largely scaled the particle sets for our model, then, we just need few evaluations to infer this model. We conduct different step sizes, $h_1 = 0.05, h_2 = 0.1, h_3 = 0.5$, the posterior estimate, the burning process and plots of the auto-correlation of a time series by lag are shown in Figure 2. The corresponding table is shown in Table 2.

4.2 Nonlinear State Space Model

We continue with a real application of our proposal to track the stochastic volatility, a nonlinear State Space Model with Gaussian noise, where log volatility considered as the latent variable is an essential element in the analysis of financial risk management. The stochastic volatility is given by

$$X_0 \sim N\left(\mu, \frac{\sigma_v^2}{1-\rho^2}\right), \quad X_t | X_{t-1} \sim N\left(\mu + \rho(X_{t-1} - \mu), \sigma_v^2\right), \quad Y_t | X_t \sim N\left(0, \exp(X_t)\tau\right),$$

where the parameters $\theta = \{\mu, \rho, \sigma_v, \tau\}$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\rho \in [-1, 1]$, σ_v and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, denote the mean value, the persistence in volatility, the standard deviation of the state process and the instantaneous volatility, respectively.

Number of particles(N)	10	20	50	100	200	500
Estimated posterior mean	0.559	0.769	0.737	0.696	0.709	0.717
Estimated posterior variance	0.105	0.039	0.023	0.012	0.005	0.001

Table 2: The estimated posterior mean and variance when varying T.

The observations $y_t = \log(p_t/p_{t-1})$, also called log-returns, denote the logarithm of the daily difference in the exchange rate p_t , here, $\{p_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is the daily closing prices of the NASDAQ OMXS30 index (a weighted average of the 30 most traded stocks at the Stockholm stock exchange) [31]. We extract the data from [Quandl](#) for the period between January 2, 2015 and January 2, 2016. The resulting log-returns are shown in Figure 3. We use SMC to track the time-series persistency volatility, large variations are frequent, which is well-known as volatility clustering in finance, from the equation (42), as $|\phi|$ is close to 1 and the standard variance is small, the volatility clustering effect easier occurs. Here, the parameters of the objective for Chebyshev particles: $\{\beta = 1, m = 40, d = 1\}$, the size of Chebyshev particles is 200. The initial value is $\mu_0 = 0, \sigma_0 = 1, \phi_0 = 0.95, \sigma_\phi = 0.05, \delta_{v_0} = 0.2, \sigma_v = 0.03$. We obtain good performance that the posterior estimation can be inferred from a few evaluations, it greatly scales the computation load for high-dimensional sampling, shown in Figure 3.

5 Conclusion

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) provides a feasible method for inferring Hidden Markov models. However, it is often computationally prohibitive and especially constrained by the curse of dimensionality, since the Monte Carlo sampler traverses randomly taking small steps within uncertain regions in the parameter space. In this process, a large number of duplicate samples will be burned, and these duplicate samples greatly increase the computational load. We have introduced a deterministic sampling mechanism, in which all generated samples are derived from particle interactions under a weighted Riesz polarization maximizing criterion. All samples inherit the properties of both a well-separated distance and a bounded covering radius. We have embedded them into MCMC, where we have achieved high performance in our experiment of a hidden Markov model. Only a few evaluations are required, and we can extend our method into high-dimensional sampling. For future research, we will develop a kernel for the Chebyshev particles and scale the model with low complexity of computations from the perspective of equilibrium states on high-dimensional sampling.

Acknowledgments

This was supported in part by BRBytes project.

References

- [1] Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines. *The journal of chemical physics*, 21(6):1087–1092, 1953.
- [2] W Keith Hastings. Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications. 1970.
- [3] Stuart Geman and Donald Geman. Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distributions, and the bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, (6):721–741, 1984.
- [4] Julian Besag, Jeremy York, and Annie Mollié. Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics. *Annals of the institute of statistical mathematics*, 43(1):1–20, 1991.
- [5] Adrian FM Smith and Gareth O Roberts. Bayesian computation via the gibbs sampler and related markov chain monte carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 55(1):3–23, 1993.
- [6] Arnaud Doucet, Nando De Freitas, and Neil Gordon. An introduction to sequential monte carlo methods. In *Sequential Monte Carlo methods in practice*, pages 3–14. Springer, 2001.
- [7] Adrian Smith. *Sequential Monte Carlo methods in practice*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [8] Martyn Plummer, Nicky Best, Kate Cowles, and Karen Vines. Coda: convergence diagnosis and output analysis for mcmc. *R news*, 6(1):7–11, 2006.
- [9] Steven B Damelin and V Maymeskul. On point energies, separation radius and mesh norm for s-extremal configurations on compact sets in \mathbb{R}^n . *Journal of Complexity*, 21(6):845–863, 2005.
- [10] Douglas P Hardin, Edward B Saff, and J Tyler Whitehouse. Quasi-uniformity of minimal weighted energy points on compact metric spaces. *Journal of Complexity*, 28(2):177–191, 2012.
- [11] DP Hardin and EB Saff. Minimal riesz energy point configurations for rectifiable d-dimensional manifolds. *Advances in Mathematics*, 193(1):174–204, 2005.
- [12] S Borodachov, D Hardin, and E Saff. Asymptotics for discrete weighted minimal riesz energy problems on rectifiable sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 360(3):1559–1580, 2008.




Figure 3: Top: The daily log-returns and estimated log-volatility with 95% confidence intervals of the NASDAQ OMXS30 index for the period between February 4, 2015 and February 4, 2016. Bottom: the posterior estimate(left), the trace of the Markov chain(middle) and the corresponding ACF(right) of μ (purple), ϕ (magenta) and σ_v (green) obtained from Chebyshev particles embedded PMH. The dotted and solid gray lines in the left and middle plots indicate the parameter posterior mean and the parameter priors, respectively.

- [13] Sergiy V Borodachov, Douglas P Hardin, and Edward B Saff. Low complexity methods for discretizing manifolds via riesz energy minimization. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 14(6):1173–1208, 2014.
- [14] Michael Fekete. Über die verteilung der wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen gleichungen mit ganzzahligen koeffizienten. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 17(1):228–249, 1923.
- [15] Steve Smale. Mathematical problems for the next century. *The mathematical intelligencer*, 20(2):7–15, 1998.
- [16] DP Hardin, EB Saff, et al. Discretizing manifolds via minimum energy points. *Notices of the AMS*, 51(10):1186–1194, 2004.
- [17] Sergiy V Borodachov, Douglas P Hardin, and Edward B Saff. *Discrete energy on rectifiable sets*. Springer, 2019.
- [18] John K Hunter. Measure theory. *University Lecture Notes, Department of Mathematics, University of California at Davis*. http://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~hunter/measure_theory, 2011.
- [19] Bálint Farkas and Béla Nagy. Transfinite diameter, chebyshev constant and energy on locally compact spaces. *Potential Analysis*, 28(3):241–260, 2008.
- [20] Tamás Erdélyi and Edward B Saff. Riesz polarization inequalities in higher dimensions. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 171:128–147, 2013.
- [21] Arno Kuijlaars and E Saff. Asymptotics for minimal discrete energy on the sphere. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 350(2):523–538, 1998.
- [22] Alexander Reznikov, E Saff, and Alexander Volberg. Covering and separation of chebyshev points for non-integrable riesz potentials. *Journal of Complexity*, 46:19–44, 2018.
- [23] Jeong-Soo Park. Optimal latin-hypercube designs for computer experiments. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 39(1):95–111, 1994.
- [24] Kenny Q Ye. Orthogonal column latin hypercubes and their application in computer experiments. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(444):1430–1439, 1998.
- [25] Max D Morris and Toby J Mitchell. Exploratory designs for computational experiments. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 43(3):381–402, 1995.
- [26] Scott Kirkpatrick, C Daniel Gelatt, and Mario P Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *science*, 220(4598):671–680, 1983.
- [27] V Roshan Joseph, Tirthankar Dasgupta, Rui Tuo, and CF Jeff Wu. Sequential exploration of complex surfaces using minimum energy designs. *Technometrics*, 57(1):64–74, 2015.
- [28] Christophe Andrieu, Arnaud Doucet, and Roman Holenstein. Particle markov chain monte carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3):269–342, 2010.
- [29] Arnaud Doucet, Simon Godsill, and Christophe Andrieu. On sequential monte carlo sampling methods for bayesian filtering. *Statistics and computing*, 10(3):197–208, 2000.
- [30] Nicolas Chopin. Central limit theorem for sequential monte carlo methods and its application to bayesian inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(6):2385–2411, 2004.
- [31] Johan Dahlin and Thomas B Schön. Getting started with particle Metropolis-Hastings for inference in nonlinear dynamical models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 88(2):1–41, 2019.