

ON THE FORGETTING OF PARTICLE FILTERS

JOONA KARJALAINEN, ANTHONY LEE, SUMEETPAL S. SINGH, AND MATTI VIHOLA

ABSTRACT. We study the forgetting properties of the particle filter when its state — the collection of particles — is regarded as a Markov chain. Under a strong mixing assumption on the particle filter’s underlying Feynman–Kac model, we find that the particle filter is exponentially mixing, and forgets its initial state in $O(\log N)$ ‘time’, where N is the number of particles and time refers to the number of particle filter algorithm steps, each comprising a selection (or resampling) and mutation (or prediction) operation. We present an example which suggests that this rate is optimal. In contrast to our result, available results to-date are extremely conservative, suggesting $O(\alpha^N)$ time steps are needed, for some $\alpha > 1$, for the particle filter to forget its initialisation. We also study the *conditional* particle filter (CPF) and extend our forgetting result to this context. We establish a similar conclusion, namely, CPF is exponentially mixing and forgets its initial state in $O(\log N)$ time. To support this analysis, we establish new time-uniform L^p error estimates for CPF, which can be of independent interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

Particle filters [17], or sequential Monte Carlo methods, have become a workhorse for applied nonlinear stochastic filtering, and more generally, the go-to approach for statistical inference in state-space models; for example, see [2, 7] for a general introduction to particle filtering and its applications in various scientific fields. The particle filter algorithm propagates $N \geq 2$ random samples, or ‘particles’ $\mathbf{X}_k = (X_k^1, \dots, X_k^N)$ through time $k = 1, 2, \dots$, which form an empirical approximation of the time-evolving sequence of filtering probability distributions π_k . In particular, for a test function ϕ , a weighted average of the particles of the form $\sum_{i=1}^N W_k^i \phi(X_k^i)$ approximates the integral of ϕ with respect to π_k ; see the discussion in Section 2.

The particle filter was largely popularised by the seminal work of Gordon et al. [17] in applied non-linear filtering. Since then, over the past decades, there have been numerous advancements in the design of more efficient particle filtering algorithms, in theoretical studies, and its use in new applications; see the textbooks Cappé et al. [2], Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos [7], Del Moral [9] for a detailed account. The particle filter approximation is asymptotically accurate for large N , and its behaviour is theoretically well understood. The collection of theoretical results available include central limit theorems [6, 14, 30]; large deviations [29]; time-uniform L^p errors [9]; propagation of chaos [10]; and convergence of U -statistics [12]. Available theoretical results are not only for the non-linear filter but have also been extended to various other estimates of interest. For example, the smoother [11, 15]; the model evidence [4, 39]; the gradient of the filter [13]; and the particle filter’s variance [5, 25, 31].

The theoretical results above are mainly about the empirical measure the particles define, whereas we focus on a natural question of a different nature. We regard the particle filter’s vector-valued state \mathbf{X}_k as an inhomogeneous Markov chain $(\mathbf{X}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and study its forgetting properties. Unlike some of the results for empirical measures, we do not concentrate on the asymptotic regime $N \rightarrow \infty$, but we do investigate how forgetting depends on N . We prove that, under a strong

mixing condition, the Markov chain (\mathbf{X}_k) is exponentially forgetting, and forgets its state in $O(\log N)$ time (Theorem 3). An example, which we present in Section 4, suggests that this rate is optimal.

Particle filter forgetting in our sense has been considered before, at least in [36]. The work of [36] studies the bias of gradient-based recursive maximum likelihood estimation for state-space models, when a particle filter is used to approximate the required gradients; this is a popular approach for calibrating state-space models [23, 32, 33]. The forgetting of the particle filter plays a crucial role in establishing the bias of the maximum likelihood estimate, which is induced by the particle filter's approximation of the gradients (e.g., see the series of Lemmas 5.1 to 5.5 in [36]). They establish an exponential forgetting result (restated as Lemma 5 here), which guarantees a Dobrushin coefficient $O(1 - \epsilon^N)$, or forgetting in $O(\epsilon^{-N})$ time, which turns out to be extremely loose for large N . In contrast, assuming similar strong mixing conditions as in [36], which is frequently used in the literature — including many of the theoretical results cited above — we establish a uniform Dobrushin coefficient for the composition of $O(\log N)$ particle filter steps (Lemma 10).

We then turn to investigate the conditional particle filter (CPF) [1]. The CPF algorithm is similar to the particle filter, except for a fixed 'reference' path, but its purpose is very different: it defines a Markov transition targetting the so-called smoothing distribution. The CPF is typically used within a particle Gibbs algorithm, which plays an important role in Bayesian estimation for time-series data using general state-space models (also known as hidden Markov models).

We prove a similar forgetting result for the CPF (Theorem 21). Our forgetting proof relies on similar ingredients as for the particle filter, and a new time-uniform L^p error bound for the CPF (Theorem 17), which can be of independent interest.

We refer the reader to Sections 7 and 8 for remarks on implications, potential applications and further work arising from our new forgetting results for the particle filter and the conditional particle filter.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND PARTICLE FILTER DEFINITION

We follow the (now common) convention of [9] and define a sequence of probability measures $\{\eta_k(dx)\}_{k \geq 1}$ on a general measurable state-space E through a so-called Feynman–Kac (FK) model. The particle filter, which is defined in Algorithm 1 below, is a Monte Carlo approximation of these probability measures.

Before defining the FK model, we declare the adopted mathematical notation. Let M be a Markov kernel on E , and let μ and ν be probability measures on E . Given a real-valued measurable function $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subset E$, let¹ $\mu(\phi) = \int \phi d\mu = \int \phi(x) d\mu(dx)$, $(\mu M)(A) = \int \mu(dx) M(x, A)$ and $(M\phi)(x) = \int M(x, dy) \phi(y)$. We denote the total variation distance between μ and ν by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{\infty} \leq 1/2} |\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)| = \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} |\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|,$$

where $\|\phi\|_{\infty} = \sup_x |\phi(x)|$, and $\text{osc}(\phi) = \sup_x \phi(x) - \inf_x \phi(x)$. The composition of Markov kernels M_1, M_2 is a Markov kernel $(M_1 M_2)(x, A) = \int M_1(x, dy) M_2(y, A)$, and more generally, we denote iterated compositions as products. We denote the k -fold product measure of μ by $\mu^{\otimes k}$. If μ and ν have densities p and q with respect to a common dominating measure λ , we note that $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \frac{1}{2} \int |p - q| d\lambda = 1 - \int \min(p, q) d\lambda$. The L^p norm of a random variable X is denoted by $\|X\|_p = \mathbb{E}(|X|^p)^{1/p}$.

¹Here, and thereafter, we implicitly assume test sets and functions to be measurable.

Many of our main results involve bounding Dobrushin (or Doeblin) coefficients of appropriate sequences of Markov kernels. The equivalence motivating the following definition can be found in, e.g., [16, Section 18.2].

Definition. For a Markov kernel M evolving on E , we denote by

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(M) = \sup_{x,y \in E} \|M(x, \cdot) - M(y, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} = \sup_{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}, \mu \neq \nu} \frac{\|\mu M - \nu M\|_{\text{TV}}}{\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}}$$

its Dobrushin contraction coefficient.

Note that the latter form implies sub-multiplicativity: for two Markov kernels M_1 and M_2 , $\beta_{\text{TV}}(M_1 M_2) \leq \beta_{\text{TV}}(M_1) \beta_{\text{TV}}(M_2)$.

A Feynman–Kac model $(\eta_0, (M_k)_{k \geq 1}, (G_k)_{k \geq 0})$ on E consists of an initial probability measure η_0 on E , a sequence of transition probabilities kernels M_k on E and a sequence of non-negative functions $G_k : E \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ which are called the ‘potential functions’. Let \mathcal{P} stand for the set of probability measures on E . We denote the mappings from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P} stemming from the FK model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_k(\mu)(dx) &= \frac{G_k(x)\mu(dx)}{\mu(G_k)}, & k \geq 0, \\ \Phi_{k+1}(\mu) &= \Psi_k(\mu)M_{k+1}, & k \geq 0, \\ \Phi_{k,n} &= \Phi_n \circ \cdots \circ \Phi_{k+1}, & 0 \leq k < n, \end{aligned}$$

and $\Phi_{n,n}$ is the identity mapping for all $n \geq 0$. Using these mappings, let

$$\eta_k := \Phi_{0,k}(\eta_0).$$

In the engineering and statistics literature, η_k is known as the ‘predictor’ and represents the Bayesian posterior distribution — in the context of probabilistic time-series models [9] — of the hidden state of the time-series at time k , given observations up to time $k - 1$. The ‘filter’ is the updated η_k that incorporates the observation at time k , that is $\pi_k := \Psi_k(\eta_k)$. One of the most popular methods to approximate η_k is by using a particle filter.

Algorithm 1 PARTICLEFILTER($\eta_0, M_{1:T}, G_{0:T-1}, N$)

- 1: Draw $X_0^i \sim \eta_0(\cdot)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
 - 3: Draw $A_k^i \sim \text{Categ}_{(1:N)}(G_k(X_k^1), \dots, G_k(X_k^N))$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$
 - 4: Draw $X_{k+1}^i \sim M_{k+1}(X_k^{A_k^i}, \cdot)$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$
 - 5: **end for**
-

Algorithm 1 summarises the particle filter in pseudo-code, where we denote by $a:b$ the integers from a to b , and use this in indexing, so that $M_{1:T} = (M_1, \dots, M_T)$. All random variables generated in the algorithm are conditionally independent of earlier generated variables given the random variables appearing in their distribution, and $\text{Categ}_{(n:m)}(w_{n:m})$ stands for the categorical distribution with weights proportional to w_i , that is, $A \sim \text{Categ}_{(n:m)}(w_{n:m})$ if $\mathbb{P}(A = k) = w_k / (\sum_{i=n}^m w_i)$ for $k \in \{n, \dots, m\}$. The random variables generated in the particle filter form the following empirical approximation to the ideal predictor η_k and filter π_k :

$$\eta_k^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_k^N = \Psi_k(\eta_k^N) = \sum_{i=1}^N W_k^i \delta_{X_k^i},$$

where $W_k^i = G_k(X_k^i) / (\sum_{j=1}^N G_k(X_k^j))$.

We state two results from Del Moral [9]. The first is the exponential forgetting of the ideal filter in Lemma 1, from where the second result in Lemma 2, on the time-uniform stability of the particle approximation (in the L^p), follows. These results, and our new ones to follow, assume that the FK model satisfies the following ‘strong mixing’ condition:

Assumption (A1). *There exists constants $0 < \underline{M} \leq \bar{M} < \infty$ and $0 < \underline{G} \leq \bar{G} < \infty$ such that for all $k \geq 1$, and all $x, y \in E$:*

- (M): *The Markov transitions admit densities $M_k(x, \cdot)$ with respect to a common dominating measure λ with $\underline{M} \leq M_k(x, y) \leq \bar{M}$.*
- (G): *The potentials satisfy $\underline{G} \leq G_{k-1}(x) \leq \bar{G}$.*

Lemma 1. ([9], Proposition 4.3.6) *Assume (A1). For all probability measures μ and ν , $n \geq 0$ and $k \geq 0$,*

$$\sup_{\mu, \nu} \|\Phi_{n, n+k}(\mu) - \Phi_{n, n+k}(\nu)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \beta^k,$$

where $\beta = 1 - (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$.

Lemma 2. ([9], Theorem 7.4.4) *Assume (A1) and $\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1$. For all $N \geq 2$, $n \geq 0$ and $p \geq 1$,*

$$\|\eta_n^N(\phi) - \eta_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $c = c(p) = 2d(p)^{1/p}(\bar{M}/\underline{M})^3\bar{G}/\underline{G}$. The function $d(p)$ has been defined in [9], and in particular, $d(2) = 1$.

3. FORGETTING OF THE PARTICLE FILTER

The aim of this section is to study the forgetting properties of the particle filter when its sequence of outputs, namely $\{X_t^{1:N}\}_{t \geq 0}$, is viewed as an (inhomogeneous) Markov process evolving in E^N . To do so, we define its corresponding Markov transition kernel:

$$\mathbf{M}_n(x^{1:N}, \cdot) = \left(\Phi_n \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i} \right) \right)^{\otimes N}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

We observe that the particles produced by Algorithm 1 satisfy $X_t^{1:N} \mid \{X_{t-1}^{1:N} = x^{1:N}\} \sim \mathbf{M}_t(x^{1:N}, \cdot)$ and therefore $X_t^{1:N} \sim \eta_0^{\otimes N} \mathbf{M}_{0,t}$ where $\mathbf{M}_{i,i} = \text{Id}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i,j} = \mathbf{M}_{i+1} \cdots \mathbf{M}_j$ for $i, j \geq 0$, $i < j$.

The main result of this section is the following Theorem. We postpone its proof to Section 3.2.

Theorem 3. *For all $k \geq 1, n \geq 0, N \geq 2$,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n, n+k}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{\lfloor k/(c \log N) \rfloor},$$

where ε and c only depend on the constants in (A1).

It follows from Theorem 3 that, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $k = O(\log N)$ steps are sufficient to make the total variation distance smaller than δ . In Section 4 we present an example of a model for which this rate is optimal.

3.1. Relationship with existing forgetting result. The forgetting property of the particle filter is not widely studied but one relevant result we are aware of is in [36, Lemma 5.1, eqn. (53)]. Their result, which we restate below as Lemma 5, turns out to be very loose for large N . In particular, $k = O(\epsilon^{-N})$ steps, for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, are needed to forget the initialisation.

The following generic upper bound similar to [19, (4.5)] for the total variation distance between two product measures, expressed in terms of the total variation distances between their marginals, plays a central role in establishing Lemma 5.

Lemma 4. Let μ_1, \dots, μ_n and ν_1, \dots, ν_n be probability measures on E . Let μ and ν be the product measures on E^n defined by

$$\mu = \mu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mu_n, \quad \nu = \nu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \nu_n.$$

Then

$$(1) \quad \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \|\mu_i - \nu_i\|_{\text{TV}}).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that the measures $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n$ have a common dominating measure λ and let $p_i = d\mu_i/d\lambda$, $q_i = d\nu_i/d\lambda$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} &= 1 - \int_{E^n} \min(p_1 \dots p_n, q_1 \dots q_n) d\lambda^n \\ &\leq 1 - \int_{E^n} (p_1 \wedge q_1) \dots (p_n \wedge q_n) d\lambda^n \\ &= 1 - \int_E (p_1 \wedge q_1) d\lambda \dots \int_E (p_n \wedge q_n) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and we conclude since $\|\mu_i - \nu_i\|_{\text{TV}} = 1 - \int_E (p_i \wedge q_i) d\lambda$. \square

Lemma 5. Assume (A1). For all $N \geq 1, n \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$,

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}) \leq (1 - \epsilon^N)^k,$$

where $\epsilon = (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$.

Proof. Let $j \geq 1$ and define

$$\mu_x = \Phi_j \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i} \right),$$

for arbitrary $x = x^{1:N} \in E^N$, so that $\mu_x^{\otimes N} = \mathbf{M}_j(x, \cdot)$. Lemma 4 gives the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_j) &= \sup_{x, \tilde{x} \in E^N} \|\mathbf{M}_j(x, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_j(\tilde{x}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \sup_{x, \tilde{x} \in E^N} \left(1 - (1 - \|\mu_x - \mu_{\tilde{x}}\|_{\text{TV}})^N \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\mu_x - \mu_{\tilde{x}}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \beta \in [0, 1)$ with $\beta = 1 - (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$ by Lemma 1, and it follows that $\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_j) \leq 1 - (1 - \beta)^N$. Since the above argument does not depend on j , we conclude that

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}) = \beta_{\text{TV}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{M}_{n+i} \right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n+i}) \leq (1 - (1 - \beta)^N)^k. \quad \square$$

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3. In contrast with Lemma 4, we rely on the Hellinger distance for controlling the behaviour of product measures, and consequently, their total variation.

Definition. The squared Hellinger distance between two probability measures P and Q with densities p and q with respect to a common dominating measure λ is

$$H^2(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)})^2 \lambda(dx) = 1 - \int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} \lambda(dx).$$

Lemma 6. Let μ and ν be random probability measures. Then,

$$\|\mathbb{E}\mu - \mathbb{E}\nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{E}\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \mathbb{E}H^2(\mu, \nu))^2}.$$

Proof. We may write $\|\mathbb{E}\mu - \mathbb{E}\nu\|_{\text{TV}}$ as

$$\sup_A |\mathbb{E}[\mu(A) - \nu(A)]| \leq \sup_A \mathbb{E}|\mu(A) - \nu(A)| \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_A |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|,$$

which is equal to $\mathbb{E}\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}$. The second inequality of the claim follows from Lemma 28,

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 1 - (1 - H^2(\mu, \nu))^2,$$

leading to

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{E}\sqrt{1 - (1 - H^2(\mu, \nu))^2},$$

and we conclude by Jensen's inequality, with concave $t \mapsto \sqrt{t}$ and then $t \mapsto -t^2$. \square

The following result states two bounds for product measures which we will use for two regimes, for 'small N ' and for 'large N ', respectively. The second bound is a small extension, to random measures, of the well-known fact that one can bound total variation distance by Hellinger distance and the latter tensorises (see, e.g., [38], Section 15.1.3).

Lemma 7. *Let μ and ν be random probability measures on E , and let M be a Markov kernel. Then, for any $N \geq 1$:*

- (a) $\mathbb{E}\|(\mu M)^{\otimes N} - (\nu M)^{\otimes N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - (1 - \beta_{\text{TV}}(M))^N,$
- (b) $\mathbb{E}\|(\mu M)^{\otimes N} - (\nu M)^{\otimes N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \mathbb{E}\{H^2(\mu M, \nu M)\})^{2N}}.$

Proof. The first claim follows by Lemma 4:

$$\mathbb{E}\|(\mu M)^{\otimes N} - (\nu M)^{\otimes N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \mathbb{E}(1 - (1 - \|\mu M - \nu M\|_{\text{TV}})^N),$$

where $\|\mu M - \nu M\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \beta_{\text{TV}}(M)\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \beta_{\text{TV}}(M)$.

The second inequality of Lemma 6 gives

$$\mathbb{E}\|(\mu M)^{\otimes N} - (\nu M)^{\otimes N}\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \mathbb{E}H^2((\mu M)^{\otimes N}, (\nu M)^{\otimes N}))^2},$$

and the second claim follows directly by applying the identity $H^2(\mu_1^{\otimes N}, \mu_2^{\otimes N}) = 1 - (1 - H^2(\mu_1, \mu_2))^N$ and Jensen's inequality. \square

The following result follows from similar decompositions as in [9] and allows, e.g., the transference of time-uniform stability in Lemma 2 from predictive approximations η_n^N to filtering approximations π_n^N .

Lemma 8. *Let μ and ν be random probability measures and $p \geq 1$. If (A1) holds, then*

$$\sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \|\Psi_n(\mu)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi)\|_p \leq c \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \|\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)\|_p,$$

where $c = \bar{G}/\underline{G}$.

Proof. For probability distributions μ and ν one can verify that

$$\Psi_n(\mu)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi) = \frac{1}{\mu(G_n)}(\mu - \nu)[G_n(\phi - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi))],$$

so that

$$|\Psi_n(\mu)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi)|^p = \frac{1}{\mu(G_n)^p}|(\mu - \nu)(\tilde{\phi})|^p,$$

where $\tilde{\phi} = G_n(\phi - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi))$. Using the bound $G_n \geq \underline{G}$ and taking expectations, we find

$$(2) \quad \mathbb{E}(|\Psi_n(\mu)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi)|^p) \leq \frac{\text{osc}(\tilde{\phi})^p}{\underline{G}^p} \mathbb{E}(|(\mu - \nu)(\tilde{\phi}/\text{osc}(\tilde{\phi}))|^p).$$

It remains to bound $\text{osc}(\tilde{\phi})$. Since $\bar{G} \geq G_n > 0$ and $\phi(x) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi) \geq 0$ for some x ,

$$\sup_x \tilde{\phi}(x) \leq \bar{G} \left(\sup_x \phi(x) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi) \right),$$

and since $\phi(x) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi) \leq 0$ for some x ,

$$\inf_x \tilde{\phi}(x) \geq \bar{G} \left(\inf_x \phi(x) - \Psi_n(\nu)(\phi) \right).$$

Thus, $\text{osc}(\tilde{\phi}) \leq \bar{G} \text{osc}(\phi)$, and the claim follows from (2) with $c = \bar{G}/\underline{G}$. \square

The proof of the following lemma is the main argument used to prove Theorem 3. Central to its approach is the observation that the TV distance between $\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$ and $\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$ may be bounded by the expected TV distance between two product particle predictive measures; see (3). This distance can then be bounded by the corresponding expected Hellinger distance, which tensorises and therefore can be bounded precisely in terms of the expected Hellinger distance between the two particle predictive measures. In order to obtain a non-degenerate limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, this expected distance must decrease as $O(1/N)$; see first displayed equation after (3). To obtain an appropriate bound we combine time-uniform particle approximation errors with forgetting of the idealised filter; see (4). The latter gives rise to the $O(\log N)$ scaling of k .

Theorem 9. *There exist $c, c' > 1$, only depending on the constants in (A1), such that for all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq c'$ and $k \geq c \log(N)$,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2)^{1/2},$$

where $\varepsilon = (1 - c'/N)^N$. In particular, we can choose

$$c = \frac{1}{2 \log(\beta^{-1})} + \frac{1}{\log 2}, \quad c' = \frac{9}{2} (\bar{M}/\underline{M})^8 (\bar{G}/\underline{G})^4,$$

where $\beta = 1 - (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $n = 0$. For arbitrary $k \geq 2$, $x_0^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}$ define

$$\xi_t = \Phi_{0,t} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{x_0^j} \right), \quad \tilde{\xi}_t = \Phi_{0,t} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{x}_0^j} \right), \quad t = 1, \dots, k-1.$$

This definition implies $\xi_t = \Phi_t(\xi_{t-1})$ for $t \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$. Let $(X_t^{1:N})_{t=0}^{k-2}$ and $(\tilde{X}_t^{1:N})_{t=0}^{k-2}$ be the sets of particles generated independently by Algorithm 1 using the parameter vectors

$$(\xi_1, M_{2:k-1}, G_{1:k-2}, N) \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\xi}_1, M_{2:k-1}, G_{1:k-2}, N).$$

Let $(\xi_t^N, \tilde{\xi}_t^N)_{t=1}^{k-1} = (N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_{t-1}^j}, N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_{t-1}^j})_{t=1}^{k-1}$ be the corresponding empirical measures. Note that $(\xi_t^N, \tilde{\xi}_t^N)$ are the particle approximations of the measures $(\xi_t, \tilde{\xi}_t)$. We also have $X_{t-1}^{1:N} \sim \mathbf{M}_{0,t}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$ and $\tilde{X}_{t-1}^{1:N} \sim \mathbf{M}_{0,t}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$, for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$.

A final important relationship with the particle sets we will exploit is as follows. Define $\mu = \Psi_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)$, $\nu = \Psi_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)$, and $M = M_k$. Then, $\mu M = \Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N)$, $\nu M = \Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)$, and

$$\mathbb{E}\{(\mu M)^{\otimes N}\} = \mathbf{M}_{0,k}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot), \quad \mathbb{E}\{(\nu M)^{\otimes N}\} = \mathbf{M}_{0,k}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot).$$

The first part of the proof is to relate the total variation distance between $\mathbf{M}_{0,k}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$ and $\mathbf{M}_{0,k}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)$ to the expected squared Hellinger distance between two product particle predictive measures, and then to the expected squared

Hellinger distance between the particle predictive measures themselves. This is done via bound (b) of Lemma 7 together with Lemma 6:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{M}_{0,k}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,k}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} &= \|\mathbb{E}\{(\mu M)^{\otimes N}\} - \mathbb{E}\{(\nu M)^{\otimes N}\}\|_{\text{TV}} \\
&\leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \mathbb{E}H^2(\mu M, \nu M))^{2N}} \\
(3) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= \sqrt{1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{E}H^2(\Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N), \Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N))\right)^{2N}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now show that the expected squared Hellinger distance between $\Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N)$ and $\Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)$ is of order $1/N$, which will ‘stabilise’ the exponent $2N$ above. In particular, the claim will follow once we show

$$\mathbb{E}[H^2(\Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N), \Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N))] \leq c'/N,$$

for all $N \geq c'$, and arbitrary $x_0^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}$.

Denote now the relevant squared Hellinger distance

$$H_k^2 := H^2(\Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N), \Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)).$$

Applying Lemma 29 to $\Phi_k(\xi_{k-1}^N) = \Psi_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)M_k$ and $\Phi_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N) = \Psi_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)M_k$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}H_k^2 \leq C \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E}(|\Psi_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \Psi_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi)|^2),$$

where $C = (1/8)(\bar{M}/\underline{M})^2$. We apply Lemma 8 (with $p = 2$) to obtain

$$\sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \|\Psi_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \Psi_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi)\|_2 \leq C_2 \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \|\xi_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N(\phi)\|_2,$$

with $C_2 = \bar{G}/\underline{G}$.

Next, we bound the L^2 -norm on the right-hand side. Minkowski’s inequality gives the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N(\phi)\|_2 &\leq \|\xi_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \xi_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 + |\xi_{k-1}(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\phi)| + \\
(4) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\|\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where we note that the second term on the right-hand side is nonrandom. Lemma 2 (time-uniform particle filter stability) gives the bounds

$$\|\xi_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \xi_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 \leq \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \|\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 \leq \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where $C_3 = 2(\bar{M}/\underline{M})^3 \bar{G}/\underline{G}$, and by Lemma 1 (exponential forgetting of the ideal filter),

$$|\xi_{k-1}(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}(\phi)| \leq \sup_{\mu, \nu} \|\Phi_{0,k-1}(\mu) - \Phi_{0,k-1}(\nu)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \beta^{k-1}$$

for some $\beta \in [0, 1)$. If $k \geq c \log(N)$ with

$$c = \frac{1}{2 \log(\beta^{-1})} + \frac{1}{\log 2},$$

then $k - 1 \geq \log(N)/(2 \log(\beta^{-1}))$ for all $N \geq 2$. It follows that $\beta^{k-1} \leq C_3/\sqrt{N}$ and

$$\sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \|\xi_{k-1}^N(\phi) - \tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N(\phi)\|_2 \leq 3 \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Combining the above bounds, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}H_k^2 \leq c'N^{-1}$ with $c' = 9CC_2^2C_3^2 = (9/2)(\bar{M}/\underline{M})^8(\bar{G}/\underline{G})^4$. \square

We are now in a position to provide a suitable simplification of Theorem 9 and prove Theorem 3.

Lemma 10. *There exist $N_{\min} \geq 2$, $c > 1$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, only depending on the constants in (A1), such that for all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq N_{\min}$ and $k \geq c \log(N)$,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}) \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. By Lemma 31 we observe that $N \mapsto (1 - (1 - c'/N)^{2N})^{1/2}$ is decreasing for $N > c'$. Hence, we conclude by Theorem 9 by taking $N_{\min} = \lfloor c' \rfloor + 1$ and $\alpha = (1 - (1 - c'/N_{\min})^{2N_{\min}})^{1/2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Let N_{\min} be as in Lemma 10. For $N < N_{\min}$, Lemma 5 gives

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^k \mathbf{M}_{n+i}\right) \leq (1 - \epsilon^N)^k,$$

where $\epsilon = (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon^N)^k &\leq (1 - \epsilon^{N_{\min}-1})^k \leq (1 - \epsilon^{N_{\min}-1})^{(k \log 2)/(\log N)} \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon^{N_{\min}-1})^{\lfloor (k \log 2)/(\log N) \rfloor}, \end{aligned}$$

the result holds with $c = 1/\log 2$ and $\varepsilon = (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^{2(N_{\min}-1)}$.

For $N \geq N_{\min}$, we divide the time steps $n+1, \dots, n+k$ into blocks of size b , $0 < b \leq k$, and we obtain that there exist constants $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $b \geq C \log N$,

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,k}) \leq \prod_{j=0}^{\lfloor k/b \rfloor - 1} \beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n+jb, n+(j+1)b}) \leq \alpha^{\lfloor k/b \rfloor},$$

where we have used the inequality $\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_i) \leq 1$ for $i > n + \lfloor k/b \rfloor b$ and Lemma 10. We will now verify that the claim holds with the constants $\varepsilon = 1 - \alpha$, $c = 2C$. Fix $b = \lceil C \log N \rceil$ and assume that $k \geq 2C \log N$ (otherwise the result is trivial). The inequality $\lceil x \rceil \leq 2x$, $\forall x \geq 1/2$ implies

$$\alpha^{\lfloor k/b \rfloor} = \alpha^{\lfloor k/\lceil C \log N \rceil \rfloor} \leq \alpha^{\lfloor k/(2C \log N) \rfloor}.$$

The proof is now completed by combining the cases $N < N_{\min}$ and $N \geq N_{\min}$ above, i.e., by choosing the larger constant c and the smaller constant ε . \square

Remark 11. The proof of Theorem 9 involves bounding the expected TV distance between product distributions using the Hellinger distance and tensorisation. It is informative to consider whether the upper bound of Lemma 4 could be used instead, while retaining the property that the analysis relies only on time-uniform stability of the particle approximations and exponential forgetting of the ideal filter. To that end, we have

$$(5) \quad \mathbb{E} \left\| (\pi_{k-1}^N M_k)^{\otimes N} - (\tilde{\pi}_{k-1}^N M_k)^{\otimes N} \right\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - (1 - \mathbb{E} \left\| \pi_{k-1}^N M_k - \tilde{\pi}_{k-1}^N M_k \right\|_{\text{TV}})^N$$

by Lemma 4 and Jensen's inequality. A natural counterpart to (4) is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left\| \pi_{k-1}^N M_k - \tilde{\pi}_{k-1}^N M_k \right\|_{\text{TV}} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\| \pi_{k-1}^N M_k - \pi_{k-1} M_k \right\|_{\text{TV}} + \left\| \pi_{k-1} M_k - \tilde{\pi}_{k-1} M_k \right\|_{\text{TV}} + \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left\| \tilde{\pi}_{k-1}^N M_k - \tilde{\pi}_{k-1} M_k \right\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 32 in the Appendix, the first and third term on the right can be upper bounded by $O(N^{-1/2})$. Ignoring the second term (which vanishes exponentially in k) yields an upper bound that degrades to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The order $O(N^{-1/2})$ of the upper bound above is also expected to be tight, as demonstrated by Lemma 33 in a simplified context, where π_{k-1}^N and $\tilde{\pi}_{k-1}^N$ consist of independent realisations from π_{k-1} and $\tilde{\pi}_{k-1}$, respectively.

4. AN EXAMPLE WHERE $\log(N)$ STEPS IS NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT

We study a model where $\Omega(\log N)$ steps are required for the forgetting of the particle filter. More precisely, we will see that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{0,k(N)}) = 1$ for $k(N) = o(\log N)$. This allows us to conclude that the $k = O(\log N)$ dependence in Theorem 3 cannot be improved in general.

Example 12. Let $E = \{0, 1\}$, fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and define $G_n = 1$ and $M_n(x, \cdot) = \varepsilon \delta_1 + (1 - \varepsilon) \delta_x$ for all $n \geq 1$. State 1 of the model is absorbing for all ε , and one may verify that

$$\Phi_n(\mu) = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(0)\delta_0 + (\varepsilon\mu(0) + \mu(1))\delta_1,$$

and therefore,

$$\mathbf{M}_n(x^{1:N}, \cdot) = \left(\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - x^i) \delta_0 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\varepsilon(1 - x^i) + x^i \right) \delta_1 \right)^{\otimes N}.$$

We observe that this model does not satisfy (A1).

Theorem 13. Consider Example 12 with some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $x_0^{1:N} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N} = (1, \dots, 1)$. It holds that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{M}_{0,k(N)}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,k(N)}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} = 1$$

for any sequence $(k(N))_{N=1}^{\infty}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} k(N)/\log N = 0$.

We postpone the proof Theorem 13 to the end of this section. The second part of Lemma 14 below verifies that, for this specific model, $O(\log N)$ steps is sufficient to bound the total variation distance away from one. This is a similar number of steps to Theorem 3 for forgetting the initial condition.

Lemma 14. Consider Example 12 with some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $x_0^{1:N} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N} = (1, \dots, 1)$. The following hold:

(1) For $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$n \leq \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \right\rceil^{-1} \log[(N - 1)\varepsilon\delta] \Rightarrow \|\mathbf{M}_{0,n}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,n}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

(2) For $C > 0$,

$$n \geq \left\lceil \log \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} \right\rceil^{-1} \log \frac{N}{C} \Rightarrow \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{M}_{0,n}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,n}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq 1 - e^{-C}.$$

Proof. Let $X_n^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{X}_n^{1:N}$ be the particles at time n , generated using the initial states $x_0^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}$. It is straightforward to deduce that the proportion of 1's, $P_n^N = \sum_{i=1}^N X_n^i/N$, satisfies:

$$(6) \quad NP_n^N \sim \text{Binomial}(N, \varepsilon \bar{P}_{n-1}^N + P_{n-1}^N), \quad \text{where } \bar{P}_n^N = 1 - P_n^N.$$

The system starts with all 0's, so that $P_0^N = 0$ and $\bar{P}_0^N = 1$.

We now observe that

$$\|\mathbf{M}_{0,n}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,n}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} = \mathbb{P}(X_n^{1:N} \neq \tilde{X}_n^{1:N}) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0),$$

where the first equality follows from [27, Theorem I.5.2] and the fact that $\tilde{X}_n^{1:N} = \tilde{x}_0^{1:N}$ for all n , so that the only coupling is the trivial one. The result now follows from Lemma 15. \square

Lemma 15. Consider (6) with $\bar{P}_0^N = 1$. The following hold:

(1) For $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$n \leq -\frac{\log(\varepsilon\delta) + \log(N - 1)}{\log(1 - \varepsilon)} \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) \leq \delta.$$

(2) For $C > 0$,

$$n \geq \frac{\log(C) - \log(N)}{\log(1 - \varepsilon)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) \geq \exp(-C).$$

Proof. For the first part, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N - \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N] = -\mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(|\bar{P}_n^N - \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]| \geq \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(|\bar{P}_n^N - \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]|^2 \geq \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

where an application of Markov's inequality and Lemma 16 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[(\bar{P}_n^N)^2\right]}{\mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N]^2} - 1 \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon(N-1)\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)^n + (1-\varepsilon)^{-n}}{(N-1)\varepsilon + 1} - 1 \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)^n + \frac{1}{N-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)^n} - 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)^n}. \end{aligned}$$

The first result is obtained by considering the stated inequality for n .

For the second part, since $x \mapsto x^N$ is convex for $N \geq 2$, using Lemma 16,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) &= \mathbb{E}\left[(\varepsilon\bar{P}_{n-1}^N + P_{n-1}^N)^N\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[(\varepsilon\bar{P}_{n-1}^N + P_{n-1}^N)^N\right] \\ &= \{\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)^{n-1} + 1 - (1-\varepsilon)^{n-1}\}^N \\ &= \{1 - (1-\varepsilon)^n\}^N. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $n \geq \frac{\log(C) - \log(N)}{\log(1-\varepsilon)}$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{P}_n^N = 0) \geq \left\{1 - \frac{C}{N}\right\}^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \exp(-C),$$

from which we may conclude. \square

Lemma 16. Consider (6) with $\bar{P}_0^N = 1$, then for integer $n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N] = (1-\varepsilon)^n,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\bar{P}_n^N)^2\right] = \frac{(N-1)\varepsilon\left[\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)(1-\varepsilon)^2\right]^n + (1-\varepsilon)^n}{(N-1)\varepsilon + 1}.$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N | \bar{P}_{n-1}^N] &= 1 - \varepsilon\bar{P}_{n-1}^N - P_{n-1}^N \\ &= 1 - \varepsilon\bar{P}_{n-1}^N - 1 + \bar{P}_{n-1}^N \\ &= \bar{P}_{n-1}^N(1-\varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

from which we may deduce that if $\bar{P}_0^N = 1$ then $\mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N] = (1-\varepsilon)^n$ uniquely satisfies the recurrence equation

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_n^N] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{P}_{n-1}^N](1-\varepsilon).$$

Similarly if we define

$$V_n^N = \varepsilon \bar{P}_n^N + P_n^N = 1 - \bar{P}_n^N(1 - \varepsilon),$$

we find (using the fact that $N\bar{P}_{n-1}^N \mid \bar{P}_{n-1}^N \sim \text{Binomial}(N, 1 - V_{n-1}^N)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{P}_n^N)^2 \mid \bar{P}_{n-1}^N \right] &= \frac{1}{N} V_{n-1}^N (1 - V_{n-1}^N) + (1 - V_{n-1}^N)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \left\{ (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{P}_{n-1}^N - (1 - \varepsilon)^2 (\bar{P}_{n-1}^N)^2 \right\} + (1 - \varepsilon)^2 (\bar{P}_{n-1}^N)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (1 - \varepsilon) \bar{P}_{n-1}^N + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) (1 - \varepsilon)^2 (\bar{P}_{n-1}^N)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{P}_n^N)^2 \right] &= \frac{1}{N} (1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{P}_{n-1}^N \right] + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{P}_{n-1}^N)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} (1 - \varepsilon)^n + \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) (1 - \varepsilon)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{P}_{n-1}^N)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

and we can verify via tedious calculations that the recurrence equation with $\bar{P}_0^N = 1$ is uniquely satisfied by the given expression for $\mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{P}_n^N)^2 \right]$. \square

Proof of Theorem 13. For any $s \in (0, 1)$, there exists N_s such that $k(N) \leq s \log N$ for all $N > N_s$. In particular, for any $s < \log \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{-1}$, there exists $N_{s,\varepsilon}$ such that

$$\log \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{-1} \log(N-1) - s \log N > 0, \quad \forall N > N_{s,\varepsilon}.$$

Since the left-hand side tends to infinity as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exists $N_{s,\varepsilon,\delta}$ such that

$$k(N) \leq s \log N < \log \left(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \right)^{-1} [\log(N-1) + \log(\varepsilon\delta)], \quad \forall N > N_{s,\varepsilon,\delta}.$$

Thus, by the first part of Lemma 14,

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{M}_{0,k(N)}(x_0^{1:N}, \cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,k(N)}(\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}, \cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Since δ is arbitrary, the result follows. \square

5. FORGETTING OF THE CONDITIONAL PARTICLE FILTER

In this section, we study the forgetting properties of the conditional particle filter (CPF) [1], whose execution is given in Algorithm 2 below. Unlike the particle filter, it has an added input, which is the ‘frozen’ or ‘reference’ path $x_{0:T-1}^* \in E^T$ placed at $X_{0:T-1}^0$ in the algorithm. The reference particles participate in the selection step; for instance, if $A_k^i = 0$, then X_k^0 is pushed through the Markov transition M_{k+1} to define X_{k+1}^i . Note that if the reference is regarded as one particle, which is common in the literature, then Algorithm 2 has $N + 1$ particles.

Algorithm 2 CONDITIONALPARTICLEFILTER($\eta_0, M_{1:T}, G_{0:T-1}, x_{0:T-1}^*, N$)

- 1: Draw $X_0^i \sim \eta_0(\cdot)$, $i = 1 \dots N$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, \dots, T - 1$ **do**
 - 3: Set $X_k^0 = x_k^*$
 - 4: Draw $A_k^{1:N} \sim \text{Categ}_{(0:N)}(G_k(X_k^0), \dots, G_k(X_k^N))$
 - 5: Draw $X_{k+1}^i \sim M_{k+1}(X_k^{A_k^i}, \cdot)$, $i = 1 \dots N$
 - 6: **end for**
-

The conditional particle filter was introduced in [1] where the authors also showed how it corresponds precisely to a Gibbs sampler (in the context of Markov Chain Monte Carlo) for a particular probability distribution. This equivalence gave rise to the appellation ‘conditional’, and ‘particle filter’ for its algorithmic similarity to Algorithm 1. We further refer the reader to [1] for the use of the conditional particle filter in Bayesian estimation for time-series data.

The CPF described in Algorithm 2 can be viewed as a ‘perturbed’ particle filter. The perturbation is in the selection step due to the presence of the reference particle; see lines 3 and 4 of Algorithm 2. We denote, analogous to the particle filter, by $\hat{\Psi}_k$ and $\hat{\Phi}_k$ the perturbed selection and perturbed (combined) selection-mutation operators:

$$(7) \quad \hat{\Psi}_k(\mu) := \Psi_k \left(\frac{1}{N+1} \delta_{x_k^*} + \frac{N}{N+1} \mu \right),$$

$$(8) \quad \hat{\Phi}_k(\mu) := \Phi_k \left(\frac{1}{N+1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} + \frac{N}{N+1} \mu \right).$$

These perturbed operators suggest that the output of the CPF approximates the true filter similar to the particle filter. We remark that this viewpoint of the conditional particle filter, which is important in our proof to establish its forgetting properties, is atypical in the literature [1].

We will investigate the behaviour of the particles generated in Algorithm 2 — that is, excluding the reference — as a Markov chain $(X_k^{1:N})_{k=0}^T$. They follow the Markov transitions given by

$$\mathbf{M}_k^{x_{k-1}^*}(x^{1:N}, \cdot) = \left(\Phi_k \left(\frac{1}{N+1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} + \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i} \right) \right)^{\otimes N} = \left(\hat{\Phi}_k \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i} \right) \right)^{\otimes N},$$

for arbitrary $x_{k-1}^* \in E$ and $x^{1:N} \in E^N$. We use the shorthand notations $x^* = x_{0:T-1}^*$ and $\mathbf{M}_{i,j}^{x^*} = \mathbf{M}_{i+1}^{x_i^*} \cdots \mathbf{M}_j^{x_{j-1}^*}$. The empirical predictive and filtering distributions generated by the CPF are defined by

$$\hat{\eta}_k^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_k^i} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\pi}_k^N := \hat{\Psi}_k(\hat{\eta}_k^N),$$

respectively, where $X_k^{1:N}$ are the particles in Algorithm 2 at time k .

Our main forgetting result for the CPF is analogous to Theorem 3:

Theorem 17. *For all $k \geq 1, n \geq 0, N \geq 2$, and references x^* ,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}^{x^*}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^{\lfloor k/(c \log N) \rfloor},$$

where ε and c only depend on the constants in (A1).

Proof. We argue exactly as in the proof Theorem 3, but replace Lemmas 5 and 10 by Lemmas 18 and 20, respectively, which are given below. \square

The first lemma plays a similar role to Lemma 5, and we use it for small N .

Lemma 18. *For all $N \geq 1, n \geq 0, k \geq 1$ and x^* ,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}^{x^*}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^N)^k,$$

where $\varepsilon = (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$.

Proof. Let $j \geq 1$ and define

$$\mu_x = \hat{\Phi}_j \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i} \right),$$

for arbitrary $x = x^{1:N} \in E^N$, so that $\mu_x^{\otimes N} = \mathbf{M}_j^{x^{j-1}}(x, \cdot)$. With this notation established, the rest of the proof proceeds as in Lemma 5. \square

For large N , we use a bound similar to Theorem 9. Its proof follows roughly the same pattern as Theorem 9, but we also need new time uniform L^p error bounds for the CPF, which are postponed to Section 6.

Lemma 19. *There exist c and c' , only depending on the constants in (A1), such that for all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq c'$ and $k \geq c \log(N)$,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n,n+k}^{x^*}) \leq (1 - \varepsilon^2)^{1/2},$$

where $\varepsilon = (1 - c'/N)^N$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $n = 0$. We start by presenting notation that is analogous to the proof of Theorem 9. For arbitrary $k \geq 2$, $x_0^{1:N}$ and $\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}$ define

$$\xi_t = \Phi_{0,t} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{x_0^j} \right), \quad \tilde{\xi}_t = \Phi_{0,t} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{x}_0^j} \right), \quad t = 1, \dots, k-1,$$

and the perturbed distributions at time $t = 1$,

$$\xi_1^* = \hat{\Phi}_1 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{x_0^j} \right), \quad \tilde{\xi}_1^* = \hat{\Phi}_1 \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{x}_0^j} \right).$$

Let $(X_t^{1:N})_{t=0}^{k-2}$ and $(\tilde{X}_t^{1:N})_{t=0}^{k-2}$ be the sets of particles generated independently by Algorithm 2 using the parameter vectors

$$(\xi_1^*, M_{2:k-1}, G_{1:k-2}, x_{1:k-2}^*, N) \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\xi}_1^*, M_{2:k-1}, G_{1:k-2}, x_{1:k-2}^*, N).$$

Let $(\xi_t^N, \tilde{\xi}_t^N)_{t=1}^{k-1} = (N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_{t-1}^j}, N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_{t-1}^j})_{t=1}^{k-1}$ be the corresponding empirical measures. We note that $X_{t-1}^{1:N} \sim \mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{x_0^{1:N}}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{X}_{t-1}^{1:N} \sim \mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}}(\cdot)$, for $t = 1, \dots, k-1$.

Define $\mu = \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)$, $\nu = \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)$, and $M = M_k$. Then, $\mu M = \hat{\Phi}_k(\xi_{k-1}^N)$, $\nu M = \hat{\Phi}_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)$, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ (\mu M)^{\otimes N} \right\} = \mathbf{M}_{0,k}^{x_0^{1:N}}(\cdot), \quad \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\nu M)^{\otimes N} \right\} = \mathbf{M}_{0,k}^{\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}}(\cdot).$$

Bound (b) of Lemma 7 together with Lemma 6 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{M}_{0,k}^{x_0^{1:N}}(\cdot) - \mathbf{M}_{0,k}^{\tilde{x}_0^{1:N}}(\cdot) \right\|_{\text{TV}} &= \left\| \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\mu M)^{\otimes N} \right\} - \mathbb{E} \left\{ (\nu M)^{\otimes N} \right\} \right\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \mathbb{E} H^2(\mu M, \nu M))^{2N}} \\ &= \sqrt{1 - \left(1 - \mathbb{E} H^2(\hat{\Phi}_k(\xi_{k-1}^N), \hat{\Phi}_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)) \right)^{2N}}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the relevant squared Hellinger distance

$$H_k^2 := H^2(\hat{\Phi}_k(\xi_{k-1}^N), \hat{\Phi}_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)).$$

Applying Lemma 29 to $\hat{\Phi}_k(\xi_{k-1}^N) = \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)M_k$ and $\hat{\Phi}_k(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N) = \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)M_k$ yields

$$\mathbb{E} H_k^2 \leq C \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E} (|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi)|^2),$$

where $C = (1/8)(\bar{M}/\underline{M})^2$. Denote $\zeta_n = \Psi_n(\xi_n)$, $\tilde{\zeta}_n = \Psi_n(\tilde{\xi}_n)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi)\|_2 &\leq \|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \zeta_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 \\ &\quad + |\zeta_{k-1}(\phi) - \tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}(\phi)| \\ &\quad + \|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where Theorem 21 in Section 6 gives the bounds

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \zeta_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 \leq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{N}}, \quad \|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}(\phi)\|_2 \leq \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{N}},$$

and by Lemmas 8 and 1,

$$|\zeta_{k-1}(\phi) - \tilde{\zeta}_{k-1}(\phi)| \leq \sup_{\mu, \nu} \|\Psi_{k-1}(\Phi_{0, k-1}(\mu)) - \Psi_{k-1}(\Phi_{0, k-1}(\nu))\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C_3 \beta^{k-1}$$

with $C_3 = \bar{G}/\underline{G}$ and $\beta = 1 - (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$. If $k \geq c \log(N)$ with

$$c = \frac{1}{2 \log(\beta^{-1})} + \frac{1}{\log 2},$$

then $k-1 \geq \log(N)/(2 \log(\beta^{-1}))$ for all $N \geq 2$. Since $C_2 \geq C_3$ by (11), it follows that $C_3 \beta^{k-1} \leq C_2/\sqrt{N}$ and

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\xi_{k-1}^N)(\phi) - \hat{\Psi}_{k-1}(\tilde{\xi}_{k-1}^N)(\phi)\|_2 \leq 3 \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{N}},$$

and we conclude that $\mathbb{E}H_k^2 \leq c' N^{-1}$ with $c' = 9C_2^2$. \square

Lemma 20. *There exist $N_{\min} \geq 2$, $c > 1$, and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, only depending on the constants in (A1), such that for all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq N_{\min}$, $k \geq c \log(N)$, and x^* ,*

$$\beta_{\text{TV}}(\mathbf{M}_{n, n+k}^{x^*}) \leq \alpha.$$

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemmas 19 and 31 with c as in Lemma 19, $N_{\min} = \lfloor c' \rfloor + 1$, and

$$\alpha = (1 - (1 - c'/N_{\min})^{2N_{\min}})^{1/2}. \quad \square$$

6. L^p BOUNDS FOR THE CONDITIONAL PARTICLE FILTER

In this section, we prove time uniform L^p error estimates between the conditional particle filter and the true filter. The result is necessary for the proof of the CPF forgetting result (Theorem 17) above, but can be of independent interest for understanding the behaviour of the CPF with long time horizons.

The main result of this section is the following time-uniform error, which is analogous to Lemma 2, but stated for the CPF and filtering distributions:

Theorem 21. *Assume (A1). For every $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $c = c(p)$ such that for all ϕ with $\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1$, all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq 1$ and all references x^* ,*

$$\|\hat{\pi}_n^N(\phi) - \pi_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Theorem 21 complements the total variation error estimates of [24] between the conditional particle filter and the true filter.

The remainder of this section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 21. But first, some supporting results are needed. We introduce the mappings $Q_{k,n}$ from E to measures on E , and the Markov kernels $P_{k,n}$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{k,n}(\phi)(x_k) &:= \int \lambda(dx_{k+1}) \dots \lambda(dx_n) \phi(x_n) \prod_{i=k}^{n-1} G_i(x_i) M_{i+1}(x_i, x_{i+1}) \\ P_{k,n}(\phi)(x_k) &:= \frac{Q_{k,n}(G_n \phi)(x_k)}{Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x_k)}, \end{aligned}$$

and observe that with this notation,

$$\Phi_{k,n}(\mu)(\phi) = \frac{\mu Q_{k,n}(\phi)}{\mu Q_{k,n}(1)}.$$

The mappings $Q_{k,n}$ have the following stability property:

Lemma 22. *Assume (A1). Then there exists $c \in [1, \infty)$ such that for all $k \geq 0, n \geq k$ and x, x'*

$$0 < Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x) \leq c Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x').$$

In particular, one may take $c = \frac{\bar{G} \bar{M}}{\underline{G} \underline{M}}$.

Proof. Since G_k, \dots, G_n and M_{k+1}, \dots, M_n are bounded from above and below, it holds that $0 < Q_{k,n}(G_n) < \infty$. Moreover, $M_{k+1}(x, y)/M_{k+1}(x', y) \leq \frac{\bar{M}}{\underline{M}}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x) &= G_k(x) \int \lambda(dx_{k+1}) Q_{k+1,n}(G_n)(x_{k+1}) M_{k+1}(x, x_{k+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{G} \bar{M}}{\underline{G} \underline{M}} G_k(x') \int \lambda(dx_{k+1}) Q_{k+1,n}(G_n)(x_{k+1}) M_{k+1}(x', x_{k+1}) \\ &= \frac{\bar{G} \bar{M}}{\underline{G} \underline{M}} Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x'), \end{aligned}$$

from which we may conclude. \square

The following is restatement of [13, Lemma A.1], but with explicit constants.

Lemma 23. *Let G' and h' be measurable functions $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < G'(x) \leq c' G'(x'), \forall x, x'$ and some $c' \in [1, \infty)$. Let X_1, \dots, X_N be independent samples from μ . If h' has finite oscillation, then for any $p \geq 1$*

$$\sqrt{N} \left\| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N G'(X_i) h'(X_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N G'(X_i)} - \frac{\mu(G' h')}{\mu(G')} \right\|_p \leq d(p)^{1/p} c' \text{osc}(h'),$$

where $d(p)$ is as in Lemma 2.

The first direct result towards proving Theorem 21 is Theorem 24 stated next. To derive it, we follow a similar decomposition of errors used in [24] to establish total variation error. In particular, the sum of the errors on the right-hand side of Theorem 24 is due to the (one-step) Monte Carlo errors and the (one-step) errors due to the perturbation of the selection operators. These are given, respectively, by the terms T_k in (9) and R_k in (10).

Theorem 24. *Assume (A1), and let c be such that $0 < Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x) \leq c Q_{k,n}(G_n)(x')$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n$. Then, for all $N \geq 1, p \geq 1, x^*$ and $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{osc}(\phi) < \infty$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\Psi}_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\eta_n)(\phi) \right\|_p &\leq \|Z_n\|_p \text{osc}(\phi) + \frac{c d(p)^{1/p}}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=0}^n \text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|\gamma_{k,n}\|_p \text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Z_n = \frac{G_n(x_n^*)}{N \hat{\eta}_n^N(G_n) + G_n(x_n^*)}, \quad \gamma_{k,n} = \frac{\delta_{x_k^*} Q_{k,n}(G_n)}{(N \hat{\eta}_k^N + \delta_{x_k^*}) Q_{k,n}(G_n)}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\pi_n = \Psi_n(\eta_n)$. By Minkowski's inequality,

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \pi_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \|\hat{\Psi}_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi)\|_p + \|\Psi_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \pi_n(\phi)\|_p.$$

By Lemma 25, the first term on the right-hand side is bounded by $\|Z_n\|_p \text{osc}(\phi)$. For the second term, we use the identities

$$\Psi_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) = \frac{\hat{\eta}_n^N(G_n\phi)}{\hat{\eta}_n^N(G_n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_n(\phi) = \frac{\eta_0 Q_{0,n}(G_n\phi)}{\eta_0 Q_{0,n}(G_n)},$$

which together with Minkowski's inequality and a telescopic decomposition give the bound

$$\|\Psi_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \pi_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \|T_0\|_p + \sum_{k=1}^n (\|T_k\|_p + \|R_k\|_p),$$

where

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} T_0 &:= \frac{\hat{\eta}_0^N Q_{0,n}(G_n\phi)}{\hat{\eta}_0^N Q_{0,n}(G_n)} - \frac{\eta_0 Q_{0,n}(G_n\phi)}{\eta_0 Q_{0,n}(G_n)}, \\ T_k &:= \frac{\hat{\eta}_k^N Q_{k,n}(G_n\phi)}{\hat{\eta}_k^N Q_{k,n}(G_n)} - \frac{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n\phi)}{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n)}, \quad k \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

$$(10) \quad R_k := \frac{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n\phi)}{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n)} - \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n\phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}.$$

By Lemma 26, $\|R_k\|_p \leq \|\gamma_{k-1,n}\|_p \text{osc}(P_{k-1,n}(\phi))$, and it remains to bound T_i , $i = 0, \dots, n$.

Denote $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma\{X_{0:k}^{1:N}, A_{0:k-1}^{1:N}\}$. For $k \geq 1$, write $\mathbb{E}[|T_k|^p] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[|T_k|^p | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]]$, and note that conditionally on \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , the random variables X_k^1, \dots, X_k^N are i.i.d. samples from $\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N$. We observe that

$$T_k = \frac{\mu^N(G'h')}{\mu^N(G')} - \frac{\mu(G'h')}{\mu(G')},$$

where

$$G' = Q_{k,n}(G_n), \quad h' = P_{k,n}(\phi), \quad \mu^N = \hat{\eta}_k^N, \quad \mu = \hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N,$$

and consequently $G'h' = Q_{k,n}(G_n\phi)$. Then, by Lemma 23,

$$\mathbb{E}[|T_k|^p | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] \leq \left(N^{-1/2} d(p)^{1/p} c \text{osc}(h') \right)^p,$$

and so $\mathbb{E}[|T_k|^p]^{1/p} \leq N^{-1/2} d(p)^{1/p} c \text{osc}(h')$. The case T_0 follows by the same argument with $G' = Q_{0,n}(G_n)$, $h' = P_{0,n}(\phi)$, $\mu^N = \hat{\eta}_0^N$ and $\mu = \eta_0$. \square

Lemma 25. *Let $\phi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function with $\text{osc}(\phi) < \infty$. Then*

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_k(\hat{\eta}_k^N)(\phi) - \Psi_k(\hat{\eta}_k^N)(\phi)\|_p \leq \|Z_k\|_p \text{osc}(\phi),$$

where

$$Z_k = \frac{G_k(x_k^*)}{N\hat{\eta}_k^N(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)}.$$

Proof. Let μ be a probability measure on E . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_k(\mu)(\phi) &:= \frac{N\mu(G_k\phi) + G_k(x_k^*)\phi(x_k^*)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)} \\ &= \frac{\mu(G_k\phi)}{\mu(G_k)} \left(\frac{N\mu(G_k)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)} \right) + \frac{G_k(x_k^*)\phi(x_k^*)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)} \\ &= \Psi_k(\mu)(\phi) \left(1 - \frac{G_k(x_k^*)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)} \right) + \frac{G_k(x_k^*)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)} \phi(x_k^*), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\hat{\Psi}_k(\mu)(\phi) - \Psi_k(\mu)(\phi) = (\phi(x_k^*) - \Psi_k(\mu)(\phi)) \frac{G_k(x_k^*)}{N\mu(G_k) + G_k(x_k^*)},$$

where $|\phi(x_k^*) - \Psi_k(\mu)(\phi)| \leq \text{osc}(\phi)$. Setting $\mu = \hat{\eta}_k^N$ and taking $\|\cdot\|_p$ now gives the claim. \square

Lemma 26. *With R_k defined in (10), $\|R_k\|_p \leq \|\gamma_{k-1,n}\|_p \text{osc}(P_{k-1,n}(\phi))$.*

Proof. First, we observe that since

$$\hat{\Phi}_k(\mu) = \Phi_k \left(\frac{1}{N+1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} + \frac{N}{N+1} \mu \right), \quad \Phi_k(\mu)(Q_{k,n}(\phi)) = \frac{\mu Q_{k-1,k}(Q_{k,n}(\phi))}{\mu Q_{k-1,k}(Q_{k,n}(1))}, \text{ and}$$

$$Q_{k-1,k}(Q_{k,n}(\phi)) = Q_{k-1,n}(\phi),$$

it follows that

$$\hat{\Phi}_k(\mu) Q_{k,n}(\phi) = \frac{(N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} + \mu) Q_{k-1,n}(\phi)}{(N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} + \mu) Q_{k-1,n}(1)}.$$

By inserting this relation into the definition

$$R_k = \frac{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\Phi}_k \hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N) Q_{k,n}(G_n)} - \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)},$$

we obtain the expression

$$\frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} + \frac{N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} - \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}.$$

Multiplying and dividing by two well chosen terms gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \\ & + \frac{N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \frac{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \\ & - \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

and rearranging the terms yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \left(\frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} - 1 \right) \\ & + \frac{N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \frac{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

By simplifying the expression in the parentheses we finally obtain

$$\frac{N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \left(\frac{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} - \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \right).$$

By writing the expression in the parentheses as the difference $(\mu - \mu')(P_{k-1,n}(\phi))$ with probability measures

$$\mu = \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}, \quad \mu'(dx) = \frac{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N(dx) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)(x)}{\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)},$$

we have

$$\|R_k\|_p \leq \left\| \frac{N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*} Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{(\hat{\eta}_{k-1}^N + N^{-1} \delta_{x_{k-1}^*}) Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \right\|_p \text{osc} \left(\frac{Q_{k-1,n}(G_n \phi)}{Q_{k-1,n}(G_n)} \right). \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 21. We estimate each term in Theorem 24 separately:

$$\begin{aligned}\|Z_n\|_p &= \left\| \frac{G_n(x_n^*)}{N\hat{\eta}_n^N(G_n) + G_n(x_n^*)} \right\|_p \leq \frac{1}{N+1} \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}}, \\ \|\gamma_{k,n}\|_p &= \left\| \frac{\delta_{x_k^*} Q_{k,n}(G_n)}{(N\hat{\eta}_k^N + \delta_{x_k^*})Q_{k,n}(G_n)} \right\|_p \leq \frac{1}{N+1} \frac{\bar{G}\bar{M}}{\underline{G}\underline{M}},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that, by Lemma 22,

$$\delta_{x_k^*} Q_{k,n}(G_n) \leq \frac{\bar{G}\bar{M}}{\underline{G}\underline{M}} \hat{\eta}_k^N Q_{k,n}(G_n).$$

Next, we bound $\text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi))$. Since $P_{k,n}(\phi)(x) = \Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_x))(\phi)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi)) &\leq \sup_{x,y} \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} |\Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_x))(\phi) - \Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_y))(\phi)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x,y} \|\Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_x)) - \Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_y))\|_{\text{TV}}\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} = \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} |\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|$. Lemmas 8 and 1 then give the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x,y} \|\Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_x)) - \Psi_n(\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_y))\|_{\text{TV}} &\leq \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \sup_{x,y} \|\Phi_{k,n}(\delta_x) - \Phi_{k,n}(\delta_y)\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \beta^{n-k},\end{aligned}$$

hence $\sum_{k=0}^n \text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi)) \leq (\bar{G}/\underline{G})(1-\beta)^{-1}$ for all n , with $\beta = 1 - (\underline{M}/\bar{M})^2$. It follows from Theorem 24 and the previous bounds that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\| \hat{\Psi}_n(\hat{\eta}_n^N)(\phi) - \Psi_n(\eta_n)(\phi) \right\|_p &\leq \frac{1}{N+1} \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} + \frac{d(p)^{1/p}}{\sqrt{N}} \left(\frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{M}}{\underline{M}} \right)^3 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N+1} \left(\frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{M}}{\underline{M}} \right)^3.\end{aligned}$$

Since $1/(N+1) \leq 1/(2\sqrt{N})$ for $N \geq 1$, the claim follows with the constant

$$(11) \quad c = \frac{\bar{G}}{2\underline{G}} + \left(\frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\bar{M}}{\underline{M}} \right)^3 \left(d(p)^{1/p} + \frac{1}{2} \right). \quad \square$$

The result of Theorem 21 naturally applies to the predictive distributions, leading to a CPF analogue of Lemma 2:

Theorem 27. *Assume (A1) and $\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1$. For all $N \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$, and x^* ,*

$$\|\hat{\eta}_n^N(\phi) - \eta_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{N}},$$

where c only depends on p and the constants in (A1).

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 24,

$$\|\Psi_n \hat{\eta}_n^N(\phi) - \Psi_n \eta_n(\phi)\|_p \leq \frac{c' d(p)^{1/p}}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=0}^n \text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi)) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \|\gamma_{k,n}\|_p \text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi))$$

for some c' . We set $G_n = 1$, so that

$$\|\hat{\eta}_n^N(\phi) - \eta_n(\phi)\|_p = \|\Psi_n \hat{\eta}_n^N(\phi) - \Psi_n \eta_n(\phi)\|_p.$$

The claim now follows by bounding $\|\gamma_{k,n}\|_p$ and $\text{osc}(P_{k,n}(\phi))$ as in Theorem 21. \square

7. IMPLICATIONS FOR ALGORITHMS THAT COUPLE PARTICLE FILTERS

Couplings of particle filters have been suggested in the context of multilevel Monte Carlo [e.g. 18, 21, 22, 34]. Couplings of CPFs have been used in their theoretical analysis [8, 26] and in algorithms that generate unbiased estimates for smoothing expectations [20, 26]. We review here some implications of our results in the coupling context.

In what follows, $\text{MAXCOUPLE}(\mu, \nu)$ stands for the total variation maximal coupling [cf. 37]; that is, if $(X, Y) \sim \text{MAXCOUPLE}(\mu, \nu)$, then $X \sim \mu$, $Y \sim \nu$ and $\mathbb{P}(X \neq Y) = \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}$. Simulation from maximal coupling can be implemented in practice if we can sample from μ and can point-wise evaluate densities of μ and ν with respect to a common dominating measure.

Our results are directly relevant when two particle filters share common dynamics (models), except for having different initialisations. In such a context, let $\mathbf{X}_0 \neq \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_0$ be two arbitrary initial particle filter states, and denote the predictive distributions of the filters as $\mu_k := \Phi_k(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_{k-1}^i})$ and $\tilde{\mu}_k := \Phi_k(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{X}_{k-1}^i})$. One step of the the coupling algorithm suggested in [21, Section 3.3] may be summarised as follows:

$$(12) \quad (X_k^i, \tilde{X}_k^i) \sim \text{MAXCOUPLE}(\mu_k, \tilde{\mu}_k), \quad \text{independently for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

We have $\mathbb{P}(X_k^i \neq \tilde{X}_k^i) = \mathbb{E}\|\mu_k - \tilde{\mu}_k\|_{\text{TV}}$, which can be upper bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mu_k - \Phi_{1,k}(\mu_1)\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\Phi_{1,k}(\mu_1) - \Phi_{1,k}(\tilde{\mu}_1)\|_{\text{TV}} + \|\tilde{\mu}_k - \Phi_{1,k}(\tilde{\mu}_1)\|_{\text{TV}}].$$

Under (A1), Lemmas 1 and 32 ensure that if $k \geq O(\log N)$, the upper bound is at most $O(N^{-1/2})$. Consequently, by independence and Jensen's inequality,

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{k-1})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}(1 - \|\mu_k - \tilde{\mu}_k\|_{\text{TV}})^N \geq (1 - O(N^{-1/2}))^N. \end{aligned}$$

Instead of (12), we can also maximally couple $\mathbf{M}_k(\mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \cdot)$ and $\mathbf{M}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{k-1}, \cdot)$, that is, the two particle filter states:

$$(14) \quad (\mathbf{X}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k) \sim \text{MAXCOUPLE}(\mu_k^{\otimes N}, \tilde{\mu}_k^{\otimes N}).$$

For this algorithm, under (A1) as in the proof of Theorem 9, we have that if $k \geq O(\log N)$,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k \neq \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k) &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k \neq \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{k-1})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\|\mu_k - \tilde{\mu}_k\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - O(N^{-1}))^{2N}}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound above guarantees that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k \neq \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k)$ remains bounded away from zero for large N , unlike (13), which degrades to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Using maximal coupling particle filter states in this setting is novel to our knowledge, and can be implemented in practice: simulation from (14) can be implemented in (expected) $O(N^2)$ time like (12). One may view our contribution as demonstrating that (14) can be reasonable when (A1) holds and possibly more generally. In fact, the conditional coupling probability $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{k-1})$ of the filter state maximal coupling in (14) is guaranteed to be superior to that of (12). Moreover, setting $\mu = \mu_k^{\otimes N}$ and $\nu = \tilde{\mu}_k^{\otimes N}$ in Lemma 4, the term on the left and the upper bound in (1) coincide with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X}_k \neq \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k \mid \mathbf{X}_{k-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{k-1})$ of (14) and (12), respectively.

We stress that the discussion above is only about conditional probabilities, and they are upper bounds which might not be tight when the algorithms are iterated k steps. It would be interesting to investigate whether (12) or (14) is genuinely better

in relevant scenarios. Moreover, the multilevel context of [21] differs from what is discussed above, because there the particle filter dynamics are (slightly) different.

8. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have provided a new result in Theorem 3 on how quickly the particle filter forgets its initialisation. This is evidently a significant improvement over the result in Lemma 5, which was originally reported in [36]. We then gave an example in Section 4 where our forgetting rate was shown to be tight. A similar proof technique to Theorem 3 was then used to find the forgetting properties of the conditional particle filter (CPF) in Theorem 17.

Our new forgetting result for the particle filter could potentially be useful in improving the analysis of the bias of recursive maximum likelihood implemented with a particle filter [36]. Forgetting could also be a useful tool for the analysis of particle filter stability from a new viewpoint. For instance, our results apply for understanding long-term behaviour of particle filter estimates, which are not expectations of the empirical measures. Similar logarithmic ‘memory requirement’ has been reported also in the context of particle filter variance estimation [28], but it is unclear if there is a deeper connection to be explored.

Our forgetting result for the CPF is potentially useful in understanding its behaviour over long time horizons and for analysis of smoothing estimates [3]. Because the CPF can be viewed as a perturbation of the particle filter (see (7) and (8) in Section 5), we believe that our analysis could be extended to more general perturbations, which vanish suitably in the number of particles N . These (speculative) extensions are left for future work.

Finally, our results rely on strong mixing assumption, which is common in particle filter theory, but restrictive: in practice, this usually means a compact state space. In some cases, relaxed assumptions have been used; for instance, [39] use multiplicative drift to establish particle filter stability. It is a natural question whether our forgetting analysis could be elaborated to accommodate unbounded state spaces.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

JK and MV were supported by Research Council of Finland (Finnish Centre of Excellence in Randomness and Structures, grant 346311). AL was supported by EPSRC grant ‘CoSinES (Computational Statistical Inference for Engineering and Security)’ (EP/R034710/1). SSS gratefully acknowledges funding from the Tibra Capital Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, and R. Holenstein. Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 72(3):269–342, 2010.
- [2] O. Cappé, E. Moulines, and T. Rydén. *Inference in Hidden Markov Models*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, 2005.
- [3] G. Cardoso, Y. Janati El Idrissi, S. Le Corff, E. Moulines, and J. Olsson. State and parameter learning with PARIS particle Gibbs. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3625–3675, 2023.
- [4] F. Cérou, P. Del Moral, and A. Guyader. A nonasymptotic theorem for unnormalized Feynman–Kac particle models. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 47(3):629–649, 2011.
- [5] H. P. Chan and T. L. Lai. A general theory of particle filters in hidden Markov models and some applications. *Ann. Statist.*, 41(6):2877–2904, 2013.
- [6] N. Chopin. Central limit theorem for sequential Monte Carlo methods and its application to Bayesian inference. *Ann. Statist.*, 32(6):2385 – 2411, 2004.

- [7] N. Chopin and O. Papaspiliopoulos. *An introduction to sequential Monte Carlo*, volume 4 of *Springer Series in Statistics*. Springer, 2020.
- [8] N. Chopin and S. S. Singh. On particle Gibbs sampling. *Bernoulli*, 21(3): 1855–1883, 2015.
- [9] P. Del Moral. *Feynman-Kac formulae: Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications*, volume 88. Springer, 2004.
- [10] P. Del Moral, A. Doucet, and G. W. Peters. Sharp propagation of chaos estimates for Feynman–Kac particle models. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 51(3): 459–485, 2007.
- [11] P. Del Moral, A. Doucet, and S. S. Singh. A backward particle interpretation of Feynman–Kac formulae. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 44(5):947–975, 2010.
- [12] P. Del Moral, F. Patras, and S. Rubenthaler. Convergence of U-statistics for interacting particle systems. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 24:1002–1027, 2011.
- [13] P. Del Moral, A. Doucet, and S. S. Singh. Uniform stability of a particle approximation of the optimal filter derivative. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 53(3):1278–1304, 2015.
- [14] R. Douc and E. Moulines. Limit theorems for weighted samples with applications to sequential Monte Carlo methods. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(5):2344 – 2376, 2008.
- [15] R. Douc, A. Garivier, E. Moulines, and J. Olsson. Sequential Monte Carlo smoothing for general state space hidden Markov models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 21(6):2109–2145, 2011.
- [16] R. Douc, E. Moulines, P. Priouret, and P. Soulier. *Markov chains*. Springer, 2018.
- [17] N. J. Gordon, D. J. Salmond, and A. F. M. Smith. Novel approach to nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian state estimation. *IEE Proceedings-F*, 140(2):107–113, 1993.
- [18] A. Gregory, C. J. Cotter, and S. Reich. Multilevel ensemble transform particle filtering. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 38(3):A1317–A1338, 2016.
- [19] W. Hoeffding and J. Wolfowitz. Distinguishability of sets of distributions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 29(3):700–718, 1958.
- [20] P. E. Jacob, F. Lindsten, and T. B. Schön. Smoothing with couplings of conditional particle filters. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 115(530):721–729, 2020.
- [21] A. Jasra and F. Yu. Central limit theorems for coupled particle filters. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 52:942–1001, 2020.
- [22] A. Jasra, K. Kamatani, K. J. Law, and Y. Zhou. Multilevel particle filters. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 55(6):3068–3096, 2017.
- [23] N. Kantas, A. Doucet, S. S. Singh, J. Maciejowski, and N. Chopin. On particle methods for parameter estimation in state-space models. *Statist. Sci.*, 30(3): 328–351, 2015.
- [24] B. Kuhlenschmidt and S. S. Singh. Stability of conditional sequential Monte Carlo. Preprint arXiv:1806.06520, 2018.
- [25] A. Lee and N. Whiteley. Variance estimation in the particle filter. *Biometrika*, 105(3):609–625, 2018.
- [26] A. Lee, S. S. Singh, and M. Vihola. Coupled conditional backward sampling particle filter. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(5):3066–3089, 2020.
- [27] T. Lindvall. *Lectures on the coupling method*. Wiley, 1992. Reprint: Dover paperback edition, 2002.
- [28] A. Mastrototaro and J. Olsson. Adaptive online variance estimation in particle filters: the ALVar estimator. *Statist. Comput.*, 33(4):1–26, 2023.

- [29] P. Moral and A. Guionnet. Large deviations for interacting particle systems: Applications to non-linear filtering. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 78(1):69–95, 1998.
- [30] P. D. Moral and A. Guionnet. Central limit theorem for nonlinear filtering and interacting particle systems. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9(2):275 – 297, 1999.
- [31] J. Olsson and R. Douc. Numerically stable online estimation of variance in particle filters. *Bernoulli*, 25(2):1504–1535, 2019.
- [32] G. Poyiadjis, A. Doucety, and S. S. Singh. Particle approximations of the score and observed information matrix in state space models with application to parameter estimation. *Biometrika*, 98(1):65–80, 2011.
- [33] T. B. Schön, A. Wills, and B. Ninness. System identification of nonlinear state-space models. *Automatica*, 47(1):39–49, 2011.
- [34] D. Sen, A. H. Thiery, and A. Jasra. On coupling particle filter trajectories. *Statist. Comput.*, 28(2):461–475, 2018.
- [35] A. N. Shiryaev. *Probability*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1996. ISBN 0-387-94549-0.
- [36] V. Z. Tadić and A. Doucet. Asymptotic properties of recursive particle maximum likelihood estimation. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 67(3):1825–1848, 2021.
- [37] H. Thorisson. *Coupling, Stationarity, and Regeneration*. Springer, 2000.
- [38] M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [39] N. Whiteley. Stability properties of some particle filters. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(6):2500–2537, 2013.

APPENDIX

Lemma 28 (Le Cam's inequality). *For any probability measures μ and ν on E it holds that*

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}^2 \leq 1 - (1 - H^2(\mu, \nu))^2.$$

Proof. Let p and q be the densities of μ and ν w.r.t. a measure λ (such a measure always exists). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}}^2 &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \int |p(x) - q(x)| \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\int |p^{1/2}(x) - q^{1/2}(x)| \cdot |p^{1/2}(x) + q^{1/2}(x)| \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int |p^{1/2}(x) - q^{1/2}(x)|^2 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \cdot \int |p^{1/2}(x) + q^{1/2}(x)|^2 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} H^2(p, q) \left(2 + 2 \int p^{1/2}(x) q^{1/2}(x) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \right) \\ &= H^2(\mu, \nu) (2 - H^2(\mu, \nu)) = 1 - (1 - H^2(\mu, \nu))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $1 - H^2(\mu, \nu) = \int p^{1/2}(x) q^{1/2}(x) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x)$. \square

Lemma 29. *Let μ and ν be two random probability measures. If (A1) holds for a Markov kernel M , then*

$$\mathbb{E} H^2(\mu M, \nu M) \leq c' \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E} (|\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|^2),$$

where $c' = \frac{1}{8} (\bar{M}/\underline{M})^2$.

Proof. If M is a Markov kernel with density w.r.t. λ , we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbb{E} H^2(\mu M, \nu M) &= \int \mathbb{E} (|\sqrt{\mu M(x)} - \sqrt{\nu M(x)}|^2) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\leq \int \mathbb{E} (L^2 |\mu M(x) - \nu M(x)|^2) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\leq L^2 \int \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E} (|\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|^2) \text{osc}(M(\cdot, x))^2 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\leq L^2 \bar{M}^2 \int \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E} (|\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|^2) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= L^2 \bar{M}^2 \lambda(E) \sup_{\text{osc}(\phi) \leq 1} \mathbb{E} (|\mu(\phi) - \nu(\phi)|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the lower bound of $M(x, \cdot) \geq \underline{M} > 0$, and where $L = 1/\sqrt{4\underline{M}}$ is the Lipschitz constant of the function $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$ restricted to values $x \geq \underline{M}$. For the last part, we have the estimate

$$1 = M(y, E) = \int M(y, x) \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \geq \int \underline{M} \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) = \underline{M} \lambda(E),$$

hence $\lambda(E) \leq \underline{M}^{-1}$, and the result follows with

$$c' = \frac{1}{2} L^2 \bar{M}^2 \underline{M}^{-1} = \frac{1}{8} \frac{\bar{M}^2}{\underline{M}^2}. \quad \square$$

Remark 30. As implied by the proof, the constant in Lemma 29 can be (substantially) improved, when $\text{osc}(M(\cdot, x))$ is (much) smaller than \bar{M} .

Lemma 31. *Let $b > 1$, and define*

$$f(N) = (1 - (1 - b/N)^{2N})^{1/2}.$$

Then $f'(N) \leq 0$ for $N > b$.

Proof. Define

$$\begin{aligned} g(\varepsilon) &:= (1 - \varepsilon^2)^{1/2}, \\ h_b(N) &:= (1 - b/N)^N. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that $g'(\varepsilon) < 0$ for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, $h'_b(N) \geq 0$ for $N > b$, which follows from

$$h'_b(N) = (1 - b/N)^N \left(\frac{b}{(1 - b/N)N} + \log(1 - b/N) \right)$$

and the inequality $x/(1+x) \leq \log(1+x)$, $\forall x > -1$, with $x = -b/N$. Since $f(N) = g(h_b(N))$, the result follows. \square

Lemma 32. *Assume (A1). Then for all $n \geq 0$, $N \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\pi_n^N M_{n+1} - \pi_n M_{n+1}\|_{\text{TV}}] \leq \frac{c(1)}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \cdot \frac{\bar{M}}{\underline{M}} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{1/2}},$$

where $c(1)$ is given in Lemma 2.

Proof. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\pi_n^N M_{n+1} - \pi_n M_{n+1}\|_{\text{TV}}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \int |\pi_n^N M_{n+1}(x) - \pi_n M_{n+1}(x)| \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{E} [|\pi_n^N M_{n+1}(x) - \pi_n M_{n+1}(x)|] \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \|\pi_n^N M_{n+1}(x) - \pi_n M_{n+1}(x)\|_1 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \|\pi_n^N(f_x) - \pi_n(f_x)\|_1 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \cdot \int \frac{\bar{M}c(1)}{N^{1/2}} \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{\lambda(E)}{2} \cdot \frac{\bar{G}}{\underline{G}} \cdot \frac{\bar{M}c(1)}{N^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_x = z \mapsto M_{n+1}(z, x)$ satisfies $\text{osc}(f_x) \leq \bar{M}$ and we have used Lemma 2 and Lemma 8. Using the estimate $\lambda(E) \leq \underline{M}^{-1}$ as in Lemma 29, we may conclude. \square

We can complement this general upper bound with a lower bound, which for simplicity we state only for simple empirical measures as it is sufficient to make the point. In particular, in the setting of the following Lemma, we can deduce that the true rate is $O(N^{-1/2})$.

Lemma 33. *Let M be a transition probability density on E with respect to a measure λ , such that:*

- (i) $\bar{M} := \sup_{x,y} M(x, y) < \infty$ and
- (ii) $0 < \int \text{var}_\mu(M(\cdot, x))^{1/2} \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) < \infty$.

Then, there exist constants $0 < \underline{c} \leq \bar{c} < \infty$ such that for any distribution μ and its empirical measure $\mu^N = N^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^N \delta_{X^k}$ based on independent $X^1, \dots, X^N \sim \mu$:

$$\frac{\underline{c}}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \mathbb{E} [\|\mu^N M - \mu M\|_{\text{TV}}] \leq \frac{\bar{c}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Proof. We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\mu^N M - \mu M\|_{\text{TV}}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{2} \int |\mu^N M(x) - \mu M(x)| \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \mathbb{E} [|\mu^N M(x) - \mu M(x)|] \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \|\mu^N M(x) - \mu M(x)\|_1 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \|\mu^N(f_x) - \mu(f_x)\|_1 \lambda(\mathrm{d}x), \end{aligned}$$

where $f_x = z \mapsto M(z, x)$ and $\text{osc}(f_x) \leq \bar{M}$. We have

$$\|\mu^N(f_x) - \mu(f_x)\|_2^2 = \frac{\text{var}_\mu(f_x)}{N} \leq \frac{\bar{M}^2}{N},$$

and by the Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund inequality [e.g. 35] and $\text{osc}(f_x) \leq \bar{M}$, there is a universal constant $B_4 < \infty$ such that

$$\|\mu^N(f_x) - \mu(f_x)\|_4 \leq B_4 \left\| \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\frac{f_x(X^k) - \mu(f_x)}{N} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_4 \leq \frac{B_4 \bar{M}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

By Hölder’s inequality, for any non-negative random variable Z , $\|Z\|_2^2 = \|Z^{2/3} Z^{4/3}\|_1 \leq \|Z\|_1^{2/3} \|Z\|_4^{4/3}$, which leads to

$$\|Z\|_2^3 \|Z\|_4^{-2} \leq \|Z\|_1 \leq \|Z\|_2.$$

Applying this with $Z = |\mu^N(f_x) - \mu(f_x)|$ and the bounds above, we obtain

$$\frac{\text{var}_\mu(f_x)^{3/2}}{B_4^2 \bar{M}^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \|\mu^N(f_x) - \mu(f_x)\|_1 \leq \frac{\text{var}_\mu(f_x)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

The result follows as we integrate the lower and upper bounds with respect to λ . \square

JOONA KARJALAINEN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ
P.O.Box 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND

ANTHONY LEE, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, WOODLAND RD, BRISTOL
BS8 1UG, UNITED KINGDOM

SUMEETPAL S. SINGH, NIASRA, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND APPLIED STATISTICS, UNIVER-
SITY OF WOLLONGONG, NSW 2522, AUSTRALIA

MATTI VIHOLA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ
P.O.Box 35, FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND