

# ON THE LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR METROPOLIS-HASTINGS MARKOV CHAINS: THE LYAPUNOV FUNCTION CONDITION AND EXAMPLES

FEDERICA MILINANNI AND PIERRE NYQUIST

**ABSTRACT.** With an aim to analyse the performance of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, in our recent work [MN24] we derived a large deviation principle (LDP) for the empirical measures of Metropolis-Hastings (MH) chains on a continuous state space. One of the (sufficient) assumptions for the LDP involves the existence of a particular type of Lyapunov function, and it was left as an open question whether or not such a function exists for specific choices of MH samplers. In this paper we analyse the properties of such Lyapunov functions and investigate their existence for some of the most popular choices of MCMC samplers built on MH dynamics: Independent Metropolis Hastings, Random Walk Metropolis, and the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm. We establish under what conditions such a Lyapunov function exists, and from this obtain LDPs for some instances of the MCMC algorithms under consideration. To the best of our knowledge, these are the first large deviation results for empirical measures associated with Metropolis-Hastings chains for specific choices of proposal and target distributions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods have become ubiquitous across scientific disciplines as the standard tool for sampling from a given probability distribution. This is an essential problem in a range of different areas, from machine learning, to computational chemistry, to ecology, and MCMC methods are now integral in these areas and beyond.

The canonical MCMC method, and the central building block for many of the modern methods now being used, is the Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm [Met+53; Has70]; for formulations on more general state spaces, see, e.g., [Tie98; GKM23]. Examples of some of the most popular methods

---

(F. Milinanni) KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

(P. Nyquist) CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND UNIVERSITY OF  
GOTHENBURG

*E-mail addresses:* fedmil@kth.se, pnyquist@chalmers.se.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F10, 65C05; secondary 60G57, 60J05.

*Key words and phrases.* Large deviations, empirical measure, Markov chain Monte Carlo, Metropolis-Hastings, Lyapunov function, Independent Metropolis-Hastings, Random Walk Metropolis, Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm.

built on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm are the Independent Metropolis-Hastings (IMH) algorithm [Tie94; RC04], the Random Walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm [MT96] and the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (MALA) [Bes94; RT96a; RR98]. In principle, any MCMC method can be used to sample from essentially any target measure  $\pi$ , by generating an ergodic Markov chain  $\{X\}_{i \geq 0}$  with  $\pi$  as stationary measure. However, for many  $\pi$ , using a standard method, such as Metropolis-Hastings, can come with slow convergence and/or great computational cost for a desired accuracy. Performance analysis of MCMC methods has therefore become an important topic at the intersection of applied probability and (computational) statistics.

An important first step towards understanding the performance of a given MCMC method is an analysis of the convergence to the target  $\pi$ . Classical tools for such an analysis include the spectral gap of the associated dynamics, mixing times, asymptotic variance and functional inequalities (Poincaré, log-Sobolev); see, e.g., [BR08; Ros03; DHN00; Fra+10; Fri+93; HHS05]. Some important results on properties and performance of Metropolis-Hastings algorithms are given in [MT96; RT96a; RT96b; GGR97a; RR97; RR01; CRR05; GKM23]; see also the references therein. Adding to these classical results, and overall to the toolbox for analysing MCMC methods, in a series of recent papers [And+22; And+23; Pow+24], Andrieu, Lee, Power and Wang and co-authors use weak Poincaré inequalities to study convergence of discrete time Markov chains, aiming specifically at analysing various MCMC algorithms.

An important quantity in the study of MCMC methods, and for comparing their performance, is the convergence rate of time averages. At the heart of MCMC is the property that for an ergodic chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  with invariant distribution  $\pi$  and an observable  $f \in L^1(\pi)$ , the  $n$ -step averages  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(X_i)$  can be used to approximate  $\mathbb{E}_\pi[f(X)]$ . Such averages can in turn be viewed as integrals of  $f$  with respect to the empirical measures of the Markov process. The convergence of time averages is therefore intrinsically linked to the convergence of the empirical measures to  $\pi$ , and the latter can thus be used to understand the performance of the corresponding MCMC methods.

Starting with the study of parallel tempering in [Pla+11; Dup+12], because of the integral role the empirical measures play, in the past decade we have seen an increased interest in using the theory of large deviations for empirical measures to study MCMC methods. In addition to the original work on parallel tempering/infinite swapping by Doll, Dupuis and co-authors, the following are some other notable examples of using empirical measure large deviations in the MCMC setting: in [RS15a; RS15b; RS16] the convergence properties of certain reversible and irreversible Markov processes are studied using empirical measure large deviations, showing improved performance of non-reversible methods by probing the associated rate function;

in [Bie16] Bierkens considers a continuous-time Metropolis-Hastings algorithm on a finite state space and uses large deviations to prove improved convergence for an irreversible version of the method; for parallel tempering and infinite swapping, in [DDN18] Doll et al. use large deviation rate functions, combined with associated stochastic control problems, to analyse the convergence properties of the methods; in [BNS21] Bierkens et al. use empirical measure large deviations to study the zig-zag process, obtaining the first optimality result for the so-called switching rate in one dimension; in [DW22] Dupuis and Wu use empirical measure large deviations to solve a long-standing open problem on temperature selection for parallel tempering and infinite swapping in the low-temperature regime.

In our recent work [MN24], with a performance analysis of methods built on the Metropolis-Hastings mechanism in mind, we derive a large deviation principle (LDP) for the empirical measures of Metropolis-Hastings chains on a continuous state space; the results in fact hold for a general collection of discrete-time Markov processes whose transition kernels take on a particular form, of which Metropolis-Hastings is a special case. To the best of our knowledge this is the first large deviation result that covers Metropolis-Hastings chains, and [MN24] therefore opens the possibility for new analysis and insights into Metropolis-Hastings-type methods, similar to how empirical measure large deviations are used in the works described in the previous paragraph. However, the results in [MN24] are of a general type, in that they hold for any choice of proposal distribution that satisfy certain assumptions; the critical assumption in [MN24] is the existence of a particular type of Lyapunov function (see Assumption (A.3) in Section 2.4). For specific choices of proposal distribution, and for non-compact state spaces, showing whether or not such a Lyapunov function exists becomes a challenging task. By extension, for specific choices of proposal distribution it therefore remains an open question whether or not the LDP of [MN24] holds.

The aim of this work is to answer the question of existence of a Lyapunov function, and therefore give (partial) answers to the question of whether or not an LDP holds, for IMH, RWM and MALA, three of the most common MCMC methods based on the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. These three methods are staples within MCMC and there is a vast literature on their properties and use in various applications—the following are some of the most relevant existing (theoretical) results for the three methods: [MT96; AP07; Wan22; BJ24] (IMH); [MT96; RT96b; JH00; GGR97b; MPS12; HSV14; And+22] (RWM); [RT96a; RR98; RR01; CRR05; JLM14] (MALA). In this paper we study whether or not the assumptions used in [MN24] to obtain an LDP (see Section 2.4, specifically Assumption (A.3)) hold for the corresponding choices of proposal distributions. In the cases where the assumptions do hold, we obtain an LDP for the underlying empirical measures. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that studies LDPs for particular instances of Metropolis-Hastings algorithms when the state space is a (uncountable) subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The main results are Theorems 3.1 and 4.1,

stating an LDP for the IMH and MALA methods, respectively, and Proposition 5.1, stating that the necessary type of Lyapunov function cannot exist for any RWM algorithm.

Whether or not an empirical measure LDP holds for a given Markov process depends highly on the properties of the underlying transition kernel. This topic—large deviations for empirical measures of Markov processes—dates back to the pioneering work by Donsker and Varadhan [DV75a; DV75b; DV76]. Their results have been extended in numerous directions, for a general overview and further references see [DZ09; FK06; BD19]. In particular, the requirements on the underlying transition kernel for an LDP to hold have been generalised in different ways [DL15; KM03; KM05]. Despite these advances, prior to [MN24], none of the existing conditions cover Metropolis-Hastings chains, due to the rejection part in the kernel (see Section 2.3). In [MN24] we show that it is still possible to obtain an LDP, by extending previous work of Budhiraja and Dupuis [BD19], using the weak convergence method, to also cover a class of Markov processes that includes Metropolis-Hastings chains. This is but a first step towards a more general theory of large deviations for Metropolis-Hastings chains, and future work includes extending our results to more general state spaces, and to give less restrictive conditions for the LDP to hold. A specific topic arising from the results of this paper, in particular when combined with previous results such as [KM03; KM05], is the relationship between geometric ergodicity for the underlying Markov chain and whether or not an LDP holds. A concrete question, which is the topic of future work, is whether an LDP holds for the RWM in the setting where the underlying chain is geometrically ergodic. We show in Section 5 that the assumptions used in [MN24], and originally taken from [DE97; BD19], cannot hold for the RWM. However, to the best of our knowledge these assumptions are only sufficient, and whether or not an LDP can hold for certain instances of the RWM remains an open problem; see Section 6 for more details. In a similar vein, in [DGM08], building on previous work by de Acosta [Aco97], *moderate* deviations are considered for Markov chains exhibiting sub-geometric ergodicity. An interesting question is what the corresponding results are for Metropolis-Hastings-type chains when one only has sub-geometric convergence.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we provide the preliminaries needed for the subsequent sections: notation and definitions (Section 2.1); a brief overview of convergence and ergodicity of Markov chains (Section 2.2); a description of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Section 2.3); an overview of large deviations for empirical measures, including the results obtained in [MN24] (Section 2.4). In Section 2.5 we take a closer look at Assumption (A.3). We obtain in Lemma 2.1 an equivalent version of Part (b) of this assumption, more tailored to the MCMC setting. Using this result, we then consider Markov chains arising from the three common MCMC methods—Independent Metropolis-Hastings, Metropolis-adjusted Langevin Algorithm, and Random Walk Metropolis—in Sections

3, 4 and 5, respectively. Informed by the results obtained in these sections, and previous large deviation work such as [KM03; KM05], we end the paper with a brief discussion about LDPs for Metropolis-Hastings chains and geometric ergodicity in Section 6, summarising the results of the preceding sections; the open problems posed in this sections are topics for on-going and future work.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation and definitions.** Throughout the paper we work with some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The state space of the stochastic processes under consideration is denoted by  $S$ . In the Euclidean case, i.e., when  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ —for most of the paper we will consider the specific choice  $S = \mathbb{R}^d$ —for  $x, y \in S$ , we denote by  $\langle x, y \rangle$  the scalar product between the two vectors, and  $|x| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$  is the Euclidean norm of  $x$ .

Given a set  $A \subseteq S$ , let  $-A = \{x \in S : -x \in A\}$  and let  $A^\circ$  be the interior of  $A$ . We denote by  $x \mapsto I\{x \in A\}$  the *indicator function* of  $A$ .

We denote by  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  the space of probability measures on  $S$ , and by  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $S$ . When  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , if not otherwise specified, almost all and almost surely refer to the Lebesgue measure on  $S$ , which is denoted by  $\lambda$ ; for integration with respect to  $\lambda$ , we use the standard notation  $dx$  for  $\lambda(dx)$ . Given  $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(S^2)$ , let  $[\gamma]_1$  and  $[\gamma]_2$  denote the first and second marginal of  $\gamma$ , respectively. For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ , define

$$(2.1) \quad A(\mu) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(S^2) : [\gamma]_1 = [\gamma]_2 = \mu\}.$$

Given two probability measures  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ , we denote the *total variation distance* between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  by

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{TV} = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{B}(S)} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|.$$

For  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ , the *relative entropy* (with respect to  $\nu$ ) is defined as the map  $R(\cdot \parallel \nu) : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  given by

$$R(\mu \parallel \nu) = \begin{cases} \int_S \log \left( \frac{d\mu}{d\nu} \right) d\mu, & \mu \ll \nu, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $d\mu/d\nu$  denotes the *Radon-Nikodym* derivative of  $\mu$  with respect to  $\nu$  (when well-defined).

For a measurable space  $(Y, \mathcal{Y})$ , let  $q(y, dx)$  be a collection of probability measures on  $S$  parametrized by  $y \in Y$ :  $q(y, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  for  $y \in Y$ . Such a  $q$  is called a *stochastic kernel* on  $S$  given  $Y$  if, for every  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ ,  $y \mapsto q(y, A) \in [0, 1]$  is a measurable function. The *transition kernel* of a Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  taking values in  $S$  is a stochastic kernel  $q$ , such that the conditional distribution of  $X_{i+1}$  given  $X_i$  is  $q(X_i, \cdot)$ . The notation  $q^j(x, \cdot)$  is used for the  $j$ -th iterate of the transition kernel, i.e.,

$$q^j(x, A) = \mathbb{P}(X_{i+j} \in A | X_i = x).$$

Given a transition kernel  $q$ , a set  $C \subset S$  is called *small* if there exist  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a probability measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad q^j(x, A) \geq \varepsilon \nu(A),$$

for all  $x \in C$  and all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ .

For a measure  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  and a transition kernel  $q(x, dy)$ , we say that  $\mu$  is *invariant* for  $q$ , or for the corresponding Markov chain, if for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ ,

$$\mu(A) = \int_S q(x, A) \mu(dx).$$

Lastly, for  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  a Markov chain on  $S$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the associated *empirical measure*  $L^n \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  is defined as

$$(2.3) \quad L^n(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{X_i}(\cdot).$$

**2.2. Convergence and ergodicity of Markov chains.** Throughout this section we consider a Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  taking values in  $S$ , with transition kernel  $q$  and invariant distribution  $\pi$ . Much of the standard Markov chain theory (see, e.g., [MT09]) is concerned with studying convergence properties for the distribution of  $X_i$ , as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . If the initial state of the chain is  $X_0 = x_0$ , then the distribution of the  $i$ -th term in the chain is given by the  $i$ -th iterate of the transition kernel,

$$X_i \sim q^i(x_0, \cdot).$$

Questions about the convergence, or *ergodicity*, of the Markov chain can therefore be phrased in terms of  $q^i(x_0, \cdot)$ . The two notions of convergence considered in this paper are *uniform ergodicity* and *geometric ergodicity*.

**Definition 2.1.** The Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is *uniformly ergodic* if there exist  $R < \infty$  and  $r > 1$  such that

$$\|q^i(x_0, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} \leq Rr^{-i},$$

for all  $x_0 \in S$ .

Uniform ergodicity provides a strong form of convergence to the invariant distribution  $\pi$ . However, on continuous and unbounded state spaces it is often too strong, and a weaker notion of ergodicity is needed.

**Definition 2.2.** The Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is *geometrically ergodic* if there exist  $R : S \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  and  $r > 1$  such that

$$\|q^i(x_0, \cdot) - \pi\|_{TV} \leq R(x)r^{-i},$$

for  $\pi$ -almost every  $x_0 \in S$ .

See [MT09] for a more in-depth account of different forms of ergodicity of Markov chains, and associated convergence results. For the setting of this paper, the important point is that whereas uniform ergodicity is too strong

to hold for a large class of Markov chains arising in the MCMC context, geometric ergodicity is weak enough to hold much more widely.

A convenient way of establishing geometric ergodicity is via the *drift and minorization condition* (see, e.g., [MT09; Liv21]): geometric ergodicity of  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  is equivalent to the existence of a Lyapunov function  $V : S \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ ,  $\lambda < 1$ ,  $b < \infty$  and a small set  $C \subset S$  (see (2.2)) such that the following holds,

$$(2.4) \quad \int_S V(y)q(x, dy) \leq \lambda V(x) + bI\{x \in C\}.$$

In the literature on Markov processes, (2.4) is referred to as the drift condition and (2.2) as the minorization condition. As previously stated, combined they guarantee geometric ergodicity for the underlying Markov chain.

In this paper, for the large deviation results we are concerned with finding, or establishing that there cannot exist, a different type of Lyapunov functions, satisfying slightly different conditions than the drift condition; the details are given in Section 2.4 and onward. To facilitate comparison of the different criteria, it is useful to reformulate the drift condition (2.4) in terms of the function  $U = \log V : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . For this  $U$ , the condition (2.4) becomes

$$(2.5) \quad U(x) - \log \int_S e^{U(y)}q(x, dy) \geq -\log \left( \lambda + e^{-U(x)}bI\{x \in C\} \right).$$

**2.3. The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm.** We now give a brief description of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, introduced in [Met+53] and [Has70], which provides a way to generate a Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  on  $S$ , with a given target distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  as its invariant distribution. As indicated in Section 2.1, in this paper we consider state spaces  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ; see [Tie98] for extensions of the Metropolis-Hastings method to more general settings, including more abstract state spaces.

The key ingredient of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm is the *proposal distribution*  $J(\cdot|x) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ , which is assumed to be defined for all  $x \in S$ ; with a slight abuse of notation we denote by  $\pi(\cdot)$  and  $J(\cdot|x)$  both the measures and the corresponding probability density functions. Here we consider target and proposal distributions that have a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure:  $\pi \ll \lambda$  and  $J(\cdot|x) \ll \lambda$  for almost all  $x \in S$ .

The Metropolis-Hastings algorithm is as follows: Assume that at step  $i$ , the chain is in state  $x$ ,  $X_i = x$ . A proposal  $Y_{i+1}$  for the next value of the chain,  $X_{i+1}$ , is obtained by sampling from the proposal distribution  $J(\cdot|x)$ . This proposal is then accepted or rejected according to the *Hastings ratio*, defined as

$$(2.6) \quad \varpi(x, y) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)J(x|y)}{\pi(x)J(y|x)} \right\}.$$

That is, with probability  $\varpi(x, Y_{i+1})$ , we accept the proposal and set  $X_{i+1} = Y_{i+1}$ . Otherwise, with probability  $1 - \varpi(x, Y_{i+1})$ , we reject the proposal and

set  $X_{i+1} = x$ ; for a more detailed description and discussion see [And+03; AG07; RC04] and the references therein.

**2.3.1. The Metropolis-Hastings transition kernel.** In analysing both large deviation and ergodicity properties of Metropolis-Hastings chains, a central object is the associated transition kernels. For a Markov chain generated via the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, the transition kernel, which we henceforth denote by  $K$ , is of the form

$$(2.7) \quad K(x, dy) = a(x, y)dy + r(x)\delta_x(dy),$$

where  $a(x, y)$  is given by

$$(2.8) \quad a(x, y) = \varpi(x, y)J(y|x).$$

This term corresponds to moves that are proposed via  $J(\cdot|x)$ , and accepted with probability  $\varpi(x, y)$ . The second term on the right-hand side of (2.7) represents transitions to the current state, i.e., no move. This is caused by the proposed new state being rejected, which occurs with probability

$$(2.9) \quad r(x) = 1 - \int_S a(x, y)dy.$$

We henceforth refer to  $K$  on the form (2.7), for some proposal distribution  $J$ , as a *Metropolis-Hastings kernel*, or MH kernel. An important observation is that due to the definition of the Hastings ratio, and by extension the MH kernel  $K$ , under mild assumptions on  $J$  the corresponding Markov chain has  $\pi$  as its unique invariant distribution (see, e.g., [RC04] or [MN24]).

**2.4. Large deviation principle for the empirical measures of Metropolis-Hastings chains.** Consider a Markov chain  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  with state space  $S$ . We can define the associated sequence  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$  of empirical measures as in (2.3),

$$L^n(\cdot) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{X_i}(\cdot).$$

We say that the sequence  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1}$  satisfies a *large deviation principle* (LDP) with *speed*  $n$  and *rate function*  $I : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , if  $I$  is lower semi-continuous, has compact sub-level sets, and for any measurable set  $A \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} - \inf_{\mu \in A^\circ} I(\mu) &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(L^n \in A^\circ) \\ &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(L^n \in \bar{A}) \leq - \inf_{\mu \in \bar{A}} I(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, the inequalities suggest that, for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  and  $n$  large,

$$\mathbb{P}(L^n \approx \mu) \simeq \exp\{-nI(\mu)\}.$$



The definition of an LDP makes this statement rigorous in the limit  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For a thorough treatment of the theory of large deviations and its applications, well beyond the setting of Markov chains and MCMC considered in this paper, see, e.g., [DZ09; DE97; FK06; BD19] and references therein.

In our previous work [MN24] we consider Markov chains  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  generated via the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, described in Section 2.3, on a continuous state space that is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We prove that, under Assumptions (A.1)-(A.3), the sequence of associated empirical measures  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1}$  satisfies an LDP on  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  with speed  $n$  and rate function  $I : \mathcal{P}(S) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  given by

$$(2.10) \quad I(\mu) = \inf_{\gamma \in A(\mu)} R(\gamma \parallel \mu \otimes K),$$

where  $A(\mu)$  is defined in (2.1). It is useful to note, e.g., for applications to the analysis of MCMC methods, that the rate function in (2.10) admits alternative representations that are not based on relative entropy. Deriving such alternative representations, both in general and for specific choices of the MH transition kernel  $K$ , is the topic of on-going work.

The following are the assumptions and main result of [MN24]; see [MN24] for a longer discussion about interpretations and consequences, including potential alternative formulations, of the assumptions.

- (A.1)  $S$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and the target probability measure  $\pi$  is equivalent to  $\lambda$  on  $S$  (i.e.,  $\pi \ll \lambda$  and  $\lambda \ll \pi$ ). The probability density  $\pi(x)$  is a continuous function.
- (A.2) The proposal distribution  $J(\cdot|x)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the target measure  $\pi$  (i.e.,  $J(\cdot|x) \ll \pi$ ), for all  $x \in S$ . The probability density  $J(y|x)$  is a continuous and bounded function of  $x$  and  $y$ , and satisfies

$$J(y|x) > 0, \quad \forall (x, y) \in S^2.$$

- (A.3) There exists a function  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that the following properties hold:

- (a)  $\inf_{x \in S} [U(x) - \log \int_S e^{U(y)} K(x, dy)] > -\infty$
- (b) For each  $M < \infty$ , the set

$$\left\{ x \in S : U(x) - \log \int_S e^{U(y)} K(x, dy) \leq M \right\}$$

is a relatively compact subset of  $S$ .

- (c) For every compact set  $K \subset S$  there exists  $C_K < \infty$  such that

$$\sup_{x \in K} U(x) \leq C_K.$$

**Theorem 2.1** (Theorem 4.1 in [MN24]). *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be the MH chain from Section 2.3 and  $K(x, dy)$  the associated MH kernel. Let  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$  be the corresponding sequence of empirical measures. Under Assumptions (A.1)-(A.3),  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1}$  satisfies an LDP with speed  $n$  and rate function given by (2.10).*

Assumption (A.3) is always satisfied when the state space is bounded—for example, the function  $U \equiv 0$  fulfills properties (a)-(c). When the space  $S$  is non-compact, e.g., the case  $S = \mathbb{R}^d$  considered in this paper, it is not straightforward to show that there exists such a function  $U$ , satisfying all three properties of Assumption (A.3). Note that, in line with [DE97; BD19], we here refer to a function  $U$  that satisfies Assumption (A.3) as a Lyapunov function. This differs slightly from the standard Markov chain literature where, in the setting considered here, the term is often reserved for functions  $V$  appearing in the drift condition (2.4) associated with geometric ergodicity.

As outlined in Section 1, the aim of this work is to investigate whether or not the most restrictive assumption, Assumption (A.3), holds for some specific choices of proposal distributions  $J$ . When this is the case, we also obtain an LDP for the associated empirical measures by appealing to Theorem 2.1. Before moving to the three examples considered in this paper—IMH, MALA and RWM—in Section 2.5 we first obtain an equivalent formulation of Property (b), which is the most challenging part of the assumption, more amenable to analysis in the MCMC setting.

**2.5. Properties of Lyapunov functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying (A.3): a necessary and sufficient condition.** Establishing whether or not Assumption (A.3) holds is the most challenging step when using the results of [MN24] to obtain an LDP for specific choices of proposal distribution  $J$ , and by extension the MH kernel  $K$ . Therefore, before considering specific examples, in this section we inspect the assumption in some more detail. In particular, we obtain an equivalent formulation of the most demanding part, the relative compactness appearing in (b), that is tailored to the MCMC setting.

Given a function  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , we define  $F_U : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$(2.11) \quad F_U(x) = U(x) - \log \int_S e^{U(y)} K(x, dy).$$

Using this definition, we can reformulate Property (a) of Assumption (A.3) as

$$\inf_{x \in S} F_U(x) > -\infty,$$

and Property (b) now requires that the sub-level sets of  $F_U$  are relatively compact.

Note that  $F_U$  corresponds to the left-hand-side of (2.5) for the specific choice of kernel  $q = K$ . Thus, there is a direct link between the function  $F_U$  appearing in the large deviation context and the Lyapunov function  $V$  appearing in the drift condition (2.4) associated with the MH kernel  $K$ . We recall that geometric ergodicity is equivalent to the drift and minorization conditions, (2.4) and (2.2) respectively (see Chapter 15 in [MT09]), and thus the type of Lyapunov function used in [MN24] to prove an LDP for MH chains is intimately linked to those used in the Markov chain literature to establish geometric ergodicity; this is discussed more in Section 6.

As mentioned above, Property (b) is the more demanding part of (A.3). To streamline the study of this property for specific choices of MH dynamics, and thus the MH kernel  $K$ , in Lemma 2.1 we provide necessary and sufficient conditions on  $K$  and the function  $U$  that are equivalent to relative compactness of  $F_U$  but more amenable to analysis. This result will be used extensively in Sections 3-5, where we consider kernels  $K$  corresponding to IMH, MALA and RWM samplers.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For a given function  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , Property (b) in Assumption (A.3) holds if and only if the transition kernel  $K$ , defined in (2.7), satisfies*

$$(2.12) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1,$$

and  $U$  satisfies

$$(2.13) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy = 0.$$

It is worthwhile to emphasise here that the MH transition kernel  $K$ , and therefore also the function  $a$ , depends on the specific choice of target  $\pi$  and proposal density  $J$ , and that (2.12) is a property solely of  $K$ . That is, this property does not involve any choice of (potential) Lyapunov function  $U$ . Therefore, as we will see in the coming sections, for a specific choice of MH dynamics, it is possible to have (2.12) satisfied but there being no functions  $U$  that satisfies (2.13). We will also see examples where (2.12) is not satisfied and thus there is no need to look for a suitable Lyapunov function.

*Proof of Lemma 2.1.* From the definition (2.11) of  $F_U$ , Property (b) in Assumption (A.3) equivalent to  $F_U$  having relatively compact sub-level sets. Because we here consider  $S = \mathbb{R}^d$ , this in turn holds if and only if for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}$ , there exists an  $R > 0$  such that for all  $x$  in the sub-level set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : F_U(x) \leq M\}$ , we have that  $|x| \leq R$ . This is equivalent to the following statement: for all  $M \in \mathbb{R}$  there exists an  $R > 0$  such that for all  $x$  with norm  $|x| > R$ ,  $F_U(x) > M$  holds, i.e.,

$$(2.14) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} F_U(x) = +\infty.$$

Using the decomposition (2.7) of the transition kernel  $K(x, dy)$ ,  $F_U$  can be rewritten as

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} F_U(x) &= -\log \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} K(x, dy) \\ &= -\log \left( \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy + r(x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this we obtain that (2.14) is equivalent to

$$(2.16) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy + r(x) \right) = 0.$$

Because, by definition,  $a(x, y) \geq 0$  and  $r(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x, y \in S$ , (2.16) is equivalent to satisfying both (2.13) and  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} r(x) = 0$ . From the definition (2.9) of  $r(x)$ , the latter limit can be reformulated as (2.12). We conclude that (2.12) and (2.13) are necessary and sufficient conditions for the relative compactness of the sub-level sets of  $F_U(x)$ , and therefore for Property (b) in Assumption (A.3). ■

In the context of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, the measurable function  $r(x)$  represents the probability of rejecting a proposed state when the current state of the chain is  $x$ , while  $1 - r(x)$  is the probability of accepting the proposal. Thus, Lemma 2.1 indicates that  $1 - r(x)$ , the probability of accepting a state proposed from state  $x$ , converges to 1 as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ .

Equipped with Lemma 2.1, we are now ready to consider Assumption (A.3) for the three classes of samplers mentioned in Section 1: Independent Metropolis-Hastings (Section 3), the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (Section 4), and Random Walk Metropolis (Section 5).

### 3. INDEPENDENT METROPOLIS-HASTINGS ALGORITHM

The first choice of Metropolis-Hastings dynamics we consider is the Independent Metropolis-Hastings (IMH) algorithm [Tie94; RC04]; see also Section 1 for more general references about IMH and its theoretical properties. In the IMH algorithm, moves from a state  $x \in S$  are proposed with a proposal distribution  $J(\cdot|x)$  that is independent of  $x$ , i.e.  $J(dy|x) = \hat{J}(dy) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ . Let  $f(y)$  be the probability density of  $\hat{J}(dy)$ . With this choice of proposal distribution, the density  $a(x, y)$  of the acceptance part in the MH transition kernel  $K(x, dy)$  simplifies to

$$a(x, y) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} \right\} f(y).$$

We consider target and proposal distributions with densities of the form

$$\pi(x) \propto e^{-\eta|x|^\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) \propto e^{-\gamma|y|^\beta},$$

respectively, with  $\eta, \gamma, \alpha, \beta > 0$ . In Theorem 3.1 we prove an LDP for the IMH sampler for certain values of these hyperparameters.

We consider a target  $\pi$  and proposal  $f$  on these forms in order to facilitate comparison with the results presented in [MT96]. Therein, Mengersen and Tweedie show that the Markov chain generated through the algorithm is uniformly ergodic, and hence geometrically ergodic, if the proposal density is bounded below by a multiple of the target; otherwise even geometric ergodicity fails. In Proposition 3.1, we characterise the conditions on the parameters  $\eta, \gamma, \alpha, \beta$  that are necessary and sufficient for the existence of a Lyapunov function  $U$  satisfying Property (b) of (A.3). It turns out that these conditions correspond to the cases where the target density  $\pi$  has lighter tails than the proposal density  $f$ , i.e., precisely the cases where the IMH chain is

uniformly ergodic. The LDP in Theorem 3.1 is a direct corollary of Theorem 2.1 combined with Proposition 3.1.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Consider a target density  $\pi(x) \propto e^{-\eta|x|^\alpha}$  and the independent proposal density  $f(y) \propto e^{-\gamma|y|^\beta}$  in the Independent Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Suppose that either of the following holds:*

- i)  $\alpha = \beta$  and  $\eta > \gamma$ ,
- ii)  $\alpha \geq \beta$ .

*Then, the empirical measures of the associated Metropolis-Hastings chain satisfies an LDP with speed  $n$  and rate function  $I$  given by (2.10).*

**Proposition 3.1.** *Consider the target density  $\pi(x) \propto e^{-\eta|x|^\alpha}$  and the independent proposal density  $f(y) \propto e^{-\gamma|y|^\beta}$  in the Independent Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Assumption (A.3) is satisfied if and only if either of the following holds:*

- i)  $\alpha = \beta$  and  $\eta > \gamma$ ,
- ii)  $\alpha \geq \beta$ .

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Start by considering Property (b) in Assumption (A.3). By Lemma 2.1, this property is equivalent to satisfying both (2.12) and (2.13).

In the IMH case, limit (2.12) can be rewritten as

$$(3.1) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} \right\} f(y) dy = 1.$$

With our choice of  $\pi$  and  $f$  we have the following pointwise convergence:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} &= e^{-\eta|y|^\alpha + \gamma|y|^\beta} \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} e^{\eta|x|^\alpha - \gamma|x|^\beta} \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha < \beta, \text{ or } \alpha = \beta \text{ and } \eta < \gamma, \\ 1 & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \text{ and } \eta = \gamma, \\ +\infty & \text{if } \alpha > \beta, \text{ or } \alpha = \beta \text{ and } \eta > \gamma, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} \right\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha < \beta, \text{ or } \alpha = \beta \text{ and } \eta < \gamma, \\ 1 & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \text{ and } \eta \geq \gamma, \text{ or } \alpha > \beta. \end{cases}$$

Because  $f$  is, by definition, a probability density, by dominated convergence the limit in (3.1), and therefore the first condition (2.12) in Lemma 2.1), is satisfied if and only if

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} \right\} = 1,$$

i.e. if and only if  $\alpha = \beta$  and  $\eta \geq \gamma$ , or  $\alpha > \beta$ .

We will now show that by choosing  $U(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta$ , the limit (2.13) in Lemma 2.1 is satisfied for any choice of  $\eta, \gamma, \alpha, \beta > 0$ . Therefore, using the

above results related to verifying the limit (2.12), we have that Property (b) in Assumption (A.3) is satisfied if and only if  $\alpha = \beta$  and  $\eta \geq \gamma$ , or  $\alpha > \beta$ .

Let  $C \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(y) = Ce^{-\gamma|y|^\beta}$ . If  $U(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta$ , the limit in (2.13) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)f(x)}{\pi(x)f(y)} \right\} f(y) dy \\ & \leq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} \cdot 1 \cdot Ce^{-\gamma|y|^\beta} dy \\ & = C \int_S e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta} dy \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $U(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta$  satisfies Property (b) in Assumption (A.3).

We proceed by showing that this choice of  $U(x)$  also satisfies Property (a). Because  $a(x, y) \leq f(y) = Ce^{-\gamma|y|^\beta}$  and  $r(x) \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in S} F_U(x) &= \inf_{x \in S} \left\{ -\log \left( \int_S e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} a(x, y) dy + r(x) \right) \right\} \\ &\geq -\sup_{x \in S} \left\{ \log \left( \int_S e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta - \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} \cdot Ce^{-\gamma|y|^\beta} dy + 1 \right) \right\} \\ &= -\log \left( C \int_S e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta} dy \cdot \sup_{x \in S} e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta} + 1 \right) \\ &= -\log \left( C \int_S e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}|y|^\beta} dy \cdot 1 + 1 \right) > -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $U(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta$  satisfies Property (a) in Assumption (A.3).

Lastly, since  $U(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2}|x|^\beta$  is continuous, it is bounded on every compact set, hence it also satisfies Property (c) in (A.3). This completes the proof. ■

#### 4. METROPOLIS-ADJUSTED LANGEVIN ALGORITHM

In this section we consider the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (MALA) [Bes94; RT96a], which is characterised by the following proposal density

$$J(y|x) = C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - x - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \nabla \log \pi(x) \right|^2 \right\}.$$

This proposal is obtained by a discretisation with step size  $\varepsilon > 0$  of the continuous-time Langevin process  $X = \{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , defined by

$$dX_t = \frac{1}{2} \nabla \log \pi(X_t) dt + dB_t,$$

where  $B_t$  denotes the standard  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion.

The aim of the section is to prove necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a Lyapunov function  $U(x)$  satisfying Assumption (A.3) when the target density is

$$(4.1) \quad \pi(x) \propto e^{-\gamma|x|^\beta},$$

with  $\beta > 0$ . In this case the corresponding MALA proposal density is given by

$$(4.2) \quad J(y|x) = C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right\}.$$

Such necessary and sufficient conditions are obtained in Proposition 4.1. Similar to the results for IMH in Section 3, combined with the large deviation result in [MN24], Proposition 4.1 yields the following LDP for the empirical measure of the MH chain with MALA proposal.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider a target density  $\pi(x) \propto e^{-\gamma|x|^\beta}$  and let  $J(y|x)$  be the corresponding MALA proposal density with discretization step  $\varepsilon$ ,*

$$J(y|x) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right\}.$$

*Suppose that either of the following holds,*

- i)  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ ,*
- ii)  $1 < \beta < 2$ .*

*Then, the empirical measures of the associated Metropolis-Hastings chain satisfy an LDP with speed  $n$  and rate function  $I$  given by (2.10).*

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is an immediate consequence of combining Theorem 2.1 with the following result, the proof of which is the main focus of this section.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let the target density be  $\pi(x) \propto e^{-\gamma|x|^\beta}$  and let  $J(y|x)$  be the corresponding MALA proposal density (4.2) with discretisation step  $\varepsilon$ . Assumption (A.3) is satisfied if and only if either of the following holds:*

- i)  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ ,*
- ii)  $1 < \beta < 2$ .*

We split the proof of Proposition 4.1 into a series of Lemmas, considering different ranges of the parameter values.

Before embarking on the proof, we compare the results of Proposition 4.1 to the analysis of the MALA algorithm in [RT96a]. Therein, Roberts and Tweedie analyse one-dimensional target distributions  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  with density

$$\pi(x) \propto e^{-\gamma|x|^\beta}, \quad |x| > |x_0|,$$

for some  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\gamma > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$ . Thus, in the case of  $d = 1$ , the tail behaviour is the same as in Proposition 4.1. The result of their analysis states that the MALA Markov chain is geometrically ergodic when  $1 < \beta < 2$ , and when  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ . These are precisely the cases in Proposition 4.1 for which a Lyapunov function exists, and therefore the LDP in Theorem 4.1 holds. In [RT96a] it is also shown that the Markov chain associated with MALA, with the given forms of  $\pi$  and  $J$ , is not geometrically ergodic when  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\beta > 2$  or  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma \geq 2$ . For the same

values of parameters  $\beta, \gamma$  and  $\varepsilon$ , Proposition 4.1 states that there does not exist a function  $U$  satisfying Assumption (A.3). For the remaining case,  $\beta = 1$ , Roberts and Tweedie cite an argument by Meyn and Tweedie [MT09] showing that the resulting Markov chain is geometrically ergodic for positive  $x$ . However, we show here that when  $\beta = 1$  there cannot exist a function  $U$  as in Assumption (A.3).

Results similar to those of [RT96a] can be obtained also for arbitrary dimensions  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  by applying the results from [RZ23], where Roy and Zhang provide sufficient conditions for geometric ergodicity of Markov chains arising from MALA. If we apply their results (Theorem 1 in [RZ23]) to the setting of Proposition 4.1, we obtain that if the conditions *i*) and *ii*) are satisfied, then the MALA chain is geometrically ergodic. In addition, by the same theorem, when  $\beta = 1$ , if the product  $\sqrt{\varepsilon}\gamma$  is sufficiently large, the sufficient conditions for geometric ergodicity hold. Consistent with the one-dimensional case, this is an example where the MALA chain is geometrically ergodic, but Assumption (A.3) is not satisfied. Moreover, in the same paper necessary conditions for geometrical ergodicity are also derived. Using such results (Theorem 4 in [RZ23]) we establish that if  $\beta > 2$ , or  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma > 2$  (cases where Assumption (A.3) does not hold) the MALA chain is not geometrically ergodic.

Throughout this section we will use the following quantities repeatedly: for  $x, t \in S$ , let

$$(4.3) \quad y(x, t) = t + x - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2}|x|^{\beta-2}x,$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} g(x, t) = & -\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{2}\right) (|y(x, t)|^\beta - |x|^\beta) \\ & - \frac{\varepsilon}{8}(\gamma\beta)^2 (|y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2}) \\ & - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} (|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

With this definition for  $y(x, t)$ , we have

$$(4.5) \quad \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle = |x|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2}|x|^\beta + \langle t, x \rangle.$$

We take the first step towards a proof of Proposition 4.1 by deriving, in Lemma 4.1, a condition on  $g(x, t)$  that is equivalent to the necessary condition (2.12) in Lemma 2.1. Next, we analyse conditions (2.12) and (2.13), the former via Lemma 4.1, for different ranges of the parameters  $\beta, \gamma$  and  $\varepsilon$ . In Lemmas 4.2-4.3 we show that for  $\beta \in (0, 1]$ , condition (2.12) holds but there does not exist a function  $U$  satisfying (2.13). Next, in Lemmas 4.4-4.5 we consider the necessary condition (2.12) for  $\beta \in (1, 2)$  and  $\beta = 2$ , respectively. In Lemma 4.6, for  $\beta \in (1, 2]$  and  $\gamma, \varepsilon$  such that (2.12) holds, we construct a Lyapunov function  $U$  satisfying Assumption (A.3). Lastly,



in Lemma 4.5, we show that for  $\beta > 2$ , even the condition (2.12) related to the MH kernel is violated and there cannot exist such a Lyapunov function. Proposition 4.1 is an immediate consequence of the combination of these lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.** *The necessary condition (2.12) in Lemma 2.1 is satisfied if and only if, for almost all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$(4.6) \quad \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} g(x, t) \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Given the choice of target (4.1) and the corresponding MALA proposal (4.2), the density (2.8) of the acceptance part of the Markov transition kernel  $K(x, dy)$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} a(x, y) = \min & \left\{ 1, \exp \left\{ -\gamma(|y|^\beta - |x|^\beta) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left( \left| x - y + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |y|^{\beta-2} y \right|^2 - \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right) \right\} \right\} \\ & \times C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The term coming from the ratio  $J(x|y)/J(y|x)$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| x - y + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |y|^{\beta-2} y \right|^2 - \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \\ &= |x - y|^2 + \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 |y|^{2\beta-2} + \varepsilon\gamma\beta |y|^{\beta-2} (\langle x, y \rangle - |y|^2) \\ & \quad - |y - x|^2 - \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 |x|^{2\beta-2} - \varepsilon\gamma\beta |x|^{\beta-2} (\langle x, y \rangle - |x|^2) \\ &= \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 (|y|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2}) - \varepsilon\gamma\beta (|y|^\beta - |x|^\beta) \\ & \quad + \varepsilon\gamma\beta (|y|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
a(x, y) = \min & \left\{ 1, \exp \left\{ -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) (|y|^\beta - |x|^\beta) \right. \right. \\
& - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\gamma\beta)^2 (|y|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2}) \\
& \left. \left. - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} (|y|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y \rangle \right\} \right\} \\
& \times C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the change of variables

$$t = y - x + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_S a(x, y) dy &= \int_S \min \left\{ 1, \exp \left\{ -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) (|y(x, t)|^\beta - |x|^\beta) \right. \right. \\
& - \frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\gamma\beta)^2 (|y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2}) \\
(4.7) \quad & \left. \left. - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} (|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle \right\} \right\} \hat{J}(t) dt, \\
&= \int_S \min \{ 1, \exp \{ g(x, t) \} \} \hat{J}(t) dt
\end{aligned}$$

where  $y(x, t)$  is given by (4.3), and  $\hat{J}(t) = C \exp \{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} |t|^2 \}$  is a probability density. By dominated convergence, the necessary condition (2.12) is satisfied if and only if

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \min \{ 1, \exp \{ g(x, t) \} \} = 1,$$

which is equivalent to (4.6). ■

To study the limit of  $g(x, t)$ , as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , for different values of  $\beta$ , we analyse the behaviour of  $|y(x, t)|^\alpha - |x|^\alpha$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\alpha = \beta$ ,  $2\beta - 2$ , and  $\beta - 2$ . For this purpose, observe that, from the definition (4.3) of  $y(x, t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
|y(x, t)|^2 &= |t|^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right)^2 |x|^2 + 2 \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right) \langle t, x \rangle \\
(4.8) \quad &= |x|^2 \left( 1 - \varepsilon\gamma\beta |x|^{\beta-2} + \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 |x|^{2(\beta-2)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{|t|^2}{|x|^2} + 2 \left\langle \frac{t}{|x|}, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle - \varepsilon\gamma\beta |x|^{\beta-3} \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It will also be useful to consider the Taylor expansion

$$(4.9) \quad (1 + s)^\alpha = 1 + \alpha s + o(s),$$

for  $|s| < 1$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $0 < \beta < 1$ . Then,*

$$(4.10) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1.$$

However, there does not exist a function  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(4.11) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(y) - U(x)} a(x, y) dy = 0.$$

*Proof.* We will use Lemma 4.1 to show (4.10). For  $0 < \beta < 1$ , as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , (4.8) behaves as

$$|y(x, t)|^2 = |x|^2 \left( 1 + 2 \left\langle \frac{t}{|x|}, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle + o(|x|^{-1}) \right).$$

Using the Taylor expansion (4.9) with  $s = 2\langle t, x \rangle / |x|^2 + o(|x|^{-1})$ , then for  $\alpha = \beta/2$  we obtain

$$|y(x, t)|^\beta = |x|^\beta \left( 1 + \beta \left\langle \frac{t}{|x|}, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle + o(|x|^{-1}) \right),$$

and for  $\alpha = (\beta - 2)/2$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} = |x|^{\beta-2} \left( 1 + (\beta - 2) \left\langle \frac{t}{|x|}, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle + o(|x|^{-1}) \right).$$

Note that the term  $-\frac{\varepsilon}{8}(\gamma\beta)^2 (|y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2})$  in (4.4) is negligible as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  for the values of  $\beta$  considered here. Recalling the inner product (4.5), the limit (4.6) in Lemma 4.1 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) (|y(x, t)|^\beta - |x|^\beta) - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} (|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle \right] \\ &= \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \left( \beta |x|^{\beta-1} \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} \left( (\beta - 2) |x|^{\beta-3} \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) \left( |x|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^\beta + \langle t, x \rangle \right) \right] \\ &= \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \varepsilon \left( \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 (\beta - 2) |x|^{2\beta-3} \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} (\beta - 2) |x|^{\beta-2} \left( \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right)^2 \right] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} g(x, t) \geq 0$  for almost all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and by Lemma 4.1 we have  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1$ .

We now proceed by proving by contradiction that a Lyapunov function  $U$  that satisfies (4.11) cannot exist. Assume that  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfies (4.11). By applying the change of variable  $w = y - x$  this is equivalent to

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(x+w)-U(x)} a(x, x+w) dw \\ &= \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(x)} \int_S e^{U(x+w)} \varpi(x, x+w) J(x+w|x) dw, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J(x+w|x) &= C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| w + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} x \right|^2 \right\} \\ &= C \exp \left\{ -\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon} - \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-1} \left\langle w, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma^2\beta^2}{8} |x|^{2\beta-2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for a fixed  $w \in S$ , as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(4.13) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} J(x+w|x) = C e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon}}.$$

Fix a direction  $v \in S$ , with  $|v| = 1$ , and let  $x = \rho v$ . Then, if (4.12) holds, we have

$$(4.14) \quad \lim_{\rho \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-U(\rho v)} \int_S e^{U(\rho v+w)} \varpi(\rho v, \rho v+w) J(\rho v+w|\rho v) dw = 0.$$

The following type of construction, and calculations following it, will be used multiple times in the paper. Define the terms in the sequence  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$  according to

$$U_n = \inf_{\rho \geq n} U(\rho v).$$

For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $\rho_n \geq n$  such that

$$(4.15) \quad 0 \leq U(\rho_n v) < U_n + \varepsilon.$$

We define a sequence  $\{\rho_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [1, \infty)$  with terms  $\rho_n$  that satisfy (4.15) for each  $n$ . By construction,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n = +\infty$ , therefore (4.14) implies

$$(4.16) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(\rho_n v)} \int_S e^{U(\rho_n v+w)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v+w) J(\rho_n v+w|\rho_n v) dw = 0.$$

Define the set

$$(4.17) \quad H = \{w : \langle w, v \rangle \geq 0\} \subset S.$$

Observe that if  $w \in H$ , then for each  $n$ ,

$$|\rho_n v + w| = \sqrt{\rho_n^2 + |w|^2 + 2\rho_n \langle w, v \rangle} \geq |\rho_n| \geq n$$

and therefore, from the definition of  $U_n$ ,

$$(4.18) \quad U(\rho_n v + w) \geq U_n.$$

Recall that  $\varpi(x, y) \leq 1$  for all  $x, y \in S$ . Then

$$(4.19) \quad \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \leq \int_H J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw.$$

By dominated convergence and (4.13),

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw &= \int_H \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\ &= \int_H C e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon}} dw = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Equations (4.19) and (4.20) combined imply

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

In the other direction, using that  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1$  (shown above), we obtain the asymptotic lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\ &= 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S \setminus H} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\ &\geq 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S \setminus H} J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\ &= 1 - \int_{S \setminus H} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\ &= 1 - \int_{S \setminus H} C e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon}} dw. \end{aligned}$$

From (4.20) and symmetry of the standard  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian distribution, we have

$$\int_{S \setminus H} C e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon}} dw = \int_H C e^{-\frac{|w|^2}{2\varepsilon}} dw = \frac{1}{2}$$

This proves that

$$(4.21) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, from (4.15), (4.18) and (4.21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(\rho_n v + w) - U(\rho_n v)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} \int_S e^{U(\rho_n v + w)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} \int_H e^{U(\rho_n v + w)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} e^{U_n} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& = e^{-\varepsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& = \frac{e^{-\varepsilon}}{2} > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (4.16), and using Lemma 2.1 we conclude that a Lyapunov function  $U$  satisfying (4.11) cannot exist.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\beta = 1$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1.$$

However, there does not exist a function  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  such that

$$(4.22) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(y) - U(x)} a(x, y) dy = 0.$$

*Proof.* When  $\beta = 1$ ,  $g(x, t)$ , as defined in (4.4), becomes

$$(4.23) \quad g(x, t) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} (|y(x, t)| - |x|) - \frac{\gamma}{2} (|y(x, t)|^{-1} - |x|^{-1}) \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle.$$

Moreover, from (4.8), as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  and with  $\beta = 1$ ,  $|y(x, t)|^2$  behaves as

$$|y(x, t)|^2 = |x|^2 \left( 1 + |x|^{-1} \left( -\varepsilon\gamma + 2 \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) + o(|x|^{-1}) \right).$$

Using the Taylor expansion (4.9) with  $s = |x|^{-1} (-\varepsilon\gamma + 2 \langle t, x \rangle / |x|) + o(|x|^{-1})$ , for  $\alpha = 1/2$  we have

$$|y(x, t)| = |x| \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} |x|^{-1} \left( -\varepsilon\gamma + 2 \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) + o(|x|^{-1}) \right),$$

and for  $\alpha = -1/2$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^{-1} = |x|^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2} |x|^{-1} \left( -\varepsilon\gamma + 2 \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) + o(|x|^{-1}) \right).$$

Moreover, recalling the inner product (4.5), the limit in (4.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ -\frac{\gamma}{2} \left( -\frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} + \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{\gamma}{2} |x|^{-2} \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} - \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right) \left( |x|^2 + \langle t, x \rangle - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} |x| \right) \right] \\ & = \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma}{2} |x|^{-1} \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} - \left\langle t, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right)^2 \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, this implies that  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1$ .

To show that there cannot exist a function  $U$  satisfying (4.22), we now follow the same strategy as in Lemma 4.2. Suppose that there is such a function. With the change of variable  $w = y - x$ , the proposal density takes the form

$$J(x + w|x) = C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| w + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} \frac{x}{|x|} \right|^2 \right\}.$$

Because the proposal depends on  $x/|x|$ , fix a direction  $v \in S$ , with  $|v| = 1$  and consider  $x = \rho v$ ,  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then,

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} J(\rho v + w|\rho v) = C \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| w + \frac{\varepsilon\gamma}{2} v \right|^2 \right\}.$$

Similar to Lemma 4.2, define the sequence  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  according to

$$U_n = \inf_{\rho \geq n} U(\rho v).$$

For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can extract a sequence  $\{\rho_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\rho_n \geq n$  and

$$0 \leq U(\rho_n v) < U_n + \varepsilon.$$

Then  $\rho_n \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and by the assumption on  $U$ ,

$$(4.24) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(\rho_n v)} \int_S e^{\rho_n v \cdot w} \varpi(\rho_n v, \varpi_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w|\rho_n v) dw = 0,$$

with  $\varpi$  and  $J$  associated with the MALA density with  $\beta = 1$ . With  $H$  defined as in (4.17), an argument analogous to that used in Lemma 4.2, for a fixed direction  $v$ , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w|\rho_n v) dw = c$$

for some  $0 < c < 1$ ; the difference compared to Lemma 4.2 is that the limit of  $J$  is no longer the density of a centred Gaussian distribution, why the

mass on  $H$  is not  $1/2$  but rather some  $c \in (0, 1)$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(\rho_n v + w) - U(\rho_n v)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} \int_S e^{U(\rho_n v + w)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} \int_H e^{U(\rho_n v + w)} \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} e^{U_n} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& = e^{-\varepsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_H \varpi(\rho_n v, \rho_n v + w) J(\rho_n v + w | \rho_n v) dw \\
& = ce^{-\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $ce^{-\varepsilon} > 0$ , this contradicts the assumption that  $U$  satisfies (4.24). By extension,  $U$  cannot satisfy (4.22), which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $1 < \beta < 2$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1.$$

*Proof.* To prove the claim we will once again rely on Lemma 4.1. From the definition of  $y(x, t)$  and (4.8), when  $1 < \beta < 2$  and as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^2 = |x|^2 \left( 1 - \varepsilon \gamma \beta |x|^{\beta-2} + o(|x|^{\beta-2}) \right).$$

Using the Taylor expansion (4.9) with  $s = -\varepsilon \gamma \beta |x|^{\beta-2} + o(|x|^{\beta-2})$ , we obtain that for  $\alpha = \beta/2$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^\beta = |x|^\beta \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma \beta^2}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} + o(|x|^{\beta-2}) \right),$$

and for  $\alpha = (\beta - 2)/2$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} = |x|^{\beta-2} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma \beta (\beta - 2)}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} + o(|x|^{\beta-2}) \right).$$

Using (4.5) for the inner product  $\langle x, y(x, t) \rangle$ ,  $g(x, t)$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
g(x, t) &= -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) (|y(x, t)|^\beta - |x|^\beta) - \frac{\gamma \beta}{2} (|y(x, t)|^{\beta-2} - |x|^{\beta-2}) \langle x, y(x, t) \rangle \\
&= -\gamma \left( 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} \right) \left( -\frac{\varepsilon \gamma \beta^2}{2} |x|^{2\beta-2} \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma \beta}{2} \left( -\frac{\varepsilon \gamma \beta (\beta - 2)}{2} |x|^{2\beta-4} \right) \left( |x|^2 - \frac{\varepsilon \gamma \beta}{2} |x|^\beta + \langle t, x \rangle \right) \\
&= -\varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{\gamma \beta}{2} \right)^3 (\beta - 2) |x|^{3\beta-4} + \varepsilon \left( \frac{\gamma \beta}{2} \right)^2 (\beta - 2) |x|^{2\beta-4} \langle t, x \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$



Note that

$$-\varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^3 (\beta - 2)|x|^{3\beta-4} \geq 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon \left( \frac{\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 (\beta - 2)|x|^{2\beta-4} \langle t, x \rangle,$$

for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . As a consequence,  $\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} g(x, t) \geq 0$ , and by Lemma 4.1 we obtain the desired limit.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\beta = 2$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1$$

*if and only if  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ .*

*Proof.* When  $\beta = 2$ ,  $|y(x, t)|^2$  becomes (see (4.8))

$$|y(x, t)|^2 = |x|^2 \left( 1 - 2\varepsilon\gamma + (\varepsilon\gamma)^2 + \frac{|t|^2}{|x|^2} + 2(1 - \varepsilon\gamma) \left\langle \frac{t}{|x|}, \frac{x}{|x|} \right\rangle \right).$$

If we restrict to the two cases  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma > 2$ , the limit of  $g(x, t)$ , as defined in (4.4), simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \gamma^2 (|y(x, t)|^2 - |x|^2) &= -\frac{\varepsilon^2 \gamma^3}{2} (\varepsilon\gamma - 2) \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } \varepsilon\gamma < 2, \\ -\infty, & \text{if } \varepsilon\gamma > 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, when  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ , (4.6) holds and, by Lemma 4.1,

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy = 1.$$

On the other hand, when  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma > 2$ , the limit in (4.6) is negative, and the claim again follows from Lemma 4.1.

It remains to consider the case  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma = 2$ . With these parameter values,

$$|y(x, t)|^2 - |x|^2 = |t|^2 - 2\langle t, x \rangle,$$

and the sign of  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \gamma^2 (|y(x, t)|^2 - |x|^2)$  depends on the direction  $x/|x|$ . Take a direction  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|v| = 1$ , set  $x = \rho v$  with  $\rho \geq 0$ , and consider the limit in the direction  $v$ . Let  $H_v^-$  and  $H_v^+$  be the half-spaces of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  defined as  $H_v^- = \{t : \langle t, v \rangle < 0\}$  and  $H_v^+ = \{t : \langle t, v \rangle > 0\}$ . Then,

$$\lim_{\rho \rightarrow +\infty} -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \gamma^2 (|y(\rho v, t)|^2 - |\rho v|^2) = \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \gamma^2 (|t|^2 - 2\rho \langle t, v \rangle) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } t \in H_v^-, \\ +\infty & \text{if } t \in H_v^+. \end{cases}$$

Recall the expression (4.7) for  $\int_S a(x, y)dy$  and observe that  $\int_{H_v^-} \hat{J}(t)dt = \int_{H_v^+} \hat{J}(t)dt = 1/2$ . Combined, for the choice  $x = \rho v$ , this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(\rho v, y)dy &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \min \{1, \exp \{g(\rho v, t)\}\} \hat{J}(t)dt \\ &= \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_{H_v^-} \min \{1, \exp \{g(\rho v, t)\}\} \hat{J}(t)dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{H_v^+} \min \{1, \exp \{g(\rho v, t)\}\} \hat{J}(t)dt \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 1 = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This limit is independent of the direction  $v$  and it follows that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y)dy = \frac{1}{2} \neq 1.$$

We thus conclude that the limit does not hold when  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma = 2$ , which completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

We now prove the positive part of Proposition 4.1: that a Lyapunov function satisfying the desired properties exists when either  $\beta \in (1, 2)$  or  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *If  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ , or  $1 < \beta < 2$  there exists a function  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  that satisfies Assumption (A.3).*

*Proof.* We will show that the specific choice  $U(x) = \frac{|x|^2}{4\varepsilon}$  satisfies Assumption (A.3) for the given ranges of  $\beta, \varepsilon, \gamma$ .

First, we note that by continuity  $U(x)$  satisfies Property (c).

Next, we prove that Property (b) holds for this choice of  $U$ . By Lemma 2.1, this property is equivalent to the limits (2.12) and (2.13), the first of which was shown to hold for the parameter values considered here in Lemmas 4.4-4.5. It therefore remains to show that this choice of  $U$  also satisfies (2.13).

Because  $a(x, y) \leq J(y|x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y)dy &\leq \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} J(y|x)dy. \\ &= C \int_S \exp \left\{ \frac{|y|^2}{4\varepsilon} - \frac{|x|^2}{4\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left| y - \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right) x \right|^2 \right\} dy \\ &= C \exp \left\{ -\frac{|x|^2}{4\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right)^2 |x|^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \times \int_S \exp \left\{ -\frac{|y|^2}{4\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right) \langle y, x \rangle \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the integral in the previous display,

$$\int_S \exp \left\{ -\frac{|y|^2}{4\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} |x|^{\beta-2} \right) \langle y, x \rangle \right\} dy.$$

This integral is finite for every  $x \in S$  and behaves as  $O(e^{|x|})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy \leq 0,$$

and, because the left hand side is always non-negative, the limit (2.13) follows.

We finish the proof by showing that Property (a) holds for  $U = |x|^2/4\varepsilon$ . Recalling (2.15), we can rewrite Property (a) as

$$\inf_{x \in S} -\log \left( \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy + r(x) \right) > -\infty.$$

This is equivalent to

$$(4.25) \quad \sup_{x \in S} \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy + r(x) < +\infty.$$

Because (2.13) holds and  $r(x) \in [0, 1]$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S e^{U(y)-U(x)} a(x, y) dy + r(x) < +\infty.$$

Moreover, because  $a(x, y)$ ,  $U(x)$  and  $r(x)$  are continuous functions, (4.25) must hold. This proves Property (a) in Assumption (A.3), which in turn completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

We now move to the last step towards proving Proposition 4.1: showing that for  $\beta > 2$ , Assumption (A.3) cannot hold, as the necessary condition (2.12) from Lemma 2.1 is violated when  $\beta > 2$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $\beta > 2$ . Then,*

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S a(x, y) dy < 1.$$

*Proof.* If  $\beta > 2$ , as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$  the leading term in  $g(x, t)$  is

$$-\frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\gamma\beta)^2 \left( |y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2} - |x|^{2\beta-2} \right).$$

Moreover, from (4.8) we see that, as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$|y(x, t)|^2 = \left( \frac{\varepsilon\gamma\beta}{2} \right)^2 |x|^{2\beta-2} + o\left(|x|^{2\beta-2}\right).$$

This implies that  $|x|^{2\beta-2} = o\left(|y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2}\right)$ . Consequently, the liminf in (4.6) becomes

$$\liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} g(x, t) = \liminf_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \left( -\frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\gamma\beta)^2 |y(x, t)|^{2\beta-2} \right) = -\infty.$$

By Lemma 4.1 we obtain that  $\int_S a(x, y)dy \neq 1$ . From the definition of  $a(x, y)$  as a transition kernel, it cannot hold that  $\int_S a(x, y)dy > 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* Lemmas 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 show that Assumption (A.3) is satisfied if  $\beta = 2$  and  $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ , or  $1 < \beta < 2$ .

In all other cases, at least one of the two conditions (2.12) or (2.13) is not satisfied, as shown in Lemmas 4.2, 4.3, 4.5 and 4.7. It follows by Lemma 2.1 that there cannot exist a  $U$  that satisfies Property (b), and therefore Assumption (A.3) does not hold for these choices of  $\beta, \varepsilon, \gamma$ .  $\blacksquare$

## 5. RANDOM WALK METROPOLIS ALGORITHM

The final example of an explicit Metropolis-Hastings algorithm considered in this paper is the Random Walk Metropolis (RWM) algorithm; see, e.g., [RC04; MT96; Rob03] and references therein. The RWM is characterized by proposal densities  $J(y|x)$  of the form

$$J(y|x) = \hat{J}(y - x) = \hat{J}(x - y),$$

where, with an abuse of notation,  $\hat{J}(t) = \hat{J}(-t)$  is the density of some probability distribution in  $\hat{J}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ . The proposal density is therefore symmetric, i.e.  $J(y|x) = J(x|y)$ , and the Hastings ratio (2.6) simplifies to

$$\varpi(x, y) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \right\}.$$

With the following proposition we show that Assumption (A.3) cannot be fulfilled when employing the RWM proposal.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let*

$$(5.1) \quad J(y|x) = \hat{J}(y - x) = \hat{J}(x - y)$$

*be the proposal density in the Random Walk Metropolis algorithm. There exists no function  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  that satisfies Assumption (A.3).*

Proposition 5.1 can be related to Theorem 3.1 in [MT96], which states that the Markov chain generated via the RWM algorithm with a proposal distribution of the form under consideration is not uniformly ergodic for any  $\pi$ . However, in the same paper, Mengersen and Tweedie show that imposing additional assumptions on the target leads to the associated MH chain being geometrically ergodic. As we discuss in Section 6, we suspect that if the chain is geometrically ergodic then an LDP does hold. This is not in conflict with the result of Proposition 5.1, according to which Assumption (A.3) is not satisfied for *any*  $U$ , even when specific tail decays are imposed.

*Proof.* When the proposal density  $J(y|x)$  is of random walk type (5.1), the probability of accepting any proposal from state  $x \in S$  can be written as

$$\int_S a(x, y)dy = \int_S \varpi(x, y)\hat{J}(y - x)dy = \int_S \varpi(x, x + t)\hat{J}(t)dt,$$

where we applied the change of variable  $y \mapsto x + t$ . Therefore, in the RWM case, the two necessary conditions (2.12) and (2.13) for Property (b) of (A.3) (see Lemma 2.1) can be expressed as

$$(5.2) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \varpi(x, x+t) \hat{J}(t) dt = 1,$$

and,

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(x)} \int_S e^{U(x+t)} \varpi(x, x+t) \hat{J}(t) dt = 0,$$

respectively.

To show that Assumption (A.3) cannot be satisfied with the RWM transition kernel, we assume that the necessary condition (5.2) holds, and prove that there cannot then also exist a function  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfying (5.3).

We now proceed in a manner analogous to the proofs of Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3. Consider a function  $U : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and construct a sequence  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$  with terms

$$U_n = \inf_{|y| \geq n} U(y).$$

For a fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $x_n \in S$  such that  $|x_n| \geq n$  and

$$(5.4) \quad U_n \leq U(x_n) < U_n + \varepsilon.$$

Let  $\{x_n\} \subset S$  be such a sequence, i.e.,  $|x_n| \geq n$  and (5.4) holds for  $x_n$ . By construction,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_n| = +\infty$ , and if (5.3) holds then it also follows that

$$(5.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(x_n)} \int_S e^{U(x_n+t)} \varpi(x_n, x_n+t) \hat{J}(t) dt = 0.$$

For each  $n$ , let

$$H_n = \{t : \langle x_n, t \rangle \geq 0\} \subset S.$$

Observe that for  $t \in H_n$ ,

$$|x_n + t| = \sqrt{|x_n|^2 + |t|^2 + 2\langle x_n, t \rangle} \geq |x_n| \geq n,$$

hence,

$$(5.6) \quad U(x_n + t) \geq \inf_{|y| \geq n} U(y) = U_n.$$

Moreover,  $S \setminus H_n = -H_n^\circ$  for all  $n$ , and since  $\hat{J}$  is a symmetric measure (i.e.  $\hat{J}(B) = \hat{J}(-B)$  for all measurable sets  $B$ ) and  $\hat{J} \ll \lambda$ ,

$$\hat{J}(H_n) = \hat{J}(H_n^\circ) = \hat{J}(-H_n^\circ) = \hat{J}(S \setminus H_n).$$

Combining this with

$$\hat{J}(H_n) + \hat{J}(S \setminus H_n) = \hat{J}(S) = 1,$$

we obtain

$$\int_{H_n} \hat{J}(t) dt = \frac{1}{2},$$

which we use to determine

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt.$$

Because  $\varpi(x, y) \leq 1$  for all  $x, y \in S$ , for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\int_{H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \leq \int_{H_n} \hat{J}(t) dt = \frac{1}{2}.$$

In the other direction, under the assumption that (5.2) holds, i.e.,  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \int_S \varpi(x, x + t) \hat{J}(t) dt = 1$ , we have the asymptotic lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt &= 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S \setminus H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \\ &\geq 1 - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S \setminus H_n} \hat{J}(t) dt = 1 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the upper and lower bounds, if (5.2) holds we also have

$$(5.7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Using (5.4), (5.6) and (5.7) we can bound the term on the left-hand side of (5.5) from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(x_n)} \int_S e^{U(x_n+t)} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U(x_n)} \int_{H_n} e^{U(x_n+t)} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-U_n - \varepsilon} \int_{H_n} e^{U_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \\ &= e^{-\varepsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{H_n} \varpi(x_n, x_n + t) \hat{J}(t) dt \\ &= \frac{e^{-\varepsilon}}{2} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the necessary condition (5.3), which requires the limit to be equal to 0. Therefore, (5.2) and (5.3) cannot both hold in this setting. Using Lemma 2.1 we conclude that a Lyapunov function  $U$  satisfying Assumption (A.3) cannot exist when the proposal distribution is of RWM type.  $\blacksquare$

## 6. LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR MH CHAINS, LYAPUNOV CONDITION AND GEOMETRIC ERGODICITY: SUMMARY AND OPEN PROBLEMS

In Sections 3-5, we considered different instances of the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and showed under what conditions Assumption (A.3) is satisfied. In the first two examples—IMH and MALA—we found a Lyapunov function that satisfies (A.3) for certain values of the algorithms' hyperparameters. However, for RWM we instead proved that a Lyapunov function

as in (A.3) cannot exist for any combination of proposal and target distributions. Throughout Sections 3-5 we also compared our results on Assumption (A.3) to existing results on geometric ergodicity for the MH chains corresponding to the three classes of MCMC samplers. The conclusions are summarised in Table 1.

		Assumption (A.3)	Geometric ergodicity
IMH	$\alpha = \beta$ and $\eta > \gamma$ , or $\alpha \geq \beta$	✓	✓
	otherwise	✗	✗
MALA $d = 1$	$\beta = 2$ and $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ , or $\beta \in (1, 2)$	✓	✓
	$\beta = 1$ , $S = (0, +\infty)$ $\beta = 2$ and $\varepsilon\gamma \geq 2$ , or $\beta \in (0, 1) \cup (2, +\infty)$	✗	✓
MALA $d \geq 1$	$\beta = 2$ and $\varepsilon\gamma < 2$ , or $\beta \in (1, 2)$	✓	✓
	$\beta = 1$ , $\sqrt{\varepsilon}\gamma \gg 0$	✗	✓
	$\beta = 2$ and $\varepsilon\gamma > 2$ , or $\beta \in (2, +\infty)$	✗	✗
RWM	tail decays as in [MT96]	✗	✓
	otherwise	✗	✗

TABLE 1. Summary of the results from Sections 3-5, including existing results on geometric ergodicity. For IMH, the target and proposal are taken to be on the forms  $\pi(x) \propto \exp\{-\eta|x|^\alpha\}$  and  $f(x) \propto \exp\{-\gamma|\eta|^\beta\}$ , respectively. For MALA, the target is on the form  $\pi(x) \propto -\gamma|x|^\beta$ , and the MALA proposal becomes (4.2); here the results are split into two cases, corresponding to the different results on geometric ergodicity for  $d = 1$ , considered in [RT96a] (second row), and the more general case analysed in [RZ23] (third row). For RWM the results refer to any proposal of the form (5.1).

Assumption (A.3), in conjunction with (A.1) and (A.2), guarantees that the empirical measure of the algorithm's Markov chain satisfies an LDP with speed and rate function described in Section 2.4. This combined with the results of Sections 3-4 allow us to state Theorems 3.1 and 4.1, providing LDPs for the empirical measures of IMH and MALA chains, respectively, under certain conditions on their parameters. For the RWM, we emphasise that the fact that Assumption (A.3) can never be satisfied does not imply that an empirical measure LDP cannot hold for MH chains associated with RWM dynamics. Rather, we believe that an LDP should exist for certain choices of proposal and target, and that the three assumptions (A.1)-(A.3) in this case are only sufficient, not necessary, for an LDP. This leads to the following open problem.

**Open problem.** *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a geometrically ergodic MH chain associated with RWM dynamics. Are there reasonable conditions on the target and proposal distributions such that the empirical measures  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1}$  associated with  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  satisfy an LDP?*

Note that, should such an LDP hold, the associated rate function does not have to agree with that of Theorem 2.1. An analogous and informative example is that of reflected Brownian motion and related constrained processes considered in [BD03]. Therein, Budhiraja and Dupuis consider processes—both discrete-time Markov chains and diffusions—for which the usual stability criterion assumed in order to obtain an LDP for the associated empirical measures (see p. 2 in [BD03], or the classical works [DV75b; DV76]) does not hold. They still obtain an LDP, which highlights the fact that the processes may wander out to  $\infty$ , and in turn this causes the empirical measures to put some mass there. These results show that in order to have an LDP, it is essential to take into account how many excursions out to  $\infty$  will take place for the underlying process; this is also reflected in the corresponding rate function. There are also some analogies between the setting considered in [BD03] and the “boundary case” of MALA defined on  $(0, \infty)$ , where geometric ergodicity holds for  $\beta = 1$  (see [RT96a]) but Assumption (A.3) does not (see Table 1). Thus, techniques similar to those of [BD03] adapted to the setting of MH chains may help in establishing an LDP for this case.

Table 1 shows that for IMH and the bulk of MALA samplers, i.e., excluding the cases  $\beta = 1$ , conditions for geometric ergodicity coincide precisely with those guaranteeing Assumption (A.3), and by extension the cases where we have an affirmative answer to the question of whether or not an LDP holds for the underlying empirical measures. Moreover, as the discussion above hints at, there are reasons to believe that an LDP will hold also in the cases where Assumption (A.3) is not satisfied but the MH chain is geometrically ergodic. One can extend this question—is there an LDP for the empirical measures of a given MH chain—beyond the specific proposal and target distributions considered in this paper. To this effect we pose the following open problem, which contains the RWM one as a special case.

**Open problem.** *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a geometrically ergodic MH chain. Is this condition enough for the empirical measure  $\{L^n\}_{n \geq 1}$  associated with  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  to satisfy an LDP? If not, are there other conditions that are sufficient whilst also covering specific, or a large class, of MCMC samplers?*

Implicit in the open problems above, in case there are affirmative answers, is the statement that Property (b) is what makes Assumption (A.3) too strict for some MH chains. To highlight this, we end this section with some brief observations about Assumption (A.3) in the cases where geometric ergodicity, i.e., the drift and minorization conditions (see Section 2.2), holds. First, in this case Property (c) is a reasonable assumption on  $U$ , as e.g., continuity would be enough, and this holds for the standard functions used to satisfy the drift condition. Second, Property (a) follows from the geometric ergodicity, as we show in the following Proposition.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 0}$  be a geometrically ergodic Metropolis-Hasting Markov chain, and let  $V : S \rightarrow [1, +\infty)$  be a Lyapunov function that satisfies*



the drift condition (2.4). Then Property (a) in Assumption (A.3) holds for the Lyapunov function  $U = \log V : S \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ .

*Proof.* As discussed in Section 2.2, the inequality (2.4) in the standard drift condition for Markov chains is equivalent to (2.5), i.e., for some  $\lambda < 1, b < \infty$  and a small set  $C \subset S$ ,

$$(6.1) \quad F_U(x) \geq -\log \left( \lambda + e^{-U(x)} b I\{x \in C\} \right),$$

with  $F_U$  as in (2.11). Note that  $b$  in the drift condition (2.4) can be chosen positive. Therefore, assume  $b > 0$ . For every  $x \in S$ , because  $U(x) \geq 0$ ,

$$\lambda + b e^{-U(x)} I\{x \in C\} \leq \lambda + b < \infty.$$

Combining this with (6.1), we obtain

$$\inf_{x \in S} F_U(x) \geq -\log(\lambda + b) > -\infty.$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Prof A. Budhiraja (UNC Chapel Hill) for insightful comments and for pointing us to the paper [BD03] in connection with the discussion in Section 6. The research of FM and PN was supported by the Swedish e-Science Research Centre (SeRC). PN was also supported by Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, and by the Swedish Research Council (VR-2018-07050, VR-2023-03484).

#### REFERENCES

- [Aco97] A. de Acosta. “Moderate deviations for empirical measures of Markov chains: lower bounds”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 25.1 (1997), pp. 259–284.
- [AG07] S. Asmussen and P. W. Glynn. *Stochastic simulation: Algorithms and analysis*. Vol. 57. Springer, 2007.
- [And+03] C. Andrieu, N. De Freitas, A. Doucet, and M. I. Jordan. “An introduction to MCMC for machine learning”. In: *Machine Learning* 50 (2003), pp. 5–43.
- [And+22] C. Andrieu, A. Lee, S. Power, and A. Q. Wang. “Comparison of Markov chains via weak Poincaré inequalities with application to pseudo-marginal MCMC”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 50.6 (2022), pp. 3592–3618.
- [And+23] C. Andrieu, A. Lee, S. Power, and A. Q. Wang. *Weak Poincaré Inequalities for Markov chains: theory and applications*. 2023. arXiv: 2312.11689 [math.PR].
- [AP07] Y. F. Atchadé and F. Perron. “On the geometric ergodicity of Metropolis-Hastings algorithms”. In: *Statistics* 41.1 (2007), pp. 77–84.

- [BD03] A. Budhiraja and P. Dupuis. “Large Deviations for the Empirical Measures of Reflecting Brownian Motion and Related Constrained Processes in  $R_+$ ”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 8.none (2003), pp. 1–46.
- [BD19] A. Budhiraja and P. Dupuis. “Analysis and approximation of rare events”. In: *Representations and Weak Convergence Methods. Series Prob. Theory and Stoch. Modelling* 94 (2019).
- [Bes94] J. Besag. “Comments on “Representations of knowledge in complex systems” by U. Grenander and M. I. Miller”. In: *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 56:591-592 (1994), p. 4.
- [Bie16] J. Bierkens. “Non-reversible Metropolis-Hastings”. In: *Stat. Comput.* 26.6 (2016), pp. 1213–1228.
- [BJ24] A. Brown and G. L. Jones. “Exact convergence analysis for Metropolis–Hastings independence samplers in Wasserstein distances”. In: *J. Appl. Probab.* 61.1 (2024), pp. 33–54.
- [BNS21] J. Bierkens, P. Nyquist, and M. C. Schlottke. “Large deviations for the empirical measure of the zig-zag process”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 31.6 (2021), pp. 2811–2843.
- [BR08] M. Bédard and J. S. Rosenthal. “Optimal scaling of Metropolis algorithms: Heading toward general target distributions”. In: *Canad. J. Statist.* 36.4 (2008), pp. 483–503.
- [CRR05] O. F. Christensen, G. O. Roberts, and J. S. Rosenthal. “Scaling limits for the transient phase of local Metropolis–Hastings algorithms”. In: *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 67.2 (2005), pp. 253–268.
- [DDN18] J. D. Doll, P. Dupuis, and P. Nyquist. “A large deviations analysis of certain qualitative properties of parallel tempering and infinite swapping algorithms”. In: *Appl. Math. Optim.* 78 (2018), pp. 103–144.
- [DE97] P. Dupuis and R. E. Ellis. *A weak convergence approach to the theory of large deviations*. Wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics. New York: Wiley, 1997. ISBN: 0-471-07672-4.
- [DGM08] R. Douc, A. Guillin, and E. Moulines. “Bounds on regeneration times and limit theorems for subgeometric Markov chains”. In: *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* Vol. 44. 2. 2008, pp. 239–257.
- [DHN00] P. Diaconis, S. Holmes, and R. M. Neal. “Analysis of a non-reversible Markov chain sampler”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 10.3 (2000), pp. 726–752. DOI: 10.1214/aoap/1019487508.
- [DL15] P. Dupuis and Y. Liu. “On the large deviation rate function for the empirical measures of reversible jump Markov processes”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 43.3 (2015), pp. 1121–1156.
- [Dup+12] P. Dupuis, Y. Liu, N. Plattner, and J. D. Doll. “On the infinite swapping limit for parallel tempering”. In: *Multiscale Model. Simul.* 10.3 (2012), pp. 986–1022.

- [DV75a] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. “Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, I”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 28.1 (1975), pp. 1–47.
- [DV75b] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. “Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, II”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 28.2 (1975), pp. 279–301.
- [DV76] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. “Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time—III”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 29.4 (1976), pp. 389–461.
- [DW22] P. Dupuis and Guo-Jhen Wu. “Analysis and Optimization of Certain Parallel Monte Carlo Methods in the Low Temperature Limit”. In: *Multiscale Model. Simul.* 20.1 (2022), pp. 220–249.
- [DZ09] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*. Vol. 38. Springer, 2009.
- [FK06] J. Feng and T. G. Kurtz. *Large deviations for stochastic processes*. 131. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.
- [Fra+10] B. Franke, C.-R. Hwang, H.-M. Pai, and S.-J. Sheu. “The behavior of the spectral gap under growing drift”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 362.3 (2010), pp. 1325–1350.
- [Fri+93] A. Frigessi, P. Stefano, C.-R. Hwang, and S.-J. Sheu. “Convergence rates of the Gibbs sampler, the Metropolis algorithm and other single-site updating dynamics”. In: *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 55.1 (1993), pp. 205–219.
- [GGR97a] A. Gelman, W. R. Gilks, and G. O. Roberts. “Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 7.1 (1997), pp. 110–120.
- [GGR97b] A. Gelman, W. R. Gilks, and G. O. Roberts. “Weak convergence and optimal scaling of random walk Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 7.1 (1997), pp. 110–120.
- [GKM23] N. Glatt-Holtz, J. Krometis, and C. Mondaini. “On the accept–reject mechanism for Metropolis–Hastings algorithms”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 33.6B (2023), pp. 5279–5333.
- [Has70] W. K. Hastings. “Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications”. In: (1970).
- [HHS05] C.-R. Hwang, S.-Y. Hwang-Ma, and S.-J. Sheu. “Accelerating diffusions”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 15.2 (2005), pp. 1433–1444.
- [HSV14] M. Hairer, A. M. Stuart, and S. J. Vollmer. “Spectral gaps for a Metropolis–Hastings algorithm in infinite dimensions”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 24.6 (2014), pp. 2455–2490.
- [JH00] S. F. Jarner and E. Hansen. “Geometric ergodicity of Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 85.2 (2000), pp. 341–361.
- [JLM14] B. Jourdain, T. Lelièvre, and B. Miasojedow. “Optimal scaling for the transient phase of Metropolis Hastings algorithms: The

- longtime behavior”. In: *Bernoulli* 20.4 (2014), pp. 1930–1978. (Visited on 03/12/2024).
- [KM03] I. Kontoyiannis and S. P. Meyn. “Spectral theory and limit theorems for geometrically ergodic Markov processes”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 13.1 (2003), pp. 304–362.
- [KM05] I. Kontoyiannis and S. P. Meyn. “Large Deviations Asymptotics and the Spectral Theory of Multiplicatively Regular Markov Processes”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 10.none (2005), pp. 61–123.
- [Liv21] S. Livingstone. “Geometric ergodicity of the random walk Metropolis with position-dependent proposal covariance”. In: *Mathematics* 9.4 (2021), p. 341.
- [Met+53] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller. “Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines”. In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 21.6 (1953), pp. 1087–1092.
- [MN24] F. Milinanni and P. Nyquist. “A large deviation principle for the empirical measures of Metropolis–Hastings chains”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 170 (2024).
- [MPS12] J. C. Mattingly, N. S. Pillai, and A. M. Stuart. “Diffusion limits of the random walk Metropolis algorithm in high dimensions”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22.3 (2012), pp. 881–930.
- [MT09] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. 2009.
- [MT96] K. L. Mengersen and R. L. Tweedie. “Rates of convergence of the Hastings and Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 24.1 (1996), pp. 101–121.
- [Pla+11] N. Plattner, J. D. Doll, P. Dupuis, H. Wang, Y. Liu, and J. E. Gubernatis. “An infinite swapping approach to the rare-event sampling problem.” In: *J. Chem. Phys.* 135.13 (2011), p. 134111.
- [Pow+24] S. Power, D. Rudolf, B. Sprungk, and A. Q. Wang. *Weak Poincaré inequality comparisons for ideal and hybrid slice sampling*. 2024. arXiv: 2402.13678 [stat.CO].
- [RC04] C. P. Robert and G. Casella. *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods*. 2nd ed. 2004. Springer Texts in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2004. ISBN: 1-4757-4145-6.
- [Rob03] G. O. Roberts. “Linking theory and practice of MCMC”. In: *Oxford Statistical Science Series* (2003), pp. 145–166.
- [Ros03] J. S. Rosenthal. “Asymptotic variance and convergence rates of nearly-periodic Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 98.461 (2003), pp. 169–177.
- [RR01] G. O. Roberts and J. S. Rosenthal. “Optimal scaling for various Metropolis-Hastings algorithms”. In: *Statist. Sci.* 16.4 (2001), pp. 351–367.

- [RR97] G. O. Roberts and J. S. Rosenthal. “Geometric ergodicity and hybrid Markov chains”. In: *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 2 (1997), pp. 13–25.
- [RR98] G. O. Roberts and J. S. Rosenthal. “Optimal scaling of discrete approximations to Langevin diffusions”. In: *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* 60.1 (1998), pp. 255–268.
- [RS15a] L. Rey-Bellet and K. Spiliopoulos. “Irreversible Langevin samplers and variance reduction: a large deviations approach”. In: *Nonlinearity* 28.7 (2015), p. 2081.
- [RS15b] L. Rey-Bellet and K. Spiliopoulos. “Variance reduction for irreversible Langevin samplers and diffusion on graphs”. In: *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 20.15 (2015), pp. 1–16.
- [RS16] L. Rey-Bellet and K. Spiliopoulos. “Improving the convergence of reversible samplers”. In: *J. Stat. Phys.* 164 (2016), pp. 472–494.
- [RT96a] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. “Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations”. In: *Bernoulli* (1996), pp. 341–363.
- [RT96b] G. O. Roberts and R. L. Tweedie. “Geometric convergence and central limit theorems for multidimensional Hastings and Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Biometrika* 83.1 (1996), pp. 95–110.
- [RZ23] V. Roy and L. Zhang. “Convergence of Position-Dependent MALA with Application to Conditional Simulation in GLMMs”. In: *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.* 32.2 (2023), pp. 501–512.
- [Tie94] L. Tierney. “Markov Chains for Exploring Posterior Distributions”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 22.4 (1994), pp. 1701–1728.
- [Tie98] L. Tierney. “A note on Metropolis-Hastings kernels for general state spaces”. In: *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 8.1 (1998), pp. 1–9.
- [Wan22] G. Wang. “Exact convergence analysis of the independent Metropolis-Hastings algorithms”. In: *Bernoulli* 28.3 (2022), pp. 2012–2033.

*Current address:*

(FM) Department of Mathematics, KTH, 100 44 Stockholm, Sweden.

(PN) Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology and University of Gothenburg, 412 96, Gothenburg, Sweden.