

# GRADIENT ESTIMATION VIA DIFFERENTIABLE METROPOLIS–HASTINGS

BY GAURAV ARYA<sup>1</sup>, MORITZ SCHAUER<sup>2</sup> AND RUBEN SEYER<sup>2,a</sup>

<sup>1</sup>DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, MIT

<sup>2</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG, <sup>a</sup>RUBENSE@CHALMERS.SE

Metropolis–Hastings estimates intractable expectations — can differentiating the algorithm estimate their gradients? The challenge is that Metropolis–Hastings trajectories are not conventionally differentiable due to the discrete accept/reject steps. Using a technique based on recoupling chains, our method differentiates through the Metropolis–Hastings sampler itself, allowing us to estimate gradients with respect to a parameter of otherwise intractable expectations. Our main contribution is a proof of strong consistency and a central limit theorem for our estimator under assumptions that hold in common Bayesian inference problems. The proofs augment the sampler chain with latent information, and formulate the estimator as a stopping functional of the tail of this augmented chain. We demonstrate our method on examples of Bayesian sensitivity analysis and optimizing a random walk Metropolis proposal.

**1. Introduction.** Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods are used to estimate expectations by appealing to an ergodic theorem,

$$(1) \quad \pi_\theta f = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} f(X_i),$$

where  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is a Markov chain engineered to converge to the target distribution  $\pi_\theta$ , in particular when  $\pi_\theta$  is only known up to an intractable normalizing constant. For example, in Bayesian inference, quantities such as posterior expectation, variance, or probabilities are all integrals with respect to the posterior distribution commonly estimated in this manner. A wide class of such MCMC methods employs Metropolis–Hastings (MH) accept/reject steps to preserve the target distribution [32, 51, 78]. Examples used in practice are random walk Metropolis, Metropolis-adjusted Langevin algorithm (MALA) [8, 68, 72] and certain versions of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) [18, 57].

If the target distribution  $\pi_\theta$  depends on a parameter  $\theta$  as above, it is natural to ask how the expectations change with respect to the parameter, quantified as the derivative at a parameter value of interest

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] \right|_{\theta=\theta_0},$$

which itself must be estimated. This problem of Monte Carlo gradient estimation arises in for example optimization of stochastic systems, sensitivity analysis and experimental design, as well as reinforcement learning and variational inference in machine learning [54]. Particularly within the machine learning literature, there has been interest in differentiating through Monte Carlo samplers. Unfortunately, the MH sampler trajectory is not conventionally differentiable due to the discrete accept/reject steps. Instead, practitioners use unadjusted methods [17, 81], ignore the discrete contributions and work with biased estimates [11, 12], or enumerate the state space [13, 14].

In this paper following up on [4], we obtain a gradient estimator by differentiating through the MH sampler itself, successfully accounting for the discreteness within the framework of *stochastic perturbation analysis* (SPA) [10, 19, 20]. SPA-type gradient estimators weigh together several alternative trajectories of the chain. By introducing a recoupling coupling for the alternatives [48, 77], we exploit the stochasticity to make the estimator stable and computationally tractable. Our main contribution is a theoretical convergence guarantee under assumptions expected to hold for models commonly considered in Bayesian inference. Under these assumptions, we establish that our estimator essentially inherits the ergodicity of the underlying MH chain, and show that this entails strong consistency of as well as a central limit theorem for our gradient estimates.

Three major classes of gradient estimators appear in the literature [54]: *pathwise* estimators [23, 45], also known as the *reparameterization trick*, fully extract the parameter dependency from the target distribution, yielding a very simple gradient estimator. However, a tractable differentiable reparameterization is not available for all targets, and the method requires that  $f$  is differentiable. *Likelihood ratio* methods [27–29, 65], also known as score function methods or REINFORCE, interchange derivative and expectation to directly differentiate the target density, yielding a reweighted cost  $f(x)\nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta}(x)$ . This direct approach can even be applied to unnormalized target densities if the gradient of the log-normalizing constant is additionally estimated. However, the variance of the method deteriorates with increasing state space dimensionality [54]. Furthermore,  $f$  is treated like a black box, which has the benefit of wide applicability but the drawback of ignoring possible variance reduction from structural properties of  $f$ . *Measure-valued derivatives* (MVD) [33–36] estimate the gradient as a weighted difference of a target-dependent measure decomposition. At the cost of simulating multiple alternatives, their difference-based approach allows nondifferentiable  $f$  while accounting for structure. However, finding a tractable measure decomposition is nontrivial.

The performance of these gradient estimators in terms of variance and computational cost depends on the target  $\pi_{\theta}$  and the function  $f$  under consideration, and in general none of the estimators are universally better than any other [54]. Our estimator does not fit cleanly within the framework of any of the classes, aiming for the generality of the likelihood ratio method while using an alternative simulation approach similar to MVD. Working with the MH dynamics replaces the need for target-specific tricks with a proposal-specific coupling. We source suitable couplings for MH kernels from the recent extensive literature on this topic [59, 60, 63, 80], which has been stimulated in part by the closely related application of debiased MCMC [30, 39, 53], where the recoupling property is used to derive a bias correction term. Couplings have also appeared in both SPA literature [10, 15] and MVD literature [33], where they have been used for more efficient simulation, but to our knowledge the explicit use of general recoupling couplings to construct a consistent estimator for general state spaces is novel.

1.1. *Related work on Markov chain gradient estimation.* The aforementioned classes of gradient estimators have also been applied to Markov chains, and in this section, we contrast our estimator with some prior work.

As an extension of pathwise estimators, SPA has previously been used for consistent gradient estimation in among others queuing theory, financial modeling, and optimization of stochastic systems [19]. Nevertheless, the usual formalization by generalized semi-Markov processes does not apply to our setting, as their state space is taken to be at most countable. SPA has been extended to more general Markov chains, notably by [15] where even couplings are used for efficient simulation, but too strong assumptions on

countability, boundedness of the performance  $f$ , and uniform ergodicity are imposed to obtain consistency. We avoid these restrictions by exploiting the convergence properties of the coupling both in simulation and in the proof of consistency.

Likelihood ratio methods have been applied to the Markov chain itself [28, 29], estimating the gradient as “a sequence of finite horizon expectations”. Although their assumptions are similar to ours, they differ in one critical point: the Markov kernel is assumed to be absolutely continuous with respect to some reference measure, which is not the case for the MH kernel due to the rejection dynamics. Furthermore, they consider a weaker notion of consistency than us, so that unlike our estimator the gradient estimator for a single infinite chain does not converge almost surely to the true derivative, but rather only in mean.

Measure-valued derivative theory has been applied to Markov chains through a “product rule” for kernels [33, 35, 36]. These estimators apply to non-differentiable kernels, and use a similar structure of alternative chains called “phantoms” in the estimator, with a similar approach to efficient simulation of “phantoms” through pruning or coupling as in our algorithm. Furthermore, our SPA weight computations are related to the corresponding measure-valued derivative for a Bernoulli random variable. Unfortunately, the kernel factorization we introduce below to make explicit use of the coupling violates smoothness assumptions of measure-valued derivatives, so we are unable to immediately apply the theory. Nevertheless, we hope that our recoupling trick also can be transferred to infinite-horizon measure-valued derivatives.

*1.2. Notation.* Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}_X, \mu_0)$  be a Polish (separable completely metrizable) space equipped with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra and a reference measure  $\mu_0$ . This setting includes the familiar Euclidean space with Lebesgue measure but also allows for more general spaces. We will without loss of generality assume that the parameter of interest  $\theta$  is one-dimensional and lies in some compact interval  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}$  (usually a neighborhood of some  $\theta_0$ ). The extension to multi-dimensional parameter vectors can then be done by applying the one-dimensional results for directional derivatives.

We write  $x \wedge y$  for the minimum of  $x$  and  $y$ . Given a probability measure  $\mu$ , we denote the countable product Let  $\delta_x(dy) : X \times \mathcal{B}_X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be the Dirac measure, that is  $\delta_x(E) = \mathbf{1}_{\{x\}}(E)$  for all  $E \in \mathcal{B}_X$ . For a general Markov kernel  $K(dy|x) = K(x, dy) : X \times \mathcal{B}_Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , we define by  $\mu K(A) = \int_X K(A|x)\mu(dx)$  the resulting measure when acting on a measure  $\mu$ , and define by  $Kf(x) = \int_Y f(y)K(dy|x)$  the resulting function when acting on a measurable (integrable) function  $f$ . Hence kernels  $K_1(dy|x) : X \times \mathcal{B}_Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $K_2(dz|y) : Y \times \mathcal{B}_Z \rightarrow [0, 1]$  compose as  $K_1K_2(B|x) = \int_Y K_2(B|y)K_1(dy|x)$ . These notations may be combined and are associative.

**2. Differentiable Metropolis–Hastings estimator.** Recall that the MH chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is defined as follows [32, 51, 78]: suppose  $\pi_\theta$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mu_0$ , and  $g_\theta$  is an unnormalized  $\mu_0$ -density of  $\pi_\theta$ . Let  $q(dx^\circ|x)$  be the proposal kernel used in the sampler which we assume has a density  $q(x^\circ|x)$  with respect to  $\mu_0$  independent of  $\theta$ , and let  $\alpha_\theta(x'|x)$  be the acceptance probability

$$\alpha_\theta(x'|x) = \frac{g_\theta(x')q(x|x')}{g_\theta(x)q(x'|x)} \wedge 1.$$

The sampler proceeds by iterating the following kernel:

$$K_{\text{MH}}(dx'|x) = \alpha_\theta(x'|x)q(dx'|x) + \left[ \int (1 - \alpha_\theta(x^\circ|x))q(dx^\circ|x) \right] \delta_x(dx').$$

Convergence of the sampler relies on some regularity conditions, the definitions of which are recalled in Appendix A. A sufficient condition for  $\pi_\theta$ -irreducibility of the sampler is the positivity of the proposal density  $q$  for any pair of states, and a sufficient condition for aperiodicity is the ability to reject a move from any state [66, Section 7.3.2]. The MH chain is Harris recurrent if it is  $\pi_\theta$ -irreducible [66, Lemma 7.3]. Then, for integrable  $f$  we indeed have the Markov chain law of large numbers (1) a.s. for any starting state  $X_0$  [66, Theorem 7.4].

For the estimator, we introduce a particular way to construct alternative chains to capture the impact of a perturbation of  $\theta$ . This requires that we specify how to run two chains in parallel. Let  $q(dx^\circ \times dy^\circ | x, y)$  be a coupled proposal kernel, which to be a valid coupling must preserve the marginals and satisfy  $q(dx^\circ \times \mathsf{X} | x, y) = q(dx^\circ | x)$  and  $q(\mathsf{X} \times dy^\circ | x, y) = q(dy^\circ | y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathsf{X}^2$ . We will use a reparameterized expression of the coupling, so that we may express  $y^\circ$  given  $x, x^\circ, y$  as  $y^\circ = \tilde{q}(\epsilon, x, x^\circ, y)$  with a deterministic function taking  $x, x^\circ, y$  and independent “latent randomness”  $\epsilon$  on  $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}_{[0,1]}, \eta)$ . The existence<sup>1</sup> of such a  $\tilde{q}$  follows by standard disintegration and conditioning results [42, Lemma 4.22, Theorem 8.5].

We are now ready to formulate the Differentiable MH (DMH) estimator, expanding on the algorithm first introduced by [4, Algorithm 2]. The result is an SPA-type approach that intuitively takes the form of weighted counterfactuals (in the case where the parameter enters discretely, as in the accept/reject step). For MH, the discrete counterfactuals come from the trajectory switching between acceptance and rejection or vice versa. Although the trajectory itself changes discontinuously under parameter perturbations, by forcing the perturbations to occur in simulation and instead differentiating the conditional probabilities we obtain an estimate of the derivative [3, 19, 20]. We focus in the next definition on introducing the construction, with the proof of correctness contained within the later main results.

**CONSTRUCTION 1** (Differentiable Metropolis–Hastings estimator). Suppose the MH algorithm is run for  $N$  transitions starting from  $X_0$ . The contribution to the DMH derivative estimate from a perturbation at the  $n$ th transition is the SPA estimator

$$W_n \sum_{k=1}^{N-n-1} [f(Y_{n,k}) - f(X_{n+k})],$$

where  $W_n$  is the weight and  $Y_{n,k}$  is the alternative chain started in  $n$  after  $k$  transitions, both quantities introduced below. The full estimate is then the average over all transitions of these contributions.

Consider the  $n$ th state of the MH chain. Suppose the accept/reject step is implemented by thresholding an independent  $U_n \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  with the acceptance probability  $\alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n)$ . Then, inspecting  $X_n, X_n^\circ$ , and  $U_n$  reveals whether the primal chain accepted or rejected the proposed move, whence we obtain the weight as the derivative of the acceptance probability with a sign correction:

$$(2) \quad W_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n) \left(1 - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{U_n \leq \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n)}\right).$$

It may however be the case that  $W_n = 0$ , for example, if the proposed state is always accepted and no alternative is possible. The alternative chain  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  started from  $n$

---

<sup>1</sup>Explicit knowledge of  $\tilde{q}$  is not strictly necessary for implementation, although such a formulation is not only theoretically convenient but also practically useful [47].

can be split off by making the opposite decision to the primal in the transition:

$$Y_{n,1} = \begin{cases} X_n, & \text{if } U_n \leq \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n) \\ X_n^\circ, & \text{if } U_n > \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n) \end{cases}.$$

Once the alternative is split, we continue using the reparameterized expression for the coupling to obtain the alternative as

$$(3) \quad Y_{n,k}^\circ = \tilde{q}(\epsilon_{n,k}, X_{n+k}, X_{n+k}^\circ, Y_{n,k}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

$$Y_{n,k+1} = \begin{cases} Y_{n,k}^\circ & \text{if } U_{n+k} \leq \alpha_\theta(Y_{n,k}^\circ | Y_{n,k}) \\ Y_{n,k} & \text{if } U_{n+k} > \alpha_\theta(Y_{n,k}^\circ | Y_{n,k}) \end{cases}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where we chose to couple the accept/reject step according to a monotone coupling or common random numbers [25]. This procedure can be continued indefinitely.

*2.1. Implementation details.* We implement<sup>2</sup> the DMH estimator for our numerical experiments in Julia [9] using the package `StochasticAD.jl` [3]. Given an implementation of a proposal coupling, this allows us to automatically obtain the procedure in Construction 1 from a straightforward implementation of the usual MH algorithm. Nevertheless, the mathematical aspects treated in this paper are not dependent on the choice of any particular implementation. In our previous work [4] the description of the algorithm additionally incorporated specific details of weight computations and pruning (importance sampling between alternatives to deterministically bound the computational effort) present in `StochasticAD.jl`; we have here chosen to avoid such implementation details for clarity, although an efficient implementation would also consider for example the choice of pruning scheme and whether to use forward or reverse mode [6, 64] automatic differentiation in gradient computations.

**3. Main results.** We begin by introducing our assumptions, which are directly linked to the different parts of the estimator.

ASSUMPTION 1. The MH chain is  $\pi_\theta$ -irreducible and  $\pi_\theta|f| < \infty$ . (This implies that the MH chain is Harris recurrent and that the averages converge a.s. to  $\pi_\theta f$ .)

ASSUMPTION 2. The target unnormalized density  $g_\theta(x)$  is continuously differentiable<sup>3</sup> in  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Furthermore, for all  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\theta_0}} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \pi_\theta(X) \right|^2 \right] < \infty.$$

ASSUMPTION 3. At least one of the following holds:

- (a)  $f$  is bounded on  $\mathsf{X}$ ,
- (b) the MH chain is geometrically ergodic with drift function  $V : \mathsf{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty]$  such that  $\pi_\theta V < \infty$  and  $\pi_\theta qV < \infty$ , for which  $f$  satisfies  $\sup_{x \in \mathsf{X}} |f(x)|^{2+\gamma} / V(x) < \infty$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ .

ASSUMPTION 4. The coupling satisfies the following:

<sup>2</sup>The code is available from [https://github.com/gaurav-arya/differentiable\\_mh](https://github.com/gaurav-arya/differentiable_mh).

<sup>3</sup>It is possible to weaken the differentiability assumptions at the cost of providing a more careful bound on the derivative as one runs into measurability concerns, see for example [46].

- (i) It is *faithful*,<sup>4</sup> that is recoupled chains stay together after they first couple:  $q(dx^\circ \times dy^\circ | x, x) = q(dx^\circ | x)\delta_{x^\circ}(dy^\circ)$ .
- (ii) The chains recouple in square-integrable time: let  $\tau_{x,y} = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{X_n = Y_n | X_1 = x, Y_1 = y\}$  denote the recoupling time for parallel chains starting in  $x, y$ , then we have for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}^2$  that  $\mathbb{E}[\tau_{x,y}^2] < \infty$ .

Essentially, Assumption 1 yields the baseline convergence of MH, Assumption 2 yields the existence of the derivatives and moment bounds on weights in the estimator, and finally Assumptions 3 and 4 yield moment bounds on the difference between chains and the applicability of the recoupling trick. The assumption of geometric ergodicity is convenient and holds in many practical cases [61, 69]; although it could be possible to relax this with some additional work, we are interested in establishing a central limit theorem, where geometric ergodicity is a common sufficient condition [41]. We note that a drift function  $V$  with  $\pi_\theta V < \infty$  always exists for a geometrically ergodic Markov chain, such that the drift condition

$$(4) \quad (K_{\text{MH}}V)(x) \leq \alpha V(x) + \beta$$

holds for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ ,  $\beta \in [0, \infty)$  [21].

The following examples describe couplings for two common variants of MH that satisfy the assumptions for use in the DMH:

**EXAMPLE (Independent MH).** The simplest possible proposal is one that is independent of the current state, that is  $q(\cdot | x) = q(\cdot)$ . Then, the proposal has a trivial self-coupling  $\tilde{q}(\epsilon, x, x^\circ, y) = x^\circ$  which always succeeds (and  $\epsilon$  can be ignored). If there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $\pi_\theta(x) \leq Cq(x)$  on the support of  $\pi_\theta$ , then the sampler is uniformly ergodic [66, Theorem 7.8] and the acceptance probability in stationarity is lower-bounded by  $1/C$  [66, Lemma 7.9]. Since recoupling always occurs on acceptance, we deduce that the meeting times satisfy  $\mathbb{P}(\tau > t) \leq (1 - \frac{1}{C})^t$ , and hence all moments of  $\tau$  are finite.

**EXAMPLE (Gaussian Random Walk MH).** One of the prototypical versions of MH is Gaussian Random Walk MH, which we here consider with the simple proposal  $q(\cdot | x) \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2 I)$  with fixed scale  $\sigma^2$ . Consider a maximal reflection coupling of the proposal [59, 80]. This coupling is faithful and reparameterizes with  $\epsilon \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$  as

$$\tilde{q}(\epsilon, x, x^\circ, y) = \begin{cases} x^\circ, & \epsilon \leq \frac{\varphi([x^\circ - y]/\sigma)}{\varphi([x^\circ - x]/\sigma)} \\ x^\circ + \left[1 - 2 \frac{\langle y - x, x^\circ - x \rangle}{\|y - x\|^2}\right] (y - x), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where  $\varphi$  is the pdf for  $\mathbf{N}(0, I)$ . This idea can be extended to a non-isotropic proposal by applying a whitening transform before coupling and then transforming back the results. Obtaining an analytical expression for the recoupling time is in general difficult as it will depend on how the proposals interact with the target distribution. A tail bound on meeting times of the form  $\mathbb{P}(\tau > t) \leq C\delta^t$  for  $t, C \geq 0$ ,  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , hence sufficient for all moments of  $\tau$  to be finite, was found by [39, Proposition 4] based on the behavior of an appropriate Lyapunov function, most often obtained by assumptions on the tails of  $\pi_\theta$  [69].

---

<sup>4</sup>Terminology due to [71].



REMARK. In a certain sense, geometric ergodicity implies Assumption 4, as one can then manufacture a proposal kernel coupling where  $\tau_{x,y}$  has geometric tails, which by its Markovian nature can trivially be made faithful [39, Section 3.2]. The important theoretical restrictions introduced by the assumptions here are therefore on the MH chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ,  $f$ ,  $\pi_\theta$ , and  $q$ . Nevertheless, for computations, it is important that the coupling is computationally tractable, and shorter recoupling times reduce the variance.

3.1. *Augmented chain.* Inspecting the DMH algorithm makes it clear that given only the MH chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  we do not have enough information to compute the coupling or the DMH estimator. Hence, we will now *augment* the transition kernel to preserve this information. Our goal in this section is then to show that this augmented chain inherits its convergence properties from the MH chain. A simpler augmented chain with only proposal information was analyzed similarly by [73], although we will use different proof strategies.

CONSTRUCTION 2 (Augmented MH chain). Consider the state space  $\mathsf{X} \times \mathsf{X} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$  and the product  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{X}} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mathsf{X}} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{[0,1]} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{[0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}}$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_{[0,1]^{\mathbb{N}}}$  is the corresponding Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on countable sequences [42, Lemma 1.2]. Define a kernel that augments the current MH state  $x$  with the hidden information about the proposed next state, a uniform random value used to couple acceptance, and a sequence of i.i.d. latent randomness distributed according to some  $\eta$  used to couple proposals:

$$(5) \quad Q(dx' \times dx^\circ \times du' \times d\epsilon' \mid x) = \delta_x(dx')q(dx^\circ \mid x) du' \eta^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}(d\epsilon')$$

where  $\eta^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$  is the infinite product measure [42, Corollary 8.25]. Note that the uniform and latent sequence are sampled independently from the current state. Next, define a kernel that given this augmented state deterministically executes the MH transition:

$$(6) \quad R(dx' \mid x, x^\circ, u, \epsilon) = \mathbf{1}_{\{u \leq \alpha_\theta(x^\circ \mid x)\}} \delta_{x^\circ}(dx') + \mathbf{1}_{\{u > \alpha_\theta(x^\circ \mid x)\}} \delta_x(dx').$$

Finally, define the augmented kernel  $K_{\text{aug}} = RQ$  which iterated yields the augmented chain  $\{(X_n, X_n^\circ, U_n, \{\epsilon_{n,k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ .

By inspection  $K_{\text{MH}} = QR$  and hence one can interpret the new kernel  $K_{\text{aug}}$  as instead stopping “in the middle of” the MH transitions. From this characterization it follows that for  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$K_{\text{aug}}^N = (RQ)^N = R(QR)^{N-1}Q = RK_{\text{MH}}^{N-1}Q$$

and that the invariant distribution of  $K_{\text{aug}}$  is  $\nu_\theta := \pi_\theta Q$  by a direct verification:

$$\nu_\theta K_{\text{aug}} = (\pi_\theta Q)(RQ) = \pi_\theta(QR)Q = \pi_\theta Q = \nu_\theta.$$

We next establish the necessary technical results to inherit the desired properties and establish ergodicity; the proofs, as well as reminders of the definitions of  $\phi$ -irreducibility and Harris recurrence, are given in Appendix A.

PROPOSITION 3 (Inheriting  $\phi$ -irreducibility). *If the original MH chain is  $\phi$ -irreducible, then the augmented MH chain is  $\phi Q$ -irreducible.*

PROPOSITION 4 (Inheriting Harris recurrence). *If the original MH chain is Harris recurrent, then the augmented MH chain is Harris recurrent.*

COROLLARY 5. *Under Assumption 1, the invariant probability distribution  $\nu_\theta$  for  $K_{\text{aug}}$  is unique and ergodic.*

Although it is not necessary for the consistency argument that follows, and we do not assume that the original MH chain is geometrically ergodic in all cases, we also establish the inheritance of geometric ergodicity under an additional technical condition for later use in a central limit theorem. The proof, which relies on a *data processing inequality* in total variation, is also given in Appendix A.

PROPOSITION 6 (Inheriting geometric ergodicity). *Under Assumptions 1 and 4, additionally assuming  $q(x^\circ | x) > 0$  for all  $x, x^\circ \in \mathbf{X}$ , if the original MH chain is geometrically ergodic, then the augmented MH chain is geometrically ergodic.*

3.2. *Tail functional.* With the augmented chain and the reparametrization version of the coupling, we can express the DMH estimator in Construction 1 as a *tail functional* of the augmented chain. Let  $\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow} = \{(X_{n+k}, X_{n+k}^\circ, U_{n+k}, \{\epsilon_{n+k,\ell}\}_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  be the *tail* from the  $n$ th augmented state. The contribution to the DMH derivative estimate from a perturbation at the  $n$ th transition with a horizon  $m$  is

$$h_m(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}) = W_n \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} [f(Y_{n,k}) - f(X_{n+k})]$$

which by construction is a deterministic function of the tail. We define  $h = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} h_m$  as the a.s. limit. In fact, under Assumption 4, faithfulness implies only the terms before recoupling will be non-zero, so we may let<sup>5</sup>  $\tau_n = \tau_{X_{n+1}, Y_{n,1}}$  and write

$$h_m(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}) = W_n \sum_{k=1}^{(\tau_n \wedge m) - 1} [f(Y_{n,k}) - f(X_{n+k})]$$

and similarly for  $h$ . To apply our convergence theorems, we must show that the random variable  $h$  is integrable with respect to the induced measure on sample paths  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta}$  under our assumptions. We give the moment bound proofs in Appendix B.

LEMMA 7 (Weight moments). *Under Assumption 2,  $W_n \in L^2(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$  uniformly in  $\theta$ .*

PROPOSITION 8 (Integrability of terms). *Under Assumptions 2 to 4,  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$ ,  $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |h_m| \in L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$ , and  $h_m \rightarrow h$  in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$ .*

REMARK. The preceding results generalize to the existence of higher moments of  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \pi_\theta(X)$  implying the existence of higher moments of  $W_n$ , although this seems less well-known for many classes of models compared to the Fisher information. Combining this with a stronger growth condition on  $f$  similarly yields higher moments of  $h$ .

3.3. *Limit theorems.* Once we have established sufficient conditions for integrability, we are ready to establish our main results of unbiasedness in stationarity, strong consistency, and a central limit theorem. All proofs in this section are given in Appendix C.

First, we show that the estimator is unbiased for a finite horizon when starting in stationarity. Similar results have been proven under various conditions and for various types of gradient estimators in for example [3, 19, 36, 74]. This theorem is the critical step for the validity of the estimator and relies on a conditioning argument from SPA.

<sup>5</sup>Note that the recoupling time was deliberately defined starting from time 1, so that we can form excursions from a common state at time 0.



**THEOREM 9** (Unbiasedness in stationarity). *Let  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta}$  denote the induced measure on sample paths following  $K_{\text{aug}}$  started according to  $\nu_\theta$ . If Assumptions 1 to 4 hold, then the DMH estimator is finite-horizon unbiased:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_{N-n}(\mathbf{X}_n^\rightarrow) \right] \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0}$$

for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and interior  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ .

Next, using that the augmented MH chain inherits the ergodic properties of the original MH chain, we apply Maker's ergodic theorem [50] (recalled in Appendix C) to show that the finite-horizon version of the estimator converges to the constant infinite-horizon expectation. This allows us to lift unbiasedness to consistency, since what we converge to must then be the desired expectation. Indeed, establishing consistency by lifting (asymptotic) unbiasedness through a regenerative structure has been a general strategy of SPA literature [24, 38].

**THEOREM 10.** *If Assumptions 1 to 4 hold, then the DMH estimator is strongly consistent:*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_{N-n}(\mathbf{X}_n^\rightarrow) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \quad \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}_0} \text{-a.s.}$$

for interior  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  and every starting state  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ . In particular, for every starting state  $X_0 \in \mathbf{X}$  one can sample  $\mathbf{X}_0 \sim Q(\cdot | X_0)$ .

For practical purposes, guarantees on the rate of convergence are of interest. With geometric ergodicity and stronger moment assumptions, we exploit the stopping functional structure to obtain a central limit theorem along [7]. Note that this strengthening is essentially the same as a common sufficient assumption for the classical Markov chain central limit theorem (see for example [41, Corollary 2]).

**THEOREM 11.** *If Assumptions 1 to 4 hold, the augmented MH chain is geometrically ergodic (for example by Proposition 6),  $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |h_m| \in L^{2+\gamma}(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$ , and  $h_m \rightarrow h$  in  $L^{2+\gamma}(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_\theta})$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , then the DMH estimator obeys a central limit theorem: there exists  $\sigma \geq 0$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( h_{N-n}(\mathbf{X}_n^\rightarrow) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] \Big|_{\theta=\theta_0} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

(where the limiting distribution could be degenerate  $\delta_0$  if  $\sigma = 0$ ) for interior  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  and every starting state  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ .

The hypotheses on  $h$  in the above theorem could, if one strengthens Assumptions 2 to 4 to impose the existence of moments up to order  $4 + \gamma$ , be recovered by adapting the proofs of Lemma 7 and Proposition 8 following a previous remark.

**4. Extensions.** We conclude the theoretical treatment with comments on a few extensions to the above results which are of interest to practitioners.

4.1. *Performance functionals.* Assumption 3 is stated in terms of a real-valued performance function for a single state  $f(X_n)$ , but this can easily be extended. The extension to vector-valued performance functions is an immediate consequence of applying the theorems componentwise. A further benefit of the general ergodic results used is that the extension to performance functionals  $f(X_n, X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+L})$  or a fixed finite number of states  $L$  is straightforward; the proof of Theorem 9 only needs to be altered so that the partition accounts for that the  $n$ th term can be affected by perturbations in the first  $n + L$  states of the chain. This allows us to differentiate for example autocovariance, as demonstrated in Section 5.2.

4.2. *Pruning.* For simplicity, the mathematical formalization does not encompass the pruning scheme described in the original introduction of the DMH estimator in [4]. Finite-horizon unbiasedness in stationarity of the original weight-based pruning estimator follows from the remarks by [3, Section B.5], but this estimator does not directly admit the tail functional form of  $h_m$  as future alternatives<sup>6</sup> also depend on the past. However, simpler schemes such as independent subsampling<sup>6</sup> are clearly consistent by a simple modification of the proofs for Theorems 9 and 10.

4.3. *Parameter-dependent proposals.* In the preceding, we have assumed that the proposal kernel  $q$  is independent of the parameter  $\theta$ . However, this is a priori not the case in many practical applications; often one wishes to incorporate gradient information of  $g_\theta$  into the proposal, as in MALA and HMC, or proposal parameters themselves could be the target of optimization in order to tune the sampler. Nevertheless, depending on the application it may not be necessary to consider the sensitivity of the proposal. When the main purpose of a gradient-informed proposal is MCMC performance, one can fix the parameter in the proposal for each run, as the marginal expectation in stationarity is independent of the proposal.

Nevertheless, the actual implementation of the algorithm can be extended easily to a truly parameter-dependent proposal with `StochasticAD.jl`, but the introduction of general non-discrete sensitivity unfortunately significantly complicates the formalization in the theoretical framework above. We sketch some of the necessary extensions in Appendix D. In special cases, there may be significant simplifications that allow us to incorporate the sensitivity. For example, if proposal admits a linear reparameterization, one can transfer the ergodicity results of the chain to pathwise gradient estimates. This is the case in the RWMH proposal tuning example in Section 5.2.


Finally, on discrete spaces or with a proposal kernel that itself factorizes into a continuous and a discrete part, such as the Barker proposal of [49] which incorporates target gradient information, one could instead introduce new alternatives for diverging paths due to the proposal, just as we have done for the accept-reject step.

## 5. Numerical examples.

5.1. *Prior sensitivity analysis.* In [43] the authors introduce a distance-based metric to diagnose sensitivity of the posterior with respect to prior or likelihood by *power-scaling*, which is computed using post hoc importance sampling of the MCMC chain. In this example, we demonstrate how one can automatically obtain an equivalent to the simpler quantity-based sensitivity metric in [43, Eq. 8] from our framework, illustrating how our general methodology can form a building block in sensitivity analysis problems. Letting

---

<sup>6</sup>See also [36, Section 4.4] for discussion of such a scheme in the context of MVD.



(a) Posterior mean estimate, with 95% credible intervals. (Intercept and  $\sigma$  omitted due to differing scales.) (b) Sensitivity as gradient estimate for posterior means, with cross-chain standard errors.

FIG 1. Case study of prior sensitivity analysis on `bodyfat` dataset. Blue/top with original prior, orange/bottom with adjusted prior to resolve conflict.

$p(\phi)$  denote the prior probability and  $p(x|\phi)$  denote the likelihood, power-scaling the prior introduces a hyperparameter  $\theta$  into the posterior

$$p(\phi|x) \propto p(x|\phi) [p(\phi)]^{2\theta}$$

where the scaling  $2^\theta$  is suggested [43, Section 2.4.3] to obtain a natural symmetry at zero. The simple prior sensitivity metric then corresponds to the derivative of the posterior mean  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}[\phi]$  at  $\theta = 0$ .

We consider the case study in [43, Section 5.1], where a prior-data conflict is diagnosed in a Bayesian linear regression model. The goal is to predict body fat percentages given 13 simple body measurements, using the `bodyfat` dataset [40]. The model is

$$y_i \sim \mathbf{N}(\mu_i, \sigma^2), \quad \mu_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{13} \beta_k x_{ik},$$

$$\beta_0 \sim t_3(0, 9.2), \quad \beta_k \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1), \quad \sigma \sim t_3^+(0, 9.2)$$

where the standard Gaussian priors on the regression coefficients are selected with the goal of noninformativity.

We implement the model with a `Turing.jl` specification [22] which conveniently takes care of target density computations and transforming  $\sigma$  to an unbounded parameter space, only needing a small amount of bridging code to introduce the power-scaling hyperparameter. To reproduce the original case study faithfully, we also center the covariates and set the prior mean for  $\beta_0$  to the response mean. For the DMH, we use a Gaussian random walk proposal with a reflection coupling, adjusting for covariate scales by preconditioning with the ordinary least squares covariances. The derivative estimate is computed with 4 chains of 350 000 MH steps where 100 000 steps are burn-in starting from a zero initial parameter vector.

In Fig. 1 we see the resulting parameter estimates and derivatives. A clear non-zero sensitivity is reported for the `wrist` coefficient, which agrees with the results in the original case study. To resolve the prior-data conflict, we follow [43] and adjust the priors to account for the empirical scales of the covariates, so that  $\beta_k \sim \mathbf{N}(0, (2.5s_y/s_{x_k})^2)$ . The posterior mean of the `wrist` coefficient is now subject to less shrinkage towards the prior and the sensitivity is reduced, as expected. Although the computational properties of the DMH estimate are naturally worse than that of the original, specialized method, we emphasize that no additional theoretical derivation and little code was required to obtain these analogous results.

*5.2. Proposal kernel tuning.* The performance of MCMC is highly dependent on the proposal distribution. Different strategies have been used to find suitable proposals, such as adaptive MCMC methods [2] or variational tuning methods [11]. In this example we consider minimizing the 1-lag autocovariance, defined in stationarity as

$$\gamma_1 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}[(X_0 - \mathbb{E}_\pi[X])(X_1 - \mathbb{E}_\pi[X])] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}[X_0X_1] - \mathbb{E}_\pi[X]^2,$$

with respect to the proposal “step size”  $\sigma$  in Gaussian random walk MH. For a multidimensional target, we will minimize the determinant of the corresponding cross-covariance matrix. Autocovariance is chosen as a proxy objective for mixing speed, with the underlying intuition that an efficient sampler should yield as uncorrelated samples as possible. This objective is related to the expected squared jump distance of the chain [75, 76].

We will drop the derivative of the second term in  $\gamma_1$  in our estimator, as it vanishes in stationarity, and hence our target derivative to estimate for optimization is  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu\sigma}}[X_0X_1]$ . This problem fits into our framework if we consider two of the extensions to our theoretical result since the 1-lag autocovariance depends on pairs of states and the proposal is parameter-dependent. For consistency higher moments of the target suffice; we elaborate on the theoretical details in Appendix D.1.

First, we compare with the classical theory for  $d$ -dimensional isotropic Gaussian distributions, for which the optimum  $\sigma = 2.38/\sqrt{d}$  is well-known [67]. The proposal covariance is taken as  $\sigma^2 I$ , giving us a single parameter to tune. In Fig. 2 results for a range of  $\sigma$  are shown, where each estimate is based on 100 MCMC chains with 250 000 steps starting from zero. The suggested objective recovers the theoretical optimum, which indicates that it is a reasonable choice for proposal tuning.

We now use our DMH gradient estimator in the Adam optimizer [44] to fit a full proposal covariance to some multidimensional distributions. Each iteration will run a single chain for 250 000 steps, and the optimizer is run for 800 iterations starting with a diagonal proposal covariance matrix. The  $d \times d$  covariance matrix is parameterized in an unconstrained domain by the  $d(d+1)/2$  non-zero elements in its Cholesky factor, essentially learning component scales and pairwise correlations. We show three two-dimensional distributions: a single Gaussian with correlation for which the optimum is known, a toy non-Gaussian mixture “Dual Moon” [11], and a challenging Rosenbrock-type distribution [31, 62, 70]. The learning rate of Adam is set to 0.005 for the first two targets and 0.003 for the Rosenbrock target.

The resulting proposals are shown in Fig. 3. We recover essentially the known optimal proposal in the Gaussian case and a very plausible proposal for the “Dual Moon” with good diagnostics that arguably performs better than the rule of thumb in terms of effective sample size. For the Rosenbrock-type target we have slow tail exploration (compare discussion in [62]) that makes the optimization slow to converge and prone to sticking in local optima, but the resulting large proposal perhaps slightly improves in the first coordinate on the rule of thumb. Note that the acceptance rates of the resulting




FIG 2. Tuning an isotropic RWMH proposal targeting a  $d$ -dimensional isotropic Gaussian. Estimated 1-lag autocorrelation (top) and corresponding derivative (bottom) with cross-chain standard errors. Gray dashed line is the theoretical optimum at  $\sigma = 2.38/\sqrt{d}$ .




FIG 3. Fitting a Gaussian proposal distribution for RWMH with a given target by minimizing the 1-lag autocorrelation. The contour of the final proposal distribution is shown overlaid on the contour of the target distribution centered in the origin in gray.

proposals for the latter two targets are lower than what would naïvely be targeted using acceptance rates derived from Gaussian asymptotics, as is expected [76]. Full diagnostics are given in Appendix E. Finally, though this example is comparatively computationally demanding, we repeat a remark from [67] that it is unnecessary to tune to the precise optimum, as reasonable efficiency can be achieved with sufficiently close parameters; indeed we observe diminishing returns in the optimizer indicating a quite flat objective once having found a reasonable proposal.

## APPENDIX A: PROOFS OF SECTION 3.1

DEFINITION A.1 ( $\phi$ -irreducibility). A Markov chain on  $(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  with transition kernel  $K$  is  $\phi$ -irreducible for a non-trivial  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\phi$  on  $(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  if with  $\kappa(dx' | x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} K^n(dx' | x)$  one has for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  that  $\phi \ll \kappa(\cdot | x)$ , where  $\ll$  denotes absolute continuity, that is for all  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $\kappa(A | x) = 0 \implies \phi(A) = 0$ .

There exist more commonly used equivalent definitions of  $\phi$ -irreducibility [52, Proposition 4.2.1], but this specific formulation is useful in the following result:

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3. Fix  $y = (x, x^\circ, u, \epsilon)$ . From (6) it follows that  $R(\cdot | y)$  is a Dirac measure in some fixed  $x' \in \mathsf{X}$ . Let  $\kappa = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} K_{\text{MH}}^n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int f d\phi Q &= \iint f(y) Q(dy | \xi) \phi(d\xi) = \int \frac{d\phi}{d\kappa(\cdot | x')}(\xi) \left( \int f(y) Q(dy | \xi) \right) \kappa(d\xi | x') \\ &= \int f(y) \frac{d\phi}{d\kappa(\cdot | x')} d(\kappa Q)(\cdot | x') \end{aligned}$$

as the first component of  $y$  is  $\xi$ , so  $\phi Q$  has a  $(\kappa Q)(\cdot | x')$  density. Thus

$$\phi Q \ll (R\kappa Q)(\cdot | y) \ll \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} K_{\text{aug}}^{n+1} \right) (\cdot | y) \ll \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n} K_{\text{aug}}^n \right) (\cdot | y)$$

for arbitrary  $y$  and the statement follows.  $\square$

DEFINITION A.2 (Harris recurrence). A Markov chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  on  $(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  is *Harris recurrent* (w.r.t.  $\phi$ ) if for all  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\phi(A) > 0$  it holds that  $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{1}_A(X_n) = \infty) = 1$ , that is the chain a.s. visits  $A$  infinitely many times.

PROPOSITION A.3 ([26, Theorem 3]). *The chain  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is Harris recurrent if and only if there exists a random time  $\tau \geq 1$  such that  $X_\tau$  is independent of the starting value  $x_0$  (that is, the distribution of  $X_\tau$  under  $\mathbb{P}_{x_0}$  does not depend on  $x_0$ ).*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4. We fix a starting state  $y = (x, x^\circ, u, \epsilon)$  and write  $x' = \gamma(y)$  for the map induced by the Dirac kernel  $R$ . Consider the Markov chain  $X$  with kernel  $K_{\text{MH}}$  starting in  $X_1 = x'$ . Since  $X$  is Harris recurrent, and our state space is Polish and hence countably generated, we can use the Athreya–Ney–Nummelin splitting technique [5, 56, 58]. Hence there exists a function  $s$  with positive expectation under the invariant measure and a probability measure  $\rho$  such that

$$K_{\text{MH}}(x, \cdot) \geq s(x)\rho(\cdot)$$

which can then be used to construct a Markov chain on an augmented state space as follows: given  $X_i$ , sample a Bernoulli  $S_i$  with success probability  $s(X_i)$ ; conditional on success, draw  $X_{i+1}$  from  $\rho$ , and conditional on failure, draw from the residual kernel

$$\frac{K_{\text{MH}}(x, \cdot) - s(x)\rho(\cdot)}{1 - s(x)}.$$

We may now augment the split chain setting  $Y_n = (X_n, X_n^\circ, U_n, \epsilon_n)$ . Here  $X_n^\circ, U_n, \epsilon_n$  are draws from the *conditional* law of the augmented chain as defined earlier given  $X_n$  and  $X_{n+1}$ . Then  $Y_n$  is distributed as the augmented chain in Construction 2. The random time  $\tau = \inf_i \{S_i = 1\} + 1$  renders  $X_\tau$  independent from  $x'$ , moreover  $Y_{\tau+1}$  is independent of  $y_0$ . By Proposition A.3, the augmented chain is Harris recurrent.  $\square$



PROOF OF COROLLARY 5. By assumption  $K_{\text{MH}}$  is  $\pi_\theta$ -irreducible. From Proposition 3 we obtain that  $K_{\text{aug}}$  is  $\nu_\theta$ -irreducible. The statement now follows by a standard Markov chain result; see for example [16, Theorem 5.2.6, Corollary 9.2.16]. Note that we need not worry about aperiodicity for the convergence of averages.  $\square$

For the final proof, we recall a useful characterization of geometric ergodicity:

PROPOSITION A.4 ([21], Theorem 1.ii). *Assume that the measurable space  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  is countably generated. Let  $K$  be the transition kernel of a  $\phi$ -irreducible, aperiodic Markov chain on  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  with invariant measure  $\pi$ . Then the chain is geometrically ergodic if and only if there exists  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  with  $\pi(A) > 0$  such that for all  $x \in A$ , there exist  $\rho_x < 1$  and  $C_x < \infty$  where  $\|K^n(\cdot | x) - \pi(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \leq C_x \rho_x^n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6. The technical assumptions in Proposition A.4 hold since the state space is assumed Polish and  $K_{\text{MH}}$  is geometrically ergodic. Previously we established for  $K_{\text{aug}}$  the invariant distribution  $\pi Q$  and the inheritance of  $\phi$ -irreducibility (Proposition 3).

We begin by establishing a “data processing inequality” in total variation for  $Q$ . Total variation distance between two measures  $\phi, \psi$  on  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{X})$  can be characterized with the help of their possible couplings [48, Theorem 5.2] as

$$\|\phi(\cdot) - \psi(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} = \min_{X \sim \phi, Y \sim \psi} \mathbb{P}(X \neq Y)$$

where there exists a coupling for which the minimum is attained. (Total variation is here defined to be normalized to  $[0, 1]$ .) Any coupling of  $\phi, \psi$  can be then used to construct a coupling of  $\phi Q, \psi Q$  by always taking the independent components  $U, \epsilon'$  the same (a trivial self-coupling) and using our proposal coupling  $q$  in Assumption 4. As the proposal coupling is faithful, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi Q(\cdot) - \psi Q(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} &\leq \min_{\substack{X \sim \phi, Y \sim \psi \\ (X^\circ, Y^\circ) \sim q(\cdot | X, Y)}} \mathbb{P}(X \neq Y \vee X^\circ \neq Y^\circ) \\ &= \min_{\substack{X \sim \phi, Y \sim \psi \\ (X^\circ, Y^\circ) \sim q(\cdot | X, Y)}} \mathbb{P}(X \neq Y) = \|\phi(\cdot) - \psi(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since  $K_{\text{MH}}$  is geometrically ergodic there exists a set  $A$  with  $\pi(A) > 0$  as given by Proposition A.4. Let  $B = A \times A \times [0, 1] \times [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Then  $\pi Q(B) > 0$  by the positivity assumption on the proposal  $q$ . Hence, for any starting state  $y \in B$  we have a corresponding  $x' = \gamma(y) \in A$  from the map induced by the Dirac kernel  $R$ . Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_{\text{aug}}^n(\cdot | y) - \pi Q(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} &= \|(RK_{\text{MH}}^{n-1}Q)(\cdot | y) - \pi Q(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &= \|(K_{\text{MH}}^{n-1}Q)(\cdot | x') - \pi Q(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \|K_{\text{MH}}^{n-1}(\cdot | x') - \pi(\cdot)\|_{\text{TV}} \\ &\leq \max\{C_{x'}, 1\} \rho^{n-1} \leq \frac{\max\{C_{x'}, 1\}}{\rho_{x'}} \rho_{x'}^n \end{aligned}$$

using the geometric ergodicity of  $K_{\text{MH}}$  to obtain the last line of inequalities. Hence  $K_{\text{aug}}$  is geometrically ergodic by Proposition A.4.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF SECTION 3.2

PROOF OF LEMMA 7. We will make use of the “score expansion” of the acceptance probability derivative

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \alpha_\theta(x^\circ | x) = \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_\theta(x^\circ | x) < 1} \alpha_\theta(x^\circ | x) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \frac{g_\theta(x^\circ) q(x | x^\circ)}{g_\theta(x) q(x^\circ | x)}.$$

and with  $\alpha_\theta \leq 1$  and the elementary inequality  $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$  we can expand the weights into two terms as the proposal derivatives vanish:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|W_n|^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n) \right|^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log g_\theta(X_n) \right|^2 \right] + 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ | X_n) \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log g_\theta(X_n^\circ) \right|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is a “translated” version of the Fisher information of  $\pi_\theta$  owing to the missing normalization constant  $\mathcal{Z}_\theta$ , so by the triangle inequality

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log g_\theta(X_n) \right| \leq \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \frac{g_\theta(X_n)}{\mathcal{Z}_\theta} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log \mathcal{Z}_\theta \right|$$

and hence is finite by hypothesis.

The second term is bounded by using the *sub-invariance* of  $\pi_\theta$  for the continuous part of  $K_{\text{MH}}$ , that is  $\iint f(x) \alpha_\theta(x^\circ | x) q(dx^\circ | x) \pi_\theta(dx) \leq \int f(x^\circ) \pi_\theta(dx^\circ)$  for non-negative  $f$  and hence

$$\int \left( \int \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log g_\theta(x^\circ) \right|^2 \alpha_\theta(x^\circ | x) q(dx^\circ | x) \right) \pi_\theta(dx) \leq \int \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \log g_\theta(x^\circ) \right|^2 \pi_\theta(dx^\circ)$$

and hence is also finite. □

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 8. There are two cases depending on the version of Assumption 3. If we have Assumption 3a, then using the boundedness of  $f$  we have immediately

$$|h(\mathbf{X}_0^\rightarrow)| \leq |W_0| \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_0-1} |f(Y_{0,k}) - f(X_k)| \leq 2|W_0| \tau_0 \|f\|_\infty$$

and hence applying Hölder’s inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(\mathbf{X}_0^\rightarrow)|] \leq 2\|f\|_\infty \mathbb{E}[|W_0|^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[|\tau_0|^2]^{1/2} < \infty$$

by the assumptions and Lemma 7.

If we have Assumption 3b the result requires more work. Let  $S_T^{(X)}(f) = \sum_{k=1}^T |f(X_k)|$  and  $S_T^{(Y)}(f) = \sum_{k=1}^T |f(Y_{0,k})|$ . By the triangle inequality and Hölder’s inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(\mathbf{X}_0^\rightarrow)|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|W_0|^2]^{1/2} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (S_{\tau_0}^{(Y)}(f))^2 \right]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E} \left[ (S_{\tau_0}^{(X)}(f))^2 \right]^{1/2} \right)$$

and the expectation of the squared weights is bounded by Lemma 7, so it remains to bound the expectations of the squared stopped sums. Under our hypotheses, the marginal chains for  $X$  and  $Y$  are geometrically ergodic MH chains, and without loss of generality, they have initial distributions  $\pi_\theta$  and  $\pi_\theta q$ , respectively. Hence, the drift condition (4)

holds. We also have  $f(x)^2 \leq C_1 V(x)$ . By Cauchy-Schwarz, the drift condition also holds for  $\sqrt{V}$  as

$$K_{\text{MH}} \sqrt{V(x)} \leq \sqrt{K_{\text{MH}} V(x)} \leq \sqrt{\alpha V(x) + \beta} \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \sqrt{V(x)} + \sqrt{\beta}.$$

In this setting, we can apply a result by [1, Theorem 3.1], in a special form that follows from its proof in the case of exponent 2, to deduce for some  $C_2 > 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(X)}(f)^2 \right] &\leq C_2 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(X)}(V) \right] + \pi_{\theta}(V) + \mathbb{E}[\tau_0^2] \right), \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(Y)}(f)^2 \right] &\leq C_2 \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(Y)}(V) \right] + \pi_{\theta} q(V) + \pi_{\theta} q K_{\text{MH}}(V) + \mathbb{E}[\tau_0^2] \right). \end{aligned}$$

where in particular using the drift condition yields

$$\pi_{\theta} q K_{\text{MH}}(V) \leq \alpha \pi_{\theta} q(V) + \beta < \infty.$$

Next, using a result by [55, Lemma 2.2] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(X)}(V) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (\pi_{\theta}(V) + \beta \mathbb{E}[\tau_0]) < \infty, \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ S_{\tau_0}^{(Y)}(V) \right] &\leq \frac{1}{1-\alpha} (\pi_{\theta} q(V) + \beta \mathbb{E}[\tau_0]) < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

both finite by hypothesis. The first statement follows.

To obtain the remaining statements, apply the triangle inequality to  $|h_m|$  and note that  $\tau_0 \wedge m \leq \tau_0$  allows using the same bounds as before to obtain integrable domination uniformly in  $m$ ; then use dominated convergence.  $\square$

### APPENDIX C: PROOFS OF SECTION 3.3

**PROOF OF THEOREM 9.** Fix  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and interior  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ . To avoid excessive indices, let  $\nu := \nu_{\theta_0}$  and let  $\mathbb{E}$  denote  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu}}$  as we will consider the path measure fixed and study the impact by perturbing the kernel itself. By stationarity and linearity of expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_{\theta}} [f(X)]|_{\theta=\theta_0} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f(X_n) \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mathbb{E} [f(X_k)]$$

and so using the linearity of derivatives we will consider each state separately.

The dependence on  $\theta$  in  $K_{\text{aug}}$  is entirely structural in the sense that perturbations come from acceptance probabilities in  $R$ . If we consider

$$(7) \quad (R_{\theta+\epsilon} - R_{\theta-\epsilon})f(x, x^{\circ}, u, \epsilon') = \begin{cases} f(x^{\circ}) - f(x) & \alpha_{\theta-\epsilon}(x^{\circ}|x) < u \leq \alpha_{\theta+\epsilon}(x^{\circ}|x) \\ f(x) - f(x^{\circ}) & \alpha_{\theta+\epsilon}(x^{\circ}|x) < u \leq \alpha_{\theta-\epsilon}(x^{\circ}|x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

it is clear that a specific interval of  $u$  causes the path to diverge in a manner dependent on the sign of  $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta}$ . This will allow us to form events on which perturbations occur.

Hence, we use a filtered Monte Carlo approach [19] with two versions of the chain running in parallel for  $\theta_0 \pm \epsilon$  according to the coupling we have defined in (3). Let  $A_k(\epsilon)$  be the event on which no perturbation occurs through the  $k$ th state, and let  $B_k(\epsilon)$  be the event on which the first perturbation occurs *leaving* the  $k$ th state. By definition  $A_{k-1}(\epsilon) \setminus A_k(\epsilon) = B_{k-1}(\epsilon)$ . Hence  $B_0(\epsilon), B_1(\epsilon), \dots, B_{n-1}(\epsilon)$ , and  $A_n(\epsilon)$  form a partition for any fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Fixing  $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ , writing  $X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}, X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}$  for the alternative paths described above, we partition the derivative written as a central difference:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}[f(X_n)] &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[ f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \right] \\
(8) \quad &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)})}{2\epsilon} \mathbf{1}_{A_n(\epsilon)} \right] \\
(9) \quad &+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \right) \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B_k(\epsilon)}}{2\epsilon} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In the first term (8), where no perturbation occurs on the event, the difference is zero by definition. It remains to compute the limit in the second term (9). Consider a fixed  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , then condition on  $B_k(\epsilon)$  and the states  $X_k, X_k^\circ$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \right) \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B_k(\epsilon)}}{2\epsilon} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[ f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \middle| B_k(\epsilon), X_k, X_k^\circ \right]}_{=:\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon}} \underbrace{\frac{\mathbb{P}(B_k(\epsilon) | X_k, X_k^\circ)}{2\epsilon}}_{=:P_{k,\epsilon}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

First, we note that the conditional difference is integrably dominated, either trivially by Assumption 3a or by using the  $\theta$ -uniform drift condition (4) from Assumption 3b to obtain

$$\left| f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \right| \leq 2C_f \left( \alpha^{n-k} (V(X_k^\circ) + V(X_k)) + \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right).$$

The a.s. limit of the conditional difference is established by case analysis on the sign of  $\frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta}$  and  $U_k$ . By forcing the perturbation according to (7), thus forcing  $B_k(\epsilon)$  to occur so that the limit is only in the dynamics, we establish for the different cases

$$\begin{cases}
-\mathbb{E} \left[ f(Y_{k,n-k}^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) \middle| X_k, X_k^\circ \right] & \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta} > 0 \text{ and } U_k \leq \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k) \\
+\mathbb{E} \left[ f(Y_{k,n-k}^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \middle| X_k, X_k^\circ \right] & \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta} > 0 \text{ and } U_k > \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k) \\
+\mathbb{E} \left[ f(Y_{k,n-k}^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \middle| X_k, X_k^\circ \right] & \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta} \leq 0 \text{ and } U_k \leq \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k) \\
-\mathbb{E} \left[ f(Y_{k,n-k}^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) \middle| X_k, X_k^\circ \right] & \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial \theta} \leq 0 \text{ and } U_k > \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k)
\end{cases}$$

all of which by conditional dominated convergence have the same limit except for the sign  $S_k = \left( 1 - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{U_k \leq \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k)} \right) \text{sign} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k) \right)$ , which gives the expression

$$\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{\text{a.s.}} \mathbb{E} \left[ (f(Y_{k,n-k}) - f(X_n)) S_k \middle| X_k, X_k^\circ \right].$$

For the second factor, the characterization in (7) and Assumption 2 imply

$$P_{k,\epsilon} = \frac{|\alpha_{\theta_0+\epsilon}(X_k^\circ | X_k) - \alpha_{\theta_0-\epsilon}(X_k^\circ | X_k)|}{2\epsilon} \xrightarrow[\epsilon \rightarrow 0]{\text{a.s.}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \alpha_{\theta_0}(X_k^\circ | X_k) \right|.$$

By moving the sign  $S_k$  to the second factor, this establishes that the a.s. limit of the product  $\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}$  is in fact  $\mathbb{E} [W_k (f(Y_{k,n-k}) - f(X_n)) | X_k, X_k^\circ]$  with our previously defined  $W_k$ . It remains to show that we can apply dominated convergence to pass to a limit in mean.

Hence, we now establish that the product is uniformly integrable. We need to show

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| \mathbf{1}_{|\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| > K} \right] = 0.$$

Apply Hölder's inequality for fixed  $K, \epsilon$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| \mathbf{1}_{|\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| > K} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ |\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon}|^{2+\gamma} \right]^{\frac{1}{2+\gamma}} \mathbb{E} \left[ |P_{k,\epsilon}|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| > K)^{\frac{\gamma}{4+2\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first factor is uniformly bounded by the same argument as before; either trivially by Assumption 3a or by using the  $\theta$ -uniform drift condition (4) from Assumption 3b to obtain the integrable bound

$$\left| f(X_n^{(\theta_0+\epsilon)}) - f(X_n^{(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) \right|^{2+\gamma} \leq 2^{2+\gamma} C_f \left( \alpha^{n-k} (V(X_k^\circ) + V(X_k)) + \frac{\beta}{1-\alpha} \right).$$

The second factor is uniformly bounded by hypothesis; applying the mean value theorem [19, Theorem 1.2] and using the uniformity in Lemma 7 we deduce

$$\sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ |P_{k,\epsilon}|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |W_k|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty.$$

Finally, the third factor has

$$\sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(|\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| > K)^{\frac{\gamma}{4+2\gamma}} \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} |\Delta_{n,k,\epsilon} P_{k,\epsilon}| > K \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{4+2\gamma}} \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

and uniform integrability follows.

Hence, summing over  $k$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E} [f(X_n)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} W_k (f(Y_{k,n-k}) - f(X_n)) \right].$$

To recover the tail functionals, we sum over all  $n$  and transpose the indices from the average over past perturbations affecting the  $n$ th state to the average over future perturbations beginning from the  $k$ th state. Since no perturbation can occur for the initial state, and the transition out of the final state has no impact in this window, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta} [f(X)] |_{\theta=\theta_0} &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E} [f(X_n)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} W_k (f(Y_{k,n-k}) - f(X_n)) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-k-1} W_k (f(Y_{k,\ell}) - f(X_{k+\ell})) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} h_{N-k}(\mathbf{X}_k^\rightarrow) \right] \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

The usual Markov chain law of large numbers is stated for functions of the “current” state. However, the general Birkhoff ergodic theorem also applies to tail functionals such as our  $h$  under consideration.

**THEOREM C.1** ([16, Theorems 5.1.8, 5.2.9]). *Let  $K$  be a Markov kernel on  $\mathcal{Z}$ , which admits an invariant probability measure  $\nu$  such that  $(\mathcal{Z}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{Z}^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{P}_\nu, T)$  is an ergodic dynamical system, where  $\mathbb{P}_\nu$  denotes the induced measure on sample paths following  $K$  started according to  $\nu$ , and  $T$  is the sequence shift. Let  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{P}_\nu)$ . Then for  $\nu$ -almost every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h \circ T^n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}[h] \quad \mathbb{P}_z \text{-a.s.}$$

with convergence also in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\nu)$ .

The infinite-horizon result also extends to the finite-horizon case by use of Maker’s ergodic theorem:

**THEOREM C.2** (following [50, Theorem 10.4.1]; [37]). *In the setting of Theorem C.1, let  $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} |h_m| \in L^1(\mathbb{P}_\nu)$  and  $h_m \rightarrow h$   $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ -a.s.. Then for  $\nu$ -almost every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} h_{N-n} \circ T^n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_\nu}[h] \quad \mathbb{P}_z \text{-a.s.}$$

with convergence also in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_\nu)$ .

**COROLLARY C.3** (using [52, Proposition 17.1.6]). *If in Theorems C.1 and C.2 the kernel  $K$  is Harris recurrent, then “ $\nu$ -almost every” is strengthened to “every”  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .*

**PROOF OF THEOREM 10.** Under the hypotheses, convergence of the estimator  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{x}_0}$ -a.s. and in  $L^1(\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\theta_0}})$  follows by Proposition 4, Theorem C.2, and Corollary C.3. The sampling initialization regime is obvious by construction of  $\nu_{\theta_0}$ . It remains to prove that the constant limit  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\theta_0}}}[h]$  is the correct one. However, under the hypotheses Theorem 9 holds, and taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of both sides in Theorem 9 yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\theta_0}}}[h] = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi_\theta}[f(X)] \right|_{\theta=\theta_0}$$

as required. □

**PROOF OF THEOREM 11.** This is an almost<sup>7</sup> direct application of [7, Theorem 5]. Consider first a central limit theorem for the infinite-horizon version  $h$ . The mixing condition follows by geometric ergodicity as [7, Section 6.1.1] implies the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients decay geometrically fast  $\mathbb{P}_{\nu_{\theta_0}}$ -a.s., the moment conditions on the stopping time follow by Assumption 4 according to [7, Remark 3.1.1b], and the moment conditions on the functional follow by hypothesis. The result holds for any starting distribution by Harris recurrence from Proposition 4 using [52, Proposition 17.1.6].

---

<sup>7</sup>Although the theorem is stated for an Euclidean Borel state space, nothing in the proofs depends explicitly on these values and we may extend to our setting.



It remains to pass from an infinite horizon to a finite horizon. Consider the difference

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (h_{N-n}(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}) - h(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}))$$

and observe that it is zero-mean in stationarity due to unbiasedness. Furthermore, using the stationarity it follows (using the shift notation  $h(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}) = h \circ T^n$  for conciseness)

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (h(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow}) - h_{N-n}(\mathbf{X}_n^{\rightarrow})) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \text{Var}(h - h_{N-n}) + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=n+1}^{N-1} \text{Cov}(h - h_{N-n}, (h - h_{N-k}) \circ T^{k-n}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^N \text{Var}(h - h_m) + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \text{Cov}(h - h_m, (h - h_{m-\ell}) \circ T^{\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

The first term tends to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , since  $\text{Var}(h - h_m) \rightarrow 0$  by hypothesis and it is the Cesàro mean of this sequence. The second term also tends to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , although the result is more complicated and requires a variant of [7, Theorem 3] with the uniform moment bound hypothesis to deduce

$$|\text{Cov}(h - h_m, (h - h_{m-\ell}) \circ T^{\ell})| \leq A_m \alpha^{\gamma/(2+\gamma)} (\ell - \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor) + \frac{B_m}{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{2(1+\gamma)/(2+\gamma)}}$$

where  $\alpha$  denotes the aforementioned mixing coefficients,  $A_m = 16 \|h - h_m\|_{2+\gamma} (\|h\|_{2+\gamma} + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|h_n\|_{2+\gamma})$ , and  $B_m = \|h - h_m\|_{2+\gamma} (\|h\|_{2+\gamma} + \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|h_n\|_{2+\gamma}) \mathbb{E}(\tau^2)^{(1+\gamma)/(2+\gamma)}$ . Hence, the covariances are summable in  $\ell$ , and it follows for the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \text{Cov}(h - h_m, (h - h_{m-\ell}) \circ T^{\ell}) \right| \\ & \leq A_m \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \alpha^{\gamma/(2+\gamma)} (\ell - \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor) + B_m \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor^{-2(1+\gamma)/(2+\gamma)} \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $A_m, B_m \rightarrow 0$  by hypothesis. Hence the second term is also a Cesàro mean converging to zero. Since the residuals are zero-mean, this shows that they converge to zero in probability, hence vanishing in the distributional limit, and the statement follows.  $\square$

#### APPENDIX D: PARAMETER-DEPENDENT PROPOSALS

Using a pathwise estimator (that is, a reparameterization trick, see [54]) for parameter-dependent proposals accounts for the additional sensitivity, at the cost of introducing new assumptions on the structure of the state space, the existence of gradients of  $f$  and  $\alpha_{\theta}$ , as well as integrability conditions on the pathwise estimator. This is the approach taken in `StochasticAD.jl`, as it is a natural extension of automatic differentiation to continuous random variables.

First, an additional weight term in (2) is required to account for the sensitivity of the states to  $\theta$ , yielding the total derivative chain rule

$$\tilde{W}_n = W_n + \left( \frac{\partial \alpha_{\theta}}{\partial x^{\circ}}(X_n^{\circ} | X_n) \frac{dX_n^{\circ}}{d\theta} + \frac{\partial \alpha_{\theta}}{\partial \theta}(X_n^{\circ} | X_n) \frac{dX_n}{d\theta} \right) (1 - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{U_n \leq \alpha_{\theta}(X_n^{\circ} | X_n)})$$

where  $\frac{dX_n}{d\theta}$ ,  $\frac{dX_n^{\circ}}{d\theta}$  denote the pathwise gradient estimators. Under additional assumptions on the acceptance probability derivatives in  $x, x^{\circ}$  similar to Assumption 2 as well as

moment conditions on the pathwise gradient estimators, one may obtain a new version of Lemma 7. Then, (8) now converges to  $\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla f(X_k), \frac{dX_k}{d\theta} \rangle]$  by a dominated convergence argument [19, Section 1.2] and one obtains the extended estimator. Unfortunately, in general, the pathwise estimator of a single sample could depend on the whole past chain, and the existence of moments of  $\tilde{W}_n$  is nontrivial, so any consistency argument will likely be ad-hoc.

**D.1. Proposal kernel tuning.** We apply the above framework to the problem in Section 5.2. In this special case, we will see that significant simplifications are possible. The Gaussian random walk proposal  $X^\circ|X = x \sim \mathbf{N}(x, \theta^2)$  has a direct reparameterization using a latent  $Z \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1)$  as  $X^\circ(X, Z) = X + \theta Z$ . The pathwise derivative estimator for the proposal thus becomes the recursion  $\frac{dX^\circ}{d\theta} = \frac{dX}{d\theta} + Z$ .

First, we consider the contribution from (8). The recursion suggests the pathwise estimator in stationarity should be  $\frac{dX}{d\theta} = \frac{X}{\theta}$ . Indeed, if we take  $\frac{dX_0}{d\theta} = \frac{X_0}{\theta}$  then we have a direct rescaling of the original MH chain and

$$\frac{dX_k}{d\theta}(X_k) = \frac{1}{\theta}X_k, \quad \frac{dX_k^\circ}{d\theta}(X_k^\circ) = \frac{1}{\theta}X_k^\circ$$

where we can write the derivative estimates as functions of the current state, allowing us to trivially transfer the ergodicity properties of the augmented chain to the sequence of pathwise estimators. Hence the pathwise derivative appearing in  $\widehat{\frac{\partial \gamma_1}{\partial \theta}}$  is

$$\frac{d}{d\theta}(X_k X_{k+1}) = \frac{dX_k}{d\theta} X_{k+1} + X_k \frac{dX_{k+1}}{d\theta} = \frac{2}{\theta} X_k X_{k+1}$$

with consistency for this term following from the usual ergodic theorems, as long as the target has second moments. In actual simulation, we may then start with  $\frac{dX_0}{d\theta} = 0$  as would be implied by a constant starting state and still have a guarantee that this term converges.

Second, we consider the contribution from (9). Recall that  $g$  denotes the unnormalized target density and observe that we, using the symmetry of the proposal, obtain the acceptance probability derivative following the previous discussion

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\theta} \alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ|X_n) &= \frac{\partial \alpha_\theta}{\partial x^\circ}(X_n^\circ|X_n) \frac{dX_n^\circ}{d\theta} + \frac{\partial \alpha_\theta}{\partial x}(X_n^\circ|X_n) \frac{dX_n}{d\theta} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ|X_n) < 1} \frac{\alpha_\theta(X_n^\circ|X_n)}{\theta} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [\log g(X_n^\circ)] X_n^\circ - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [\log g(X_n)] X_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

for which the analogue of Lemma 7 follows if  $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim \pi}[|X \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \log g(X)|^2] < \infty$ . For the second moment to exist of  $f(X_k, X_{k+1}) = X_k X_{k+1}$  (to conclude Proposition 8) it is clear that it is sufficient that the target distribution possesses fourth moments. Then, following the discussion on performance functionals dependent on multiple states, we will have consistency arguing similarly to the proofs of Theorems 9 and 10. Summing these two terms together to form the estimator, unbiasedness follows from the previous discussion, and consistency follows from the aforementioned arguments.

The multidimensional case is handled analogously; the entries of the cross-covariance matrix are essentially component-wise products, so the derivative of the determinant can be related to the derivative of each entry by Jacobi's formula. Similarly, a full parameter-dependent covariance matrix will also lead to a (more complicated) rescaling of the original chain as the pathwise estimator.

## APPENDIX E: MCMC DIAGNOSTICS FOR SECTION 5.2

The diagnostics for the final proposals in Section 5.2 (and comparisons to the naïve manual tuning) were obtained by running 4 chains of 250 000 steps starting from the same state as the optimizer. The definitions of effective sample size (ESS) and  $\hat{R}$  follow those of [79].

TABLE 1

*Gaussian with unit variance and correlation 0.5, suggested proposal. Final acceptance rate 0.354.*

Param.	Mean	Std.	MC s.e.	ESS (bulk)	ESS (tail)	$\hat{R}$
$x_1$	-0.0004	0.9995	0.0028	128 529.3669	171 540.5235	1.0000
$x_2$	0.0033	0.9976	0.0027	136 899.0162	177 234.6313	1.0000

TABLE 2

*Dual Moon, suggested proposal. Final acceptance rate 0.166.*

Param.	Mean	Std.	MC s.e.	ESS (bulk)	ESS (tail)	$\hat{R}$
$x_1$	-0.0036	1.6003	0.0085	39 979.9761	82 117.3025	1.0001
$x_2$	-0.0016	1.6020	0.0083	42 611.9025	86 820.3302	1.0001

TABLE 3

*Dual Moon, naïve proposal. Final acceptance rate 0.234.*

Param.	Mean	Std.	MC s.e.	ESS (bulk)	ESS (tail)	$\hat{R}$
$x_1$	-0.0025	1.6047	0.0110	25 431.7478	90 642.5985	1.0001
$x_2$	-0.0043	1.5966	0.0112	23 931.9972	88 170.5031	1.0002

TABLE 4

*Rosenbrock-type, suggested proposal. Final acceptance rate 0.156.*

Param.	Mean	Std.	MC s.e.	ESS (bulk)	ESS (tail)	$\hat{R}$
$x_1$	-0.0049	0.4492	0.0029	24 031.4766	18 120.7512	1.0002
$x_2$	0.2019	0.3003	0.0025	27 835.1758	15 459.7793	1.0002

TABLE 5

*Rosenbrock-type, naïve proposal. Final acceptance rate 0.233.*

Param.	Mean	Std.	MC s.e.	ESS (bulk)	ESS (tail)	$\hat{R}$
$x_1$	-0.0011	0.4497	0.0034	17 109.1143	18 581.6855	1.0002
$x_2$	0.2023	0.3013	0.0025	29 602.4486	16 926.9068	1.0002

**Acknowledgments.** We warmly thank Paolo Ceriani, Adrien Corenflos, Peter Glynn, Bernd Heidergott, Alexander Lew, Frank Schäfer, and Aila Särkkä for fruitful discussions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ALSMEYER, G. (2003). On the Existence of Moments of Stopped Sums in Markov Renewal Theory. *Probab. Math. Statist.* **23** 389–411.
- [2] ANDRIEU, C. and THOMS, J. (2008). A Tutorial on Adaptive MCMC. *Stat. Comput.* **18** 343–373. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-008-9110-y>
- [3] ARYA, G., SCHAUER, M., SCHÄFER, F. and RACKAUCKAS, C. (2022). Automatic Differentiation of Programs with Discrete Randomness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35** 10435–10447. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2210.08572>
- [4] ARYA, G., SEYER, R., SCHÄFER, F., CHANDRA, K., LEW, A. K., HUOT, M., MANSINGHKA, V., RAGAN-KELLEY, J., RACKAUCKAS, C. V. and SCHAUER, M. (2023). Differentiating Metropolis-Hastings to Optimize Intractable Densities. In *ICML 2023 Workshop on Differentiable Almost Everything: Differentiable Relaxations, Algorithms, Operators, and Simulators*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.07961>
- [5] ATHREYA, K. B., McDONALD, D. and NEY, P. (1978). Limit Theorems for Semi-Markov Processes and Renewal Theory for Markov Chains. *The Annals of Probability* **6** 788–797.
- [6] BECKER, M. R., LEW, A. K., WANG, X., GHAVAMI, M., HUOT, M., RINARD, M. and MANSINGHKA, V. K. (2024). Probabilistic Programming with Programmable Variational Inference. In *Programming Language Design and Implementation*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3656463>
- [7] BEN ALAYA, M. and PAGÈS, G. (1998). Rate of Convergence for Computing Expectations of Stopping Functionals of an  $\alpha$ -Mixing Process. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **30** 425–448. <https://doi.org/10.1239/aap/1035228077>
- [8] BESAG, J. (1994). Comments on "Representations of Knowledge in Complex Systems" by U. Grenander and M.I. Miller. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **56** 591–592.
- [9] BEZANSON, J., EDELMAN, A., KARPINSKI, S. and SHAH, V. B. (2017). Julia: A Fresh Approach to Numerical Computing. *SIAM Rev.* **59** 65–98. <https://doi.org/10.1137/141000671>
- [10] BRÉMAUD, P. (1992). Maximal Coupling and Rare Perturbation Sensitivity Analysis. *Queueing Systems Theory Appl.* **11** 307–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01163859>
- [11] CAMPBELL, A., CHEN, W., STIMPER, V., HERNANDEZ-LOBATO, J. M. and ZHANG, Y. (2021). A Gradient Based Strategy for Hamiltonian Monte Carlo Hyperparameter Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning* **139** 1238–1248. PMLR.
- [12] CHANDRA, K., LI, T.-M., TENENBAUM, J. and RAGAN-KELLEY, J. (2022). Designing Perceptual Puzzles by Differentiating Probabilistic Programs. In *Special Interest Group on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques Conference Proceedings* 1–9. ACM, Vancouver BC Canada. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3528233.3530715>
- [13] CHANDRA, K., LI, T.-M., TENENBAUM, J. and RAGAN-KELLEY, J. (2023). Acting as Inverse Inverse Planning. In *ACM SIGGRAPH 2023 Conference Proceedings. SIGGRAPH '23* 1–12. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3588432.3591510>
- [14] CHANDRA, K., LI, T.-M., TENENBAUM, J. B. and RAGAN-KELLEY, J. (2024). Storytelling as Inverse Inverse Planning. *Topics in Cognitive Science* **16** 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12710>
- [15] DAI, L. (2000). Perturbation Analysis via Coupling. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* **45** 614–628. <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.847099>
- [16] DOUC, R., MOULINES, E., PRIOURET, P. and SOULIER, P. (2018). *Markov Chains. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering*. Springer International Publishing, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97704-1>
- [17] DOUCET, A., MOULINES, E. and THIN, A. (2023). Differentiable Samplers for Deep Latent Variable Models. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. A* **381**. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2022.0147>
- [18] DUANE, S., KENNEDY, A. D., PENDLETON, B. J. and ROWETH, D. (1987). Hybrid Monte Carlo. *Phys. Lett. B* **195** 216–222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(87\)91197-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(87)91197-X)
- [19] FU, M. and HU, J.-Q. (1997). *Conditional Monte Carlo. The Kluwer International Series in Engineering and Computer Science* **392**. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-6293-1>
- [20] FU, M. C. and HU, J.-Q. (1994). Smoothed Perturbation Analysis Derivative Estimation for Markov Chains. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **15** 241–251. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6377\(94\)90084-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-6377(94)90084-1)
- [21] GALLEGOS-HERRADA, M. A., LEDVINKA, D. and ROSENTHAL, J. S. (2023). Equivalences of Geometric Ergodicity of Markov Chains. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.04395>

- [22] GE, H., XU, K. and GHAHRAMANI, Z. (2018). Turing: A Language for Flexible Probabilistic Inference. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2018* 1682–1690.
- [23] GLASSERMAN, P. (1991). *Gradient Estimation via Perturbation Analysis. The Kluwer International Series in Engineering and Computer Science*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA.
- [24] GLASSERMAN, P., HU, J.-Q. and STRICKLAND, S. G. (1991). Strongly Consistent Steady-State Derivative Estimates. *Probab. Engrg. Inform. Sci.* **5** 391–413. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269964800002199>
- [25] GLASSERMAN, P. and YAO, D. D. (1992). Some Guidelines and Guarantees for Common Random Numbers. *Manage. Sci.* **38** 884–908. <https://doi.org/10.5555/2909967.2909978>
- [26] GLYNN, P. and QU, Y. (2023). On a New Characterization of Harris Recurrence for Markov Chains and Processes. *Mathematics* **11** 2165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/math11092165>
- [27] GLYNN, P. W. (1990). Likelihood Ratio Gradient Estimation for Stochastic Systems. *Commun. ACM* **33** 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1145/84537.84552>
- [28] GLYNN, P. W. and L’ECUYER, P. (1995). Likelihood Ratio Gradient Estimation for Stochastic Recursions. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **27** 1019–1053. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1427933>
- [29] GLYNN, P. W. and OLVERA-CRAVIOTO, M. (2019). Likelihood Ratio Gradient Estimation for Steady-State Parameters. *Stoch. Syst.* **9** 83–100. <https://doi.org/10.1287/stsy.2018.0023>
- [30] GLYNN, P. W. and RHEE, C.-H. (2014). Exact Estimation for Markov Chain Equilibrium Expectations. *J. Appl. Probab.* **51A** 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.1239/jap/1417528487>
- [31] GOODMAN, J. and WEARE, J. (2010). Ensemble Samplers with Affine Invariance. *Commun. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci.* **5** 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.2140/camcos.2010.5.65>
- [32] HASTINGS, W. K. (1970). Monte Carlo Sampling Methods Using Markov Chains and Their Applications. *Biometrika* **57** 97–109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2334940>
- [33] HEIDERGOTT, B., HORDIJK, A. and WEISSHAUPT, H. (2006). Measure-Valued Differentiation for Stationary Markov Chains. *Math. Oper. Res.* **31** 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.1050.0171>
- [34] HEIDERGOTT, B. F. and VAZQUEZ-ABAD, F. (2006). Measure Valued Differentiation for Random Horizon Problems. *Markov Process. Related Fields* **12** 509–536.
- [35] HEIDERGOTT, B. and VÁZQUEZ-ABAD, F. J. (2008). Measure-Valued Differentiation for Markov Chains. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **136** 187–209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10957-007-9297-7>
- [36] HEIDERGOTT, B., VÁZQUEZ-ABAD, F. J., PFLUG, G. and FARENHORST-YUAN, T. (2010). Gradient Estimation for Discrete-Event Systems by Measure-Valued Differentiation. *ACM Trans. Model. Comput. Simul.* **20** 5:1–5:28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1667072.1667077>
- [37] HOCHMAN, M. (2017). Notes on Ergodic Theory.
- [38] HU, J.-Q. and STRICKLAND, S. G. (1990). Strong Consistency of Sample Path Derivative Estimates. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **3** 55–58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659\(90\)90047-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659(90)90047-F)
- [39] JACOB, P. E., O’LEARY, J. and ATCHADÉ, Y. F. (2020). Unbiased Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods with Couplings. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **82** 543–600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12336>
- [40] JOHNSON, R. W. (1996). Fitting Percentage of Body Fat to Simple Body Measurements. *J. Stat. Educ.* **4** 6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691898.1996.11910505>
- [41] JONES, G. L. (2004). On the Markov Chain Central Limit Theorem. *Probab. Surv.* **1** 299–320. <https://doi.org/10.1214/154957804100000051>
- [42] KALLENBERG, O. (2021). *Foundations of Modern Probability. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling* **99**. Springer, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-61871-1>
- [43] KALLIOINEN, N., PAANANEN, T., BÜRKNER, P.-C. and VEHTARI, A. (2024). Detecting and Diagnosing Prior and Likelihood Sensitivity with Power-Scaling. *Stat. Comput.* **34** 57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-023-10366-5>
- [44] KINGMA, D. P. and BA, J. (2015). Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference for Learning Representations*. ICLR, San Diego. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1412.6980>
- [45] KINGMA, D. P. and WELING, M. (2014). Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Representations*. ICLR, Ithaca. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1312.6114>
- [46] L’ECUYER, P. (1990). A Unified View of the IPA, SF, and LR Gradient Estimation Techniques. *Manag. Sci.* **36** 1364–1383. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.36.11.1364>
- [47] LEW, A. K., HUOT, M., STATON, S. and MANSINGHA, V. K. (2023). ADEV: Sound Automatic Differentiation of Expected Values of Probabilistic Programs. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **7** 5:121–5:153. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571198>



- [48] LINDVALL, T. (1992). *Lectures on the Coupling Method. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics*. Wiley, New York.
- [49] LIVINGSTONE, S. and ZANELLA, G. (2022). The Barker Proposal: Combining Robustness and Efficiency in Gradient-Based MCMC. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **84** 496–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssb.12482>
- [50] MAKER, P. T. (1940). The Ergodic Theorem for a Sequence of Functions. *Duke Math. J.* **6** 27–30. <https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-40-00602-0>
- [51] METROPOLIS, N., ROSENBLUTH, A. W., ROSENBLUTH, M. N., TELLER, A. H. and TELLER, E. (1953). Equation of State Calculations by Fast Computing Machines Technical Report No. AECU-2435, LADC-1359, 4390578. <https://doi.org/10.2172/4390578>
- [52] MEYN, S. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (2009). *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*, 2 ed. *Cambridge Mathematical Library*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511626630>
- [53] MIDDLETON, L., DELIGIANNIDIS, G., DOUCET, A. and JACOB, P. E. (2020). Unbiased Markov Chain Monte Carlo for Intractable Target Distributions. *Electron. J. Stat.* **14** 2842–2891. <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-EJS1727>
- [54] MOHAMED, S., ROSCA, M., FIGURNOV, M. and MNIH, A. (2020). Monte Carlo Gradient Estimation in Machine Learning. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **21** 1–62.
- [55] MOUSTAKIDES, G. V. (1999). Extension of Wald’s First Lemma to Markov Processes. *J. Appl. Probab.* **36** 48–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021900200016831>
- [56] MYKLAND, P., TIERNEY, L. and YU, B. (1995). Regeneration in Markov Chain Samplers. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **90** 233–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1995.10476507>
- [57] NEAL, R. M. (2011). MCMC Using Hamiltonian Dynamics. In *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Handbooks of Modern Statistical Methods* 113–162. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- [58] NUMMELIN, E. (1978). A Splitting Technique for Harris Recurrent Markov Chains. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **43** 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00534764>
- [59] O’LEARY, J. (2021). Couplings of the Random-Walk Metropolis Algorithm. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2102.01790>
- [60] O’LEARY, J. and WANG, G. (2023). Metropolis-Hastings Transition Kernel Couplings. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2102.00366>
- [61] OLIVIERO-DURMUS, A. and MOULINES, É. (2024). On Geometric Convergence for the Metropolis-adjusted Langevin Algorithm under Simple Conditions. *Biometrika* **111** 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asad060>
- [62] PAGANI, F., WIEGAND, M. and NADARAJAH, S. (2022). An N-dimensional Rosenbrock Distribution for Markov Chain Monte Carlo Testing. *Scand. J. Stat.* **49** 657–680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjos.12532>
- [63] PAPP, T. P. and SHERLOCK, C. (2022). A New and Asymptotically Optimally Contracting Coupling for the Random Walk Metropolis. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2211.12585>
- [64] RADUL, A., PASZKE, A., FROSTIG, R., JOHNSON, M. and MACLAURIN, D. (2022). You Only Linearize Once: Tangents Transpose to Gradients. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.10923>
- [65] RHEE, C.-H. and GLYNN, P. W. (2023). Lyapunov Conditions for Differentiability of Markov Chain Expectations. *Math. Oper. Res.* **48** 2019–2042. <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.2022.1328>
- [66] ROBERT, C. P. and CASELLA, G. (2004). *Monte Carlo Statistical Methods. Springer Texts in Statistics*. Springer, New York, NY. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-4145-2>
- [67] ROBERTS, G. O. and ROSENTHAL, J. S. (2001). Optimal Scaling for Various Metropolis-Hastings Algorithms. *Statist. Sci.* **16** 351–367. <https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1015346320>
- [68] ROBERTS, G. O. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (1996). Exponential Convergence of Langevin Distributions and Their Discrete Approximations. *Bernoulli* **2** 341–363. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3318418>
- [69] ROBERTS, G. O. and TWEEDIE, R. L. (1996). Geometric Convergence and Central Limit Theorems for Multidimensional Hastings and Metropolis Algorithms. *Biometrika* **83** 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/83.1.95>
- [70] ROSENBRUCK, H. H. (1960). An Automatic Method for Finding the Greatest or Least Value of a Function. *Comput. J.* **3** 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1093/comjnl/3.3.175>
- [71] ROSENTHAL, J. S. (1997). Faithful Couplings of Markov Chains: Now Equals Forever. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **18** 372–381. <https://doi.org/10.1006/aama.1996.0515>
- [72] ROSSKY, P. J., DOLL, J. D. and FRIEDMAN, H. L. (1978). Brownian Dynamics as Smart Monte Carlo Simulation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **69** 4628–4633. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.436415>
- [73] RUDOLF, D. and SPRUNGK, B. (2020). On a Metropolis–Hastings Importance Sampling Estimator. *Electron. J. Stat.* **14**. <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-EJS1680>



- [74] SEYER, R. (2023). Differentiable Monte Carlo Samplers with Piecewise Deterministic Markov Processes, Master’s thesis, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg.
- [75] SHERLOCK, C., FEARNHEAD, P. and ROBERTS, G. O. (2010). The Random Walk Metropolis: Linking Theory and Practice Through a Case Study. *Statist. Sci.* **25** 172–190. <https://doi.org/10.1214/10-STS327>
- [76] SHERLOCK, C. and ROBERTS, G. (2009). Optimal Scaling of the Random Walk Metropolis on Elliptically Symmetric Unimodal Targets. *Bernoulli* **15** 774–798. <https://doi.org/10.3150/08-BEJ176>
- [77] THORISSON, H. (2000). *Coupling, Stationarity, and Regeneration. Probability and Its Applications.* Springer, New York.
- [78] TIERNEY, L. (1998). A Note on Metropolis-Hastings Kernels for General State Spaces. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **8** 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoap/1027961031>
- [79] VEHTARI, A., GELMAN, A., SIMPSON, D., CARPENTER, B. and BÜRKNER, P.-C. (2021). Rank-Normalization, Folding, and Localization: An Improved  $\hat{R}$  for Assessing Convergence of MCMC (with Discussion). *Bayesian Anal.* **16** 667-718. <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-BA1221>
- [80] WANG, G., O’LEARY, J. and JACOB, P. (2021). Maximal Couplings of the Metropolis-Hastings Algorithm. In *Proceedings of The 24th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* **130** 1225–1233. PMLR.
- [81] ZHANG, G., HSU, K., LI, J., FINN, C. and GROSSE, R. (2021). Differentiable Annealed Importance Sampling and the Perils of Gradient Noise. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** 19398–19410.