

Genealogical processes of non-neutral population models under rapid mutation

Jere Koskela

`jere.koskela@newcastle.ac.uk`

School of Mathematics, Statistics and Physics,
Newcastle University
& Department of Statistics,
University of Warwick

Paul A. Jenkins

`p.jenkins@warwick.ac.uk`

Department of Statistics &
Department of Computer Science,
University of Warwick

Adam M. Johansen

`a.m.johansen@warwick.ac.uk`

Department of Statistics,
University of Warwick

Dario Spanò

`d.spano@warwick.ac.uk`

Department of Statistics,
University of Warwick

June 25, 2024

Abstract

We show that genealogical trees arising from a broad class of non-neutral models of population evolution converge to the Kingman coalescent under a suitable rescaling of time. As well as non-neutral biological evolution, our results apply to genetic algorithms encompassing the prominent class of sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) methods. The time rescaling we need differs slightly from that used in classical results for convergence to the Kingman coalescent, which has implications for the performance of different resampling schemes in SMC algorithms. In addition, our work substantially simplifies earlier proofs of convergence to the Kingman coalescent, and corrects an error common to several earlier results.

Keywords: Genealogical process, Non-neutral evolution, Sequential Monte Carlo, Wright–Fisher model

2020 MSC: 60J90, 65C35, 92D15

1 Introduction

A collection of articles by the present authors and Suzie Brown have focused on scaling limits of genealogical processes for interacting particle systems describing a class of genetic algorithms, as well as biological evolution [Bro21, BJK21, BJK23, KJS22]. In a recent note, Sylvain Rubenthaler showed that a strong independence assumption, on which our argument relied, ruled out several interesting applications of our result [Rub23]. His counterexample is correct, but in this article we show that our argument can be adapted to overcome the issue. Our proof is based on considering a quenched particle system in which the genealogical process simplifies to a collection of inhomogeneous coalescing random walks, and is substantially simpler and shorter than earlier proofs of similar results in [Bro21, BJK21, BJK23, KJS22]. We also

identify a natural timescale for coalescence of nonneutral particle systems (see (2)), and show in Section 3.4 that it is subtly but materially different from timescales which have been used to obtain similar scaling limits in earlier works. From the point of view of sequential Monte Carlo (SMC)—a prominent example of the genetic algorithms to which our analysis applies—the result of Section 3.4 has the at-first surprising implication that, in particular edge cases, multinomial resampling can yield fewer coalescences to a common ancestor than a minimum-variance scheme such as stratified or systematic resampling.

We consider an interacting particle system in which a population of N particles evolves in discrete generations. The first generation at time zero is initialised at respective locations $X_0 := (X_0(1), \dots, X_0(N))$, where $X_k(i) \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. We could equally well take \mathcal{X} to be a general Polish space, but focus on (subsets of) \mathbb{R}^d for concreteness. Subsequent generations are driven by a family of non-negative potential functions $g_k : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ and Markov kernels $M_k : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is the set of probability measures on \mathcal{X} . We will assume that each $M_k(x, \cdot)$ admits a density with respect to Lebesgue measure for all x and will use the same symbol for the kernel and its density.

Let $a_k|X_k := (a_k(1), \dots, a_k(N))|X_k$ be a random tuple of ancestor indices taking values in $[N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$, with distinct generations $\{a_k|X_k, X_{k+1}\}_{k \geq 0}$ being conditionally independent given particle locations. We require that, for each k , the marginal distribution of $a_k|X_k$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(a_k(i) = m|X_k) = \frac{g_k(X_k(m))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))}.$$

The joint distribution of the entries of a_k is determined by the so-called resampling mechanism (see e.g. [CP20, Chapter 9]). Particle locations at generation $k+1$ are obtained by sampling an ancestor vector $a_k|X_k$, whereupon

$$\mathbb{P}\left(X_{k+1} \in dx \mid X_k, a_k\right) = \prod_{i=1}^N M_k(X_k(a_k(i)), x(i)) dx(i).$$

Throughout, we work on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ which is rich enough to support a sequence of such particle systems for $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

For fixed N , this particle system can be seen as a non-neutral Wright–Fisher model of evolution by interpreting particle locations as genetic alleles, the potentials g_k as fitnesses, and the Markov kernels M_k as mutation processes [DMMPR09, Section 2]. They also describe SMC methods: a very broad class of algorithms used in computational statistics and related disciplines [DM04, CP20]. In both settings, the genealogical tree embedded into the particle system by the ancestor vectors is known to be important [DMM01, DMMPR09, DMKP16, JMR15, Kin82a, Kin82b, LW18, Möh98, Möh99, MS01]. To describe these genealogies, it will be convenient to assume that the particle system has been run for a large number of generations, and to relabel time in reverse: the terminal generation will be generation zero, their parents are generation one, etc. We will adopt this relabelling for the remainder of the manuscript with a few exceptions for which the direction of time is stated explicitly.

For a countable set A , define $A_d^n \subset A^n$ as the subset of n -tuples of distinct elements. Similarly, let $A_{d,u}^n$ denote the set of unordered size- n subsets of A . Let $|v|$ denote the number of elements in a tuple v , and let $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. It is convenient to define the genealogical process of n generation-zero particles as a stochastic process $\{G_k^{N,n}\}_{k \geq 0}$ taking values in labelled partitions of $[n]$, with the i th partition block labelled by the index of the corresponding particle. Throughout, we think of partition blocks ordered lexicographically for concreteness, but none of our results rely

on that ordering. We set $G_0^{N,n} = \{(\{1\}, \ell^1), \dots, (\{n\}, \ell^n)\}$ for indices $(\ell^1, \dots, \ell^n) \in [N]_d^n$. Two or more blocks merge when the corresponding particles share an ancestor, and the resulting block is labelled by the particle index of that ancestor. Because $\{G_k^{N,n}\}_{k \geq 0}$ does not track particle locations $\{X_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ and hence location-dependent fitnesses $\{g_k\}_{k \geq 0}$, it is not a Markov process in general. We will denote by $\bar{G}_k^{N,n}$ the partition-valued process obtained from $G_k^{N,n}$ by removing partition labels, and write $\xi \prec \eta$ when partition η is obtained from partition ξ by merging exactly two blocks. The setup and notation are illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: An example realisation of the interacting particle model along with the corresponding realisation of the genealogical process. Each row is a generation consisting of $N = 5$ particles with labels $1, \dots, 5$. The arrows point in the direction of the time-evolution of the particle system, while the time-index of the genealogical process counts generations in reverse. Edges highlighted in bold form the ancestral tree of the population in generation 0.

In [KJJS22] we attempted to prove that, when time is suitably rescaled, the unlabelled genealogical process $\{\bar{G}_k^{N,n}\}_{k \geq 0}$ converges to the Kingman coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Our proof relied on the following formula for conditional transition probabilities between partitions ξ and η , when η is obtained from ξ by merging some subsets of blocks:

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{G}_k^{N,n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, \nu_k) = \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{|\eta|}) \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} (\nu_k(i_1))_{b_1} \dots (\nu_k(i_{|\eta|}))_{b_{|\eta|}}, \quad (1)$$

where $(x)_j = x(x-1) \dots (x-j+1)$ is the falling factorial, b_i is the number of blocks in ξ which were merged to obtain the i th block of η , and $\nu_k := (\nu_k(1), \dots, \nu_k(N))$ are the family sizes in generation k :

$$\nu_k(i) := |\{j \in [N] : a_k(j) = i\}|.$$

The counterexample in [Rub23] shows that this formula is valid when fitness is not hereditary so that ν_k and ν_j are independent whenever $k \neq j$, but is not a correct description of the underlying particle system in general. In settings with hereditary fitness, the probability which would be required in the convergence argument of [KJJS22] instead of (1) is

$$\mathbb{P}(G_k^{N,n} = \eta | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \dots),$$

which does not equal the right-hand side of (1). In this note, we replace (1) with a valid expression, and show that the main results of [Bro21, BJJK21, BJJK23, KJJS22] are true under

an additional assumption (specifically, (6) in Theorem 1 below) which amounts to requiring the mutation kernels M_k to mix faster than the rate with which common ancestors arise due to resampling. In addition to the correction, we also present a substantially simplified proof which is shorter than its equivalent in either [KJJS22] or [BJJK23], despite the fact that the theorem statement combines the main results of both of these predecessor articles. The proof technique, which may be of independent interest, is based on analysing single holding times of a non-Markovian jump process, and stitching them together to obtain a Markovian scaling limit.

In the SMC context, we verify that the conditions of Theorem 1 hold under strong but standard mixing assumptions on the potentials g_k and mutation kernels M_k (see (17) in Proposition 1, as well as (19) and (20) in Proposition 3). These conditions essentially rule out non-compact state spaces but are widespread in the SMC literature. Strong mixing is known to yield much stronger ergodicity than our results require [KLSV23], suggesting that it is not necessary. Indeed, many results are known to be robust to violation of strong mixing in practice [CDMG16, Cho04, DMG01, JMR15, Kün05], among them the numerical simulations in [KJJS22, Section 3] which did not satisfy the requisite assumptions, but for which the predictions of our scaling limit were accurate. From the perspective of genetics models, our theorem holds when mutation operates on a faster timescale than that on which lineages coalesce, ruling out the ancestral selection graph [KN97]. Differences of fitness potentials do not play a role in this regime as long as they are not so large that the families of single, particularly fit ancestors can form macroscopic fractions of the total population with positive probability in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

2 A restated convergence theorem

Let $\mathbf{X} := \{X_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the locations of all particles in all generations in a particle system run for an infinite number of generations. For $N \geq 2$ and $2 \leq n \leq N$, let ξ be a partition of $[n]$ with at least two blocks, and let $\ell = (\ell^1, \dots, \ell^{|\xi|})$ be a labelling of the partition blocks with distinct elements of $[N]$. With the convention that $\sum_{k=j+1}^j = 0$, let

$$c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) := \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)), \quad (2)$$

$$\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) := \min \left\{ s \geq j : \sum_{k=j+1}^s c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \geq t \right\}$$

be the conditional probability of at least one merger in generation k given particle locations \mathbf{X} , particle labels ℓ in generation j , and no mergers in the intervening generations (suitably scaled by the number of possible pair-mergers), and its generalised inverse, respectively. The latter will turn out to be the appropriate timescale for obtaining our scaling limit.

In order to state our main result, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$, and $\ell \in [N]_d^n$ be fixed but arbitrary. We define T_n as the first jump time of

$$(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, 0; t)}^{N,n})_{t \geq 0},$$

and denote the end point of that jump by $(\xi(T_n), \ell(T_n))$. We also abbreviate $\tau_{N,n}(t) \equiv \tau_N(\xi, \ell, 0; t)$. For $i \in \{n-1, \dots, 2\}$, we iteratively define

$$\tau_{N,i}(t) \equiv \tau_N(\xi(T_{i+1}), \ell(T_{i+1}), \tau_{N,i+1}(T_{i+1}); t),$$

where T_i is the time of the first jump of $(\bar{G}_{\tau_{N,i}(t)}^{N,n})_{t \geq 0}$, and $(\xi(T_i), \ell(T_i))$ denotes the end point of that jump. To lighten notation we let $T_{n+1} \equiv 0$, define $S_i := T_n + \dots + T_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$,

and introduce the short-hand

$$\bar{G}_{\tau_N(t)}^{N,n} := \sum_{i=2}^n \bar{G}_{\tau_{N,i}(t-S_{i+1})}^{N,i} \mathbb{1}_{[S_{i+1}, S_i)}(t),$$

where the right-hand side is the concatenation of the genealogical processes for population size N while there are $|\xi(T_{i+1})|$ lineages. This also implicitly defines shorthand for the concatenated timescale

$$\tau_N(t) := \sum_{i=2}^n \tau_{N,i}(t - S_{i+1}) \mathbb{1}_{[S_{i+1}, S_i)}(t).$$

Note that the t -argument of each $\tau_{N,i}(t)$ is local, but that the ranges of these time changes are the global generations of the underlying particle system, so that e.g. $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; 0) = j$. The concatenated timescale $\tau_N(t)$ joins the local t -variables of $\{\tau_{N,i}(\cdot)\}_{i=2}^n$ into one global, non-decreasing timescale.

We will also let $(\Pi_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$ denote the Kingman n -coalescent, that is, the Markov process taking values in partitions of $[n]$ with $\Pi_0^n = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$ and in which each pair of blocks merges at unit rate, so that the rate with which two random blocks merge is $\binom{k}{2}$ while $|\Pi_t^n| = k$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $j < k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in (0, \infty)$, any partition ξ of $[n]$ and any η such that $\xi \prec \eta$, and any $\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) | X_j] = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) | X_j] = 0, \quad (4)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \middle| X_j \right] = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell))}{c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t))} = 1, \quad (6)$$

hold \mathbb{P} -almost surely, and that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) = \infty) = 0 \quad (7)$$

for any sufficiently large $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $t > 0$. Then, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (\bar{G}_{\tau_N(t)}^{N,n})_{t \geq 0} = (\Pi_t^n)_{t \geq 0}$$

weakly in the Skorokhod J_1 topology on the space of right-continuous paths with left limits.

Remark 1. Assumption (6) is strong. Heuristically, it is satisfied by particle systems in which particle locations mix fast enough that any information about particle weights at the time of a merger is lost by the time of the following merger. In such a particle system, the fact that the parent of two (or more) coalescing particles is likely to be fitter than average will not inform particle fitnesses at the time of the next coalescence event. In Section 3 we verify that standard resampling schemes satisfy (6) under standard strong mixing conditions.

Remark 2. In the neutral case, when the potentials g_k are constant functions and (6) holds by construction, a condition analogous to

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| = 1 | |\bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n}| = 3)]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| = 1 | |\bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n}| = 2)]} = 0$$

is necessary and sufficient for weak convergence of suitably time-rescaled genealogical processes to the Kingman coalescent [MS03]. In particular, it implies (3)–(5) in that setting. However, these implications rely on an explicit transition probability formula resembling (1), which does not hold in the general non-neutral case. Hence, we need to resort to the more cumbersome conditions (3)–(6).

Proof. We will prove the theorem in four parts: first by showing convergence of the holding time until a jump of $(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n})_{t \geq 0}$ to an exponentially distributed random variable with rate $\binom{n}{2}$, second by showing that the merger event is between exactly two uniformly chosen blocks, and third by demonstrating that we can concatenate waiting times and mergers to construct the whole process from initial condition $\{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$ to the most recent common ancestor $\{\{1, \dots, n\}\}$. Conditioning on X_j in (3)–(5) will appear superfluous until the third step. In the fourth and final step, we control the modulus of continuity to prove weak convergence.

From an initial labelled partition (ξ, ℓ) in generation $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the conditional survivor function of the next jump given particle locations \mathbf{X} is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) & \\
= \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{j+1}^{N, n} = \xi, \dots, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) & \\
= \prod_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_k^{N, n} = \xi | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) & \\
= \prod_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \left[1 - \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}} \left(|\bar{G}_k^{N, n}| < |\xi| \mid \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell) \right) \right], & \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

because $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)$ is $\sigma(\mathbf{X})$ -measurable. We now need the generic inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^\alpha \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_\alpha) \in [\tau]_\alpha^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha c(k_m) &\leq (-1)^\alpha \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_\alpha) \in [\tau]^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha c(k_m) \\
&+ \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=1}^\tau c(k)^2 \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_{\alpha-2}) \in [\tau]^{\alpha-2}} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha-2} c(k_m), \quad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

for $\tau \geq \alpha \geq 1$ and coefficients $c(k) \geq 0$, which follows from Lemma 1 in Appendix B by noting that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^\alpha = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_\alpha=1}^N \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_m},$$

and rearranging. In particular if α is odd then multiply (39) in the Appendix by $(-1)^\alpha$ (which reverses the inequality) and rearrange; if α is even then (9) is trivial because each term on the left-hand side can be matched with a term in the first sum on the right-hand side.

Expanding the product on the right-hand side of (8) and using (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} (-1)^\alpha \sum_{j+1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_\alpha \leq \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{k_m}^{N, n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k_{m-1}}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_\alpha) \in \{j+1, \dots, \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)\}_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k_m) \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_\alpha = j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k_j) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{\alpha-2} = j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha-2} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k_m) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \right)^\alpha \\
&\quad + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \binom{\alpha}{2} \left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \right)^{\alpha-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)$,

$$t \leq \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \leq t + c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) \leq t + 1, \quad (10)$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\alpha=0, \text{ even}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha [t + c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t))]^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha=1, \text{ odd}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha t^\alpha \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{2\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-j} \frac{1}{(\alpha-2)!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{\alpha-2} (t+1)^{\alpha-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2
\end{aligned}$$

For $c \in [0, 1]$ we also have

$$(t+c)^\alpha = \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} t^\beta c^{\alpha-\beta} = t^\alpha + c \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha-1} \binom{\alpha}{\beta} t^\beta c^{\alpha-1-\beta} \leq t^\alpha + \alpha(t+1)^{\alpha-1} c, \quad (11)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\alpha=0, \text{ even}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha [t^\alpha + \alpha(t+1)^{\alpha-1} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t))] \\
& \quad + \sum_{\alpha=1, \text{ odd}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha t^\alpha + \frac{1}{2} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{2\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha (t+1)^\alpha \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \frac{(-t)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \mathbb{1}\{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \geq \alpha + j\} \\
& \quad + c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) \binom{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\infty} \frac{(t+1)^{\alpha-1}}{(\alpha-1)!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{\alpha-1} \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{2\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha (t+1)^\alpha \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \\
& \leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-t)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \mathbb{1}\{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \geq \alpha + j\} \\
& \quad + \exp\left(\binom{|\xi|}{2}(t+1)\right) \left(\binom{|\xi|}{2} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) + \frac{1}{2} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{2\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

To show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) > \alpha + j\} | X_j] = 1$ we follow the argument on [KJJS22, Page 572]: by definition of τ_N , Markov's inequality, and (3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) > \alpha\} | X_j] &= 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \leq \alpha | X_j) \\
&= 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\alpha} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \geq t \mid X_j\right) \\
&\geq 1 - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\alpha} \frac{\mathbb{E}[c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) | X_j]}{t} = 1 \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, by (4), (5), and (12),

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) | X_j] \leq \exp\left(-\binom{|\xi|}{2}t\right),$$

which is the survivor function of the holding time of the Kingman coalescent started from partition ξ .

For a corresponding lower bound, we will need the following variant of (9) which follows from (39) in Appendix B if α is even, and which is trivial when α is odd:

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^\alpha \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_\alpha) \in [\tau]_\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} c(k_m) &\geq (-1)^\alpha \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_\alpha) \in [\tau]^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} c(k_m) \\
&\quad - \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\tau} c(k)^2 \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_{\alpha-2}) \in [\tau]^{\alpha-2}} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha-2} c(k_m). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

Expanding (8) and using (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} (-1)^\alpha \sum_{j+1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_\alpha \leq \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{k_m}^{N, n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k_m-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\geq 1 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_\alpha = j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k_m) \\
&\quad - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{\alpha-2} = j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} \prod_{m=1}^{\alpha-2} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k_m) \\
&= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \right)^\alpha \\
&\quad - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \binom{\alpha}{2} \left(\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \right)^{\alpha-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the bounds in (10) and (11),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\geq \sum_{\alpha=0, \text{ even}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha t^\alpha \\
&\quad + \sum_{\alpha=1, \text{ odd}}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha [t^\alpha + \alpha(t+1)^{\alpha-1} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t))] \\
&\quad - \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) - j} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \binom{\alpha}{2} (t+1)^{\alpha-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-t)^\alpha}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^\alpha \mathbf{1}\{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \geq \alpha + j\} \\
&\quad - c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) \binom{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\infty} \frac{(t+1)^{\alpha-1}}{(\alpha-1)!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{\alpha-1} \\
&\quad - \binom{|\xi|}{2}^2 \sum_{\alpha=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{\alpha-2} \binom{\alpha}{2} (t+1)^{\alpha-2} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As for the upper bound, by (4), (5), and (12), we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \geq \exp\left(-\binom{|\xi|}{2} t\right).$$

Since (6) holds for any η such that $\xi \prec \eta$, of which there are $\binom{|\xi|}{2}$, mergers involving more than two lineages occur at a rate which vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also by (6), the lineages involved in a

binary merger are sampled uniformly in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N, n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line is justified by the Dominated Convergence Theorem since the integrand is trivially bounded by one. The right-hand side does not depend on η , as required.

To see that waiting times and mergers can be concatenated to construct a process, let $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \infty$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and fix $\xi \prec \eta$ with $|\xi| \geq 3$. Then, by definition of conditional probability,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1); t_2 - t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell'), \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
&= \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_0^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\quad \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1); t_2 - t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta | G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell'), \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))].
\end{aligned}$$

The sum on the right-hand side is non-negative and bounded by 1 uniformly in N . Hence, we can use (6) to replace its second factor with $c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1))$ without changing the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Moreover, conditional on \mathbf{X} , $G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell')$ fully D-separates the evolution of the genealogical process after time $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)$ from its earlier history. See [Pea88, Chapter 3] for details on D-separation. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1); t_2 - t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell'), \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
&\sim \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)) \right. \\
&\quad \times \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)-1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\quad \left. \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1); t_2 - t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta | G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell')) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_N \sim g_N$ means $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f_N/g_N = 1$. We will now use the Tower Law to condition on $X_{j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}$, along with the fact that all terms on the right-hand side above are $\sigma(X_{j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)})$ -

measurable except the final one:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)); t_2 - t_1}^{N, n} = \eta, G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell'), \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
& \sim \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)) \right. \\
& \quad \times \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \quad \left. \times \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)); t_2 - t_1}^{N, n} = \eta | G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | X_{j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)})] \right] \\
& \sim \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)) \right. \\
& \quad \times \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \quad \left. \times \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)); t_2 - t_1}^{N, n} = \eta | G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | X_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)})] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality again follows by conditional independence due to D-separation. We have already shown that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)); t_2 - t_1}^{N, n} = \eta | G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | X_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)})] \rightarrow \exp\left(-\binom{|\eta|}{2}(t_2 - t_1)\right)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, using the Dominated Convergence Theorem to interchange expectations and limits as needed,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell', \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)); t_2 - t_1}^{N, n} = \eta, G_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell'), \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\
& \sim \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1)) \exp\left(-\binom{|\eta|}{2}(t_2 - t_1)\right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \sum_{\ell' \in [N]_d^{|\eta|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = (\eta, \ell') | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\eta, \ell, j; t_1)}^{N, n} = \eta, \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi, G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) \right] \\
& \sim \exp\left(-\binom{|\eta|}{2}(t_2 - t_1)\right) \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1) - 1}^{N, n} = \xi | G_j^{N, n} = (\xi, \ell)) c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t_1))].
\end{aligned}$$

Convergence of the remaining expectations follows via an inductive hypothesis from the earlier two steps of the proof. Iterating this argument yields convergence for any finite number of initial lineages.

Weak convergence follows very similarly to [Möh99, Proof of Theorem 3.1]. By [EK86, Corollary 7.8, Chapter 3], we require relative compactness of the family of genealogical processes indexed

by N . To that end, we define the modulus of continuity,

$$w(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{N,n}, \delta, t) := \inf_{|z_i - z_{i-1}| > \delta} \max_i \sup_{u, v \in [z_{i-1}, z_i]} \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{G}_{\tau_N(u)}^{N,n} \neq \bar{G}_{\tau_N(v)}^{N,n}\}},$$

for $\delta > 0$, $t > 0$, and $0 = z_0 < z_1 < \dots < z_{k-1} < t < z_j$ for some finite j , which exists because of the minimal separation δ . Since the state space of $\bar{G}_{\tau_N(t)}^{N,n}$ is finite, by [EK86, Corollary 7.4, Chapter 3] it suffices to show that for every $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $t > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(w(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{N,n}, \delta, t) < \eta) > 1 - \eta. \quad (14)$$

This can be done by noticing that $\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{N,n}$ jumps at most $n - 1$ times, and we have already shown that its holding times between jumps converge weakly to independent, exponentially distributed random variables.

Let (Z_1, \dots, Z_{n-1}) denote the limiting holding times between jumps, i.e. the entries are independent and $Z_j \sim \text{Exp}(\binom{n-j+1}{2})$. They can be seen as the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limits of (T_n, \dots, T_2) introduced above Theorem 1. All these jumps of the genealogical process are separated by time windows of width $\delta > 0$ with probability

$$\prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{P}(Z_m > \delta) = \exp\left(-\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-m+1}{2} \delta\right),$$

and this event implies that the modulus of continuity vanishes. Thus

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(w(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{N,n}, \delta, t) = 0) = \exp\left(-\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-m+1}{2} \delta\right),$$

and (14) holds by choosing $\delta \leq -\log(1 - \eta) / \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-m+1}{2}$. \square

3 Results for particular resampling schemes

In this section we demonstrate that the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold for practical resampling schemes under verifiable conditions. The assumptions we require amount to the so-called *strong mixing condition*, which is standard in the analysis of SMC methods. Numerical evidence suggests strong mixing is often an unnecessary assumption, but relaxing it presents considerable technical difficulties.

The specific schemes we cover are multinomial and stratified resampling. The former is arguably the simplest and most analytically tractable scheme, but suboptimal in practice, while the latter is a prototypical example of a superior low-variance scheme. We expect that convergence could be proven using similar arguments for many standard schemes, such as residual or systematic resampling.

Proofs in this section are largely technical calculations, often to check the assumptions of Theorem 1. To aid readability, they have been postponed to Appendix A.

3.1 Multinomial resampling

Under multinomial resampling, the ancestor indices $(a_k(1), \dots, a_k(N)) | X_k$ in the forward-in-time particle system are conditionally independent, and each samples a parent independently with probabilities proportional to potentials,

$$a_k(i) | X_k \sim \text{Categorical}(g_k(X_k(1)), \dots, g_k(X_k(N))), \quad (15)$$

with the probabilities parametrising the categorical distribution suitably normalised. In reverse time, ancestor indices given particle locations (X_k, X_{k-1}) are also conditionally independent, and

$$a_k(i) | X_{k-1}, X_k \sim \text{Categorical}(g_k(X_k(1))M_k(X_k(1), X_{k-1}(i)), \dots, g_k(X_k(N))M_k(X_k(N), X_{k-1}(i))). \quad (16)$$

Conditioning on these two generations of locations D-separates a_k from all other generations in either direction of time. Hence, the conditional distribution of a single reverse-time ancestral lineage given \mathbf{X} coincides with that in the *backward simulation* algorithm [GDW04]. The joint distribution of several lineages only differs from backward simulation in that our lineages merge together into a common ancestor when they sample the same ancestor index, while those in backward simulation remain distinct lineages which happen to overlap for one generation.

Proposition 1. *Suppose there exists $\gamma \geq 1$ and a function $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\frac{f(y)}{\gamma} \leq g_k(x)M_k(x, y) \leq \gamma f(y) \quad (17)$$

for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \geq 1$. Then multinomial resampling satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.

Remark 3 of [KJJS22] drew a connection between the coalescence probability $c_N(\xi, \ell, k)$ under multinomial resampling and the effective sample size (ESS) of [KLW94]:

$$\text{ESS}(k) := \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{g_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h))} \right)^2.$$

The connection of [KJJS22, Remark 3] is only relevant for coalescence probabilities arising from transition probabilities of the form (1). However, Proposition 2 shows that a similar relationship is valid for our coalescence probabilities and an effective sample size formula in which the backward simulation weights in (16) play the role of the forward weights (15) of the standard SMC algorithm. In order to state the result, let

$$L \sim \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \cdot) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j = (\xi, \ell)), \quad (18)$$

and let $\mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell}$ denote a conditional expectation with respect to its law.

Proposition 2. *Under multinomial resampling and (17), as $N \rightarrow \infty$ we have*

$$c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) = \frac{1 + o(1)}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in \|\xi\|_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[\prod_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m))M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h))M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))} \right].$$

Remark 3. Section 4.2 of [BJJK21] showed that, under multinomial resampling and the transition probability (1), genealogical trees of conditional and standard SMC algorithms converge to the same scaling limits under very similar assumptions. Conditional SMC differs from standard SMC in that one particle has a pre-determined trajectory which is guaranteed to survive all resampling steps with at least one offspring, forming the so-called immortal line. This modification is essential for correctness of the particle Gibbs algorithm [ADH10], and also finds applications in other areas of Monte Carlo simulation [JLS20, SD19] and optimisation [Fin15, Chapter 6]. The key to transferring the convergence proof from standard SMC to the conditional setting was that, under (17), the probability that any fixed particle is chosen as an ancestor is negligible in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit. The same is true in our corrected proof, and hence the presence of the immortal line will have an effect on the genealogy of a finite number of particles with probability tending to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

3.2 Stratified resampling

Under stratified resampling, particles are assigned ancestors by decomposing the unit interval into weight-based segments. Specifically, let (U_1, U_2, \dots, U_N) be independent, with $U_i \sim U((i-1)/N, i/N)$, and let

$$\bar{g}_k^{(i)} := \sum_{m=1}^i \frac{g_k(X_k(m))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))},$$

with $\bar{g}_k^{(0)} \equiv 0$. Then $a_k(i) = m$ if $U_i \in [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)})$. The resulting distribution of ancestral indices depends on the ordering of particles, which makes analysis considerably more involved. Hence, we consider a slight modification in which particle indices are reshuffled uniformly at each iteration, prior to the choice of ancestors. The same reshuffling was suggested in [ADH10, page 290] to facilitate analysis of particle MCMC methods.

Proposition 3. *Suppose there exists $\gamma \geq 1$, a function $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto (0, \infty)$, and a sequence $\varepsilon_N > 0$ such that*

$$\frac{f(y)}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \leq M_k(x, y) \leq \sqrt{\gamma} f(y), \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \leq g_k(x) \leq \sqrt{\gamma}, \quad (20)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} : \max_{i \in [N]} |\bar{g}_k^{(i)} - i/N| > \varepsilon_N) = 1, \quad (21)$$

for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $k \geq 1$. Then stratified resampling satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1.

Remark 4. The square roots in (19) and (20) are superficial. Noting that (19) and (20) imply (17), the inclusion of the square roots yields bounds that are consistent with (17) using the same constants as in the case of multinomial resampling. Condition (21) is sufficient to rule out the pathological case where particle weights are too close to equal, resulting in a genealogical process in which mergers never take place.

3.3 Stochastic rounding

Stochastic roundings are a class of resampling mechanisms for which

$$\mathbb{P}(\nu_k(i) = m | g_k) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} + \left\lfloor \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} \right\rfloor & \text{if } m = \left\lfloor \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} \right\rfloor, \\ \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} - \left\lfloor \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} \right\rfloor & \text{if } m = \left\lfloor \frac{Ng_k(X_k(i))}{\sum_{v=1}^N g_k(X_k(v))} \right\rfloor + 1. \end{cases}$$

There are a number of example resampling mechanisms with these marginals, including systematic resampling [CCF99, Whi94], the branching system of [CL97], and Srinivasan sampling [GCW19]. We conjecture that a proof akin to that of Proposition 3 could be produced for at least some of these schemes, particularly systematic resampling which closely resembles its stratified counterpart. However, each such proof is likely to be a similarly lengthy and technical calculation, and hence we do not pursue them here.

Remark 4.4 of [BJJK21] argued that the expected merger rates of all stochastic rounding schemes coincide. The basis for the argument was an explicit conditional merger probability obtained from (1) which only depended on marginal moments of family sizes. Since (1) is only valid for systems whose ancestral index vectors are independent in different generations, the scope of [BJJK21, Remark 4.4] must be subject to the same constraint.

3.4 Ordering of merger probabilities

Appendix A of [BJJK21] showed that when conditional merger probabilities can be written in the form in (1), resampling schemes based on stochastic rounding dominate multinomial resampling in that the quantity

$$\frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}^{\mathbf{X}}[(\nu_k(i))_2] \quad (22)$$

is always at least as large under the latter as under the former. The relevance of the result is that timescales for convergence to the Kingman coalescent are typically obtained as generalised inverses of (22), so that a resampling scheme for which (22) is higher will exhibit faster coalescence. The relevance to SMC algorithms is that the speed of coalescence can be thought of as the rate of build-up of path degeneracy arising from distinct lineages merging into common ancestors.

Our timescale is slightly different, obtained as the generalised inverse of coalescence probabilities in (2). Here we present a counterexample which shows that ordering of second factorial moments in (22) does not imply ordering of coalescence probabilities in (2). Hence, there does not appear to be a simple way to compare the speed of coalescence between resampling schemes using our timescale. Our counterexample is between stratified and multinomial resampling, but systematic resampling can be substituted in place of stratified resampling in all of the computations below as well.

Consider $N = 4$ and suppose we are tracking $n = 3$ lineages. Suppose that the ordered, normalised weights of each of the four available parents in the next generation are $(1-3z, z, z, z)$, for $z \in [0, 1/3]$. Figure 2 illustrates these ancestral weights, and how they line up with the four intervals used for allocating children in stratified resampling.




Figure 2: The ordered weights of four parents lined up against the four stratification intervals used to implement stratified resampling.

Let $\mathbb{P}_M, \mathbb{P}_S, \mathbb{E}_M$, and \mathbb{E}_S denote probabilities and expectations under multinomial and stratified resampling, respectively. Then, given the weights in Figure 2 with $z \leq 1/12$ and with $j < k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_S^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < 3 || \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n}| = 3, G_j^{N,n}) = 1,$$

because there is no way to allocate the three lineages to the four stratification intervals without at least three merging in the first parent. For multinomial resampling,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_M^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < 3 || \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n}| = 3, G_j^{N,n}) &= (1-3z)^3 + 3z^3 + 3 \binom{3}{2} (1-3z)^2 z + 3 \binom{3}{2} z^2 (1-z) \\ &= 1 - 18z^2 + 48z^3 \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_S^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < 3 || \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n}| = 3, G_j^{N,n}), \end{aligned}$$

with equality only if $z = 0$, so that the probability of at least one coalescence is higher under stratified resampling.

The factorial moments in (22) satisfy the opposite inequality, in that the ones under multinomial resampling dominate those under stratified resampling. Using the fact that, for $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(X)_2] = \text{Var}(X) + \mathbb{E}[X]^2 - \mathbb{E}[X] = np(1-p) + n^2p^2 - np = (n)_2p^2,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_S^{\mathbf{X}}[(\nu_k(1))_2] &= (4)_2 \frac{1/4 - 3z}{1/4} + (3)_2 \frac{3z}{1/4} = 12 - 72z, \\ \mathbb{E}_M^{\mathbf{X}}[(\nu_k(1))_2] &= (4)_2(1 - 3z)^2 = 12 - 72z + 108z^2, \\ \mathbb{E}_S^{\mathbf{X}}[(\nu_k(i))_2] &= 0 \text{ for } i \in \{2, 3, 4\}, \\ \mathbb{E}_M^{\mathbf{X}}[(\nu_k(i))_2] &= (4)_2z^2 = 12z^2 \text{ for } i \in \{2, 3, 4\}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, factorial moments of family sizes are always larger under multinomial resampling, in line with the result of [BJJK21].

A Results for Particular Resampling Schemes

A.1 Multinomial resampling

Proof of Proposition 1. The conditional merger probability under multinomial resampling is

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ &= \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1), G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ & \quad \times \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ &= \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1)) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)),\end{aligned}$$

using D-separation given (\mathbf{X}, ℓ_1) of generation k from generations $\{j, \dots, k-1\}$. Substituting in the categorical probabilities that lineages $\ell_1^{j_1}$ and $\ell_1^{j_2}$ merge into a common ancestor, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ & \quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))},\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

which is an inequality because the right-hand side counts some mergers many times. Using (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \frac{\gamma^2}{N} \\ & = \binom{|\xi|}{2} \frac{\gamma^4}{N},\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

because the middle step amounts to a sum of the probability mass function $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \cdot) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0))$ over its support $\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}$. Hence, $c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $k \in \mathbb{N}$, so that (3) and (4) hold. Furthermore, (5) holds because (10) implies

$$\sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)^2 \leq \frac{\gamma^4}{N} \sum_{k=j+1}^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)} c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \leq \frac{\gamma^4(t+1)}{N}.$$

We will obtain (6) by checking a two-part condition which implies it. The first is that there exists a sequence $C_N^n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & \leq C_N^n \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| = |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

for any sufficiently large N and almost every \mathbf{X} , where C_N^n does not depend on $k \geq 0$, $\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}$, or \mathbf{X} . The second is that, for every $\xi \prec \eta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & \sim \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n}| = |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$, uniformly in $t > 0$, $\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}$, $|\xi| \leq n$, and \mathbf{X} . When (25) and (26) hold,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n} = \eta | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & \sim \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n}| = |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & \sim \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} [\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n}| = |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell))] \\ & = \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\ & = c_N(\xi, \ell, j; \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)), \end{aligned}$$

so that (6) holds as well.

We begin by establishing (25). In order for the number of lineages to decrease by more than one in a single time-step, there must be at least one merger with three (or more) lineages, or at least two mergers involving pairs of lineages. The corresponding conditional probability given

\mathbf{X} can be bounded above:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1)) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
&\quad \times \left[\sum_{(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^3} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^4} \prod_{u \in \{0,2\}} \left(\sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i+u}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i+u}))} \right) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the factor of $1/8$ on the last line compensates for the four orderings of (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) which leave the $\{v_1, v_2\}$ and $\{v_3, v_4\}$ mergers unchanged, as well as the two further orderings of the two parent indices. Using (17), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
&\quad \times \left[\frac{(|\xi| - 2)\gamma^2}{3N} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(|\xi| - 2)(|\xi| - 3)\gamma^4}{4N} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{(|\xi| - 2)\gamma^2}{N} \left[\frac{1}{3} + \frac{(|\xi| - 3)\gamma^2}{4} \right] \\
&\quad \times \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
&\quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}. \tag{27}
\end{aligned}$$

Still by (17),

$$\frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \leq \gamma^4 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}.$$

for any $v_i, i \in [|\xi|]$. Substituting into (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma^{10}}{N} \left[\binom{|\xi|}{3} + \binom{|\xi|}{2} \binom{|\xi| - 2}{2} \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \right] \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \quad \times \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))} \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma^{10}}{N} \left[\binom{|\xi|}{3} + \binom{|\xi|}{2} \binom{|\xi| - 2}{2} \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \right] \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)), \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality holds because the factor on the second line of the middle step is the probability that lineages ℓ_1^1 and ℓ_1^2 merge. Hence, (25) holds.

To see that (26) holds, note that (17) implies that the conditional law of the ancestor index of a lineage can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(a_k(i) = m) = \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(i))} = \frac{1}{\gamma^2 N} + \frac{\gamma^2 - 1}{\gamma^2} r(i, m),$$

where $r(i, \cdot)$ is a probability mass function on $[N]$. Hence, a lineage can sample its ancestor by first flipping a Bernoulli($1/\gamma^2$)-distributed coin. If the flip succeeds, the ancestor is sampled uniformly, while if the flip fails, the ancestor is sampled from the remainder mass function $r(i, \cdot)$. A sufficient condition for (26) to hold is for each of the $|\xi|$ lineages to succeed in at least one coin flip between generation 0 and $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)$. For simplicity, we will consider the stricter event that there is at least one generation in which all $|\xi|$ lineages succeed in their coin flips. The number of generations until $|\xi|$ simultaneous successes in geometrically distributed with parameter $1/\gamma^{2|\xi|}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\text{At least one generation before } \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \text{ with } |\xi| \text{ successes}) \\
& = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^{2|\xi|}} \right)^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}. \tag{29}
\end{aligned}$$

By (24), we have that, almost surely,

$$\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{Nt}{\gamma^4} \right\rfloor,$$

which implies that (29) tends to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, to check (7) we will obtain a lower bound on $c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)$. By considering the probability

that two specific particles merge and using (17),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \geq \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \quad \times \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))} \\
& \geq \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{1}{N^2 \gamma^4} = \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} \frac{1}{N \gamma^4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Hence, $c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k)$ is bounded away from zero for each N uniformly in ℓ, j , and k , which means $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)$ has an almost surely finite upper bound and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) = \infty) = 0$ for any $t \in (0, \infty)$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. By (23) and with the random vector L defined as in (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) & \leq \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \\
& = \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[\prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

so that the right-hand side matches the statement of Proposition 2.

In the other direction, (30) yields the same expression as a lower bound when $|\xi| = 2$, but for general ξ we require a sharper bound. To that end,

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \\
& = \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[1 - \sum_{(m_1, \dots, m_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\xi|} \frac{g_k(X_k(m_i)) M_k(X_k(m_i), X_{k-1}(L^i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^i))} \right] \\
& \geq \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[1 - \left(1 - \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \left[\prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))} \right] \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. \times \sum_{\substack{(m_i: i \in [|\xi|] \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|-2} \\ \text{every } m_i \neq m}} \prod_{i \in [|\xi|] \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m_i)) M_k(X_k(m_i), X_{k-1}(L^i))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^i))} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The sum on the last line can be bounded below by using Lemma 2 in Appendix B with $r = |\xi| - 2$ and

$$a(m, \ell) = \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell))},$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_N(\xi, \ell, j; k) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in \|\xi\|_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[\prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))} \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{\binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{(v_1, v_2, v_3) \in \|\xi\|_{d,u}^3} \sum_{m=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[\prod_{i \in \{1,2,3\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_i}))} \right] \\
& - \frac{1}{8 \binom{|\xi|}{2}} \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_4) \in \|\xi\|_d^4} \mathbb{E}_{j,k}^{\mathbf{X}, \xi, \ell} \left[\prod_{u \in \{0,2\}} \prod_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{g_k(X_k(m)) M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(L^{v_{i+u}}))}{\sum_{h=1}^N g_k(X_k(h)) M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(L^{v_{i+u}}))} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the factor of $1/8$ on the last line compensates for the fact that four ordered 4-tuples (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) correspond to the same double-merger between $\{v_1, v_2\}$ and $\{v_3, v_4\}$, and that there are also two corresponding orderings of the parent indices m . The last two sums constitute lower order terms by (28), and hence the claim holds. \square

A.2 Stratified resampling

Proof of Proposition 3. Under stratified resampling, the conditional probability given \mathbf{X} that particle $\ell \in [N]$ in generation $k-1$ has parent $m \in [N]$ in generation k is

$$\frac{\|[\frac{\ell-1}{N}, \frac{\ell}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]\| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell))}{\sum_{h=1}^N \|[\frac{\ell-1}{N}, \frac{\ell}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(h-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(h)}]\| M_k(X_k(h), X_{k-1}(\ell))}.$$

Thus, the conditional probability of at least one merger in generation k among $|\xi|$ lineages can be bounded above by conditioning on the uniformly sampled indices $(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|})$ to which they are shuffled, and multiplying by the probability that at least two of those indices obtain the same parent in the stratified resampling scheme:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in \|\xi\|_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\|[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]\| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N \|[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]\| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \\
& = \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_0^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in \|\xi\|_{d,u}^2} \sum_{(h_{v_1}, h_{v_2}) \in [N]_d^2} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{\|[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]\| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N \|[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]\| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))},
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality arises because the right-hand side overcounts some mergers. Applying (19) to the last line, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{(N)_2} \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{(h_{v_1}, h_{v_2}) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{|[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]|}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]|} \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{(N)_2} \binom{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \quad \times \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]|}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]|}. \tag{31}
\end{aligned}$$

For fixed h_i , the sum in the denominator on the last line simplifies to

$$\sum_{r=1}^N \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}] \right| = \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \right| = \frac{1}{N}, \tag{32}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \quad \times \frac{N\gamma^2}{N-1} \binom{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}] \right|. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

For a fixed m , we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \prod_{i \in \{1,2\}} \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}] \right| & \leq \left(\sum_{h=1}^N \left| \left[\frac{h-1}{N}, \frac{h}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}] \right| \right)^2 \\
& = |[\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]|^2 \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{N^2}, \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from (20). Substituting back into (33),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \frac{N\gamma^2}{N-1} \frac{\gamma^2}{N} \binom{|\xi|}{2} \\
& = \frac{\gamma^4(1+o(1))}{N} \binom{|\xi|}{2}, \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

where the sum over $[N]_d^{|\xi|}$ evaluates to one because it adds up a conditional probability mass function over its support. Similarly to the multinomial case, this upper bound on the binary merger probability means that (3), (4), and (5) hold.

As with multinomial resampling, (25) and (26) are a sufficient condition for (6). To show that (25) holds, we write the probability of the number of blocks decreasing by more than one as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&= \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1)) \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{|\left[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |\left[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left[\frac{1}{3} \sum_{v_3 \neq v_1, v_2} \frac{|\left[\frac{h_{v_3}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_3}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_3}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |\left[\frac{h_{v_3}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_3}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_3}))} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{(v_3, v_4) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2 \\ \text{both } \neq v_1, v_2}} \sum_{m' \neq m} \prod_{i=3}^4 \frac{|\left[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m'-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m')}]| M_k(X_k(m'), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |\left[\frac{h_{v_i}-1}{N}, \frac{h_{v_i}}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right] ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the right-hand side is an upper bound on the probabilities of a merger of three lineages, or two simultaneous mergers of a pair of lineages each. All larger mergers must contain at least one of these events. Applying (19) and (32) to the terms in square brackets and simplifying the sum over $(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|})$ similarly to (31),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \left(\prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{|\left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |\left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}\right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left[\frac{N\gamma(|\xi| - 2)}{3(N-2)} \sum_{h_3 \neq h_1, h_2} \left| \left[\frac{h_3-1}{N}, \frac{h_3}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}] \right| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{(N\gamma)^2}{2(N-2)_2} \binom{|\xi| - 2}{2} \sum_{\substack{(h_3, h_4) \in [N]_d^2 \\ \text{both } \neq h_1, h_2}} \sum_{m' \neq m} \prod_{i=3}^4 \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m'-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m')}] \right| \right]. \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (34), we have the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{h_3 \neq h_1, h_2} \left| \left[\frac{h_3-1}{N}, \frac{h_3}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}] \right| \leq \frac{\gamma}{N}, \\
& \sum_{\substack{(h_3, h_4) \in [N]_d^2 \\ \text{both } \neq h_1, h_2}} \sum_{m' \neq m} \prod_{i=3}^4 \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m'-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m')}] \right| \leq \frac{\gamma^2}{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these into (36) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \frac{\gamma^2}{(N)_3} \left[\frac{|\xi| - 2}{3} + \frac{N\gamma^2}{2(N-3)} \binom{|\xi| - 2}{2} \right] \\
& \times \sum_{(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2} \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}.
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the required bound, the right-hand side must be bounded above by the product of $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell))$ and a factor tending to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Currently, the sum over $(v_1, v_2) \in [|\xi|]_{d,u}^2$ overcounts mergers involving more than two lineages. By (19),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))} \\
& \leq \gamma^2 \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^{v_i}))}
\end{aligned}$$

for $v_i, i \in [|\xi|]$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \leq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \frac{\gamma^6 (|\xi| - 2)}{N - 2} \left[\frac{1}{3} + \frac{N\gamma^2 (|\xi| - 3)}{4(N-3)} \right] \binom{|\xi|}{2} \\
& \times \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2} \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i=1}^2 \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now the second line on the right-hand side is the probability that lineages ℓ_1^1 and ℓ_1^2 merge, and hence a lower bound on the probability of at least one merger. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| - 1 | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell)) \\
& \leq \frac{\gamma^6 (|\xi| - 2)}{N - 2} \left[\frac{1}{3} + \frac{N\gamma^2 (|\xi| - 3)}{4(N-3)} \right] \binom{|\xi|}{2} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence (25) holds.

To show that (26) holds, we consider a transition between $G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)$ and $G_k^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1)$, where the gaps between entries of ℓ_1 are all at least $\lceil \gamma \rceil$. Such a vector exists because the largest entry of ℓ_1 needs to be at most $|\xi|(\lceil \gamma \rceil + 1) \leq N$, which is attainable for any sufficiently large N . By (19) and (32) the corresponding conditional transition probability can be bounded from below:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(G_k^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& = \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \sum_{(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\xi|} \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(\ell_1^i-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(\ell_1^i)}]| M_k(X_k(\ell_1^i), X_{k-1}(\ell_0^i))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_0^i))} \\
& \geq \frac{N^{|\xi|}}{(N)_{|\xi|} \gamma^{|\xi|}} \sum_{(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \prod_{i=1}^{|\xi|} \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(\ell_1^i-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(\ell_1^i)}] \right|. \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

Our aim is to show that (37) can be minorised by a uniform measure on the set $\{\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|} : |\ell^i - \ell^m| > \lceil \gamma \rceil\}$.

Because the separation between entries of ℓ_1 is at least $\lceil \gamma \rceil$ and $|\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}| \geq 1/(\gamma N)$ by (20), all $|\xi|$ intervals of the form $[\bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i)}]$ intersect with non-overlapping sets of intervals of the form $[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}]$. Moreover, there must be at least one $(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|}) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}$ such that, for every $i \in [N]$,

$$\left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i)}] \right| \geq \frac{1}{2N\gamma},$$

because $|\bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(\ell_i)}| \geq 1/(\gamma N)$, and an interval of width $1/(\gamma N)$ cannot overlap more than two consecutive intervals of width $1/N$. Taking one such vector $(h_1, \dots, h_{|\xi|})$ and bounding all other summands in (37) from below by zero, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(G_k^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \geq \frac{N^{|\xi|}}{(N)_{|\xi|} \gamma^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{(2N\gamma)^{|\xi|}} = \frac{1}{(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}}.$$

The number of elements of $[N]_d^{|\xi|}$ with entries separated by at least $\lceil \gamma \rceil$ is at least $N(N - 2\lceil \gamma \rceil - 1) \dots (N - (|\xi| - 1)[2\lceil \gamma \rceil + 1])$, which is the number of elements obtained by letting each choice of entry exclude itself, as well as $\lceil \gamma \rceil$ neighbours to either side, without regard for the fact that these exclusion zones can overlap. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(G_k^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1)^{N,n} | G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) &\geq \frac{N(N - 2\lceil \gamma \rceil - 1) \dots (N - (|\xi| - 1)[2\lceil \gamma \rceil + 1])}{(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|} (N)_{|\xi|} |\{\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|} : |\ell^i - \ell^m| > \lceil \gamma \rceil\}|} \\ &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{|\{\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|} : |\ell^i - \ell^m| > \lceil \gamma \rceil\}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

In view of (38), we can construct a transition from $G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)$ by first sampling an independent $Y \sim \text{Ber}((1 - \varepsilon)/(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|})$, for some sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, as soon as N is sufficiently large. If $Y = 1$, we set $G_k^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell')$, where $\ell' \sim U(\{\ell \in [N]_d^{|\xi|} : |\ell^i - \ell^m| > \lceil \gamma \rceil\})$. Otherwise, $G_k^{N,n}$ is sampled from a non-uniform remainder distribution, existence of which is guaranteed by (38). Since the distribution given $Y = 1$ is uniform regardless of the current state, (26) will hold provided $Y = 1$ happens at least once between generation 0 and $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)$. The number of generations until $Y = 1$ is $\text{Geo}((1 - \varepsilon)/(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|})$ -distributed, and hence

$$\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(\text{At least one generation before } \tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \text{ with } Y = 1) = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{(2\gamma^2)^{|\xi|}}\right)^{\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t)}.$$

By (35), $\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and hence (26) holds.

Finally, to see that (7) holds, we consider the probability that the two lexicographically lowest

blocks merge, which is a lower bound on the overall merger probability. Using (19) and (32),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \geq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \frac{|[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)}]| M_k(X_k(m), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))}{\sum_{r=1}^N |[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N}] \cap [\bar{g}_k^{(r-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(r)}]| M_k(X_k(r), X_{k-1}(\ell_1^i))} \\
& \geq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \sum_{(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \frac{N^2}{(N)_2 \gamma^2} \\
& \quad \times \sum_{m=1}^N \prod_{i \in \{1, 2\}} \left| \left[\frac{h_i-1}{N}, \frac{h_i}{N} \right] \cap \left[\bar{g}_k^{(m-1)}, \bar{g}_k^{(m)} \right] \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

By (21), we can restrict to particle locations \mathbf{X} for which there exists at least one pair $(h_1, h_2) \in [N]_d^2$ and $v \in [N]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(|\bar{G}_k^{N,n}| < |\xi| | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \\
& \geq \sum_{\ell_1 \in [N]_d^{|\xi|}} \mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{X}}(G_{k-1}^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_1) | \bar{G}_{k-1}^{N,n} = \xi, G_j^{N,n} = (\xi, \ell_0)) \frac{N^2 \gamma^2}{(N)_2} \varepsilon_N^2 = \gamma^2 (1 + o(1)) \varepsilon_N^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which is bounded away from zero in k for each fixed N . Hence, $\mathbb{P}(\tau_N(\xi, \ell, j; t) = \infty) = 0$ as required. \square

B Technical lemmas

Lemma 1. *Suppose $x_1, \dots, x_N \geq 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and $N \geq \alpha \geq 2$. Then*

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^\alpha \leq \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_m} + \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{m=1}^N x_m^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^{\alpha-2}. \quad (39)$$

Proof. By the multinomial theorem and a simple partition of the resulting sum into two subsets, we have (letting $\|\cdot\|$ denote the L^1 norm):

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^\alpha &= \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\mathbf{k}\| = \alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{k_m} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\mathbf{k}\| = \alpha \\ \max\{k_1, \dots, k_N\} = 1}} \binom{\alpha}{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{k_m} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\mathbf{k}\| = \alpha \\ \max\{k_1, \dots, k_N\} \geq 2}} \binom{\alpha}{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{k_m}
\end{aligned}$$

We then partition the right-hand side according to which index of \mathbf{k} has $k_i \geq 2$, and write the

resulting summand as $\mathbf{k}^{(i)}$ to emphasize the distinctive index:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^\alpha &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_m} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\mathbf{k}\| = \alpha \\ \max\{k_1, \dots, k_N\} \geq 2}} \binom{\alpha}{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{k_m} \\ &\leq \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_j} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\mathbf{k}^{(i)}\| = \alpha \\ k_i^{(i)} \geq 2}} \binom{\alpha}{\mathbf{k}^{(i)}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{k_m^{(i)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This is an inequality because the right-hand side overcounts vectors \mathbf{k} with more than one entry larger than 2. For example $\mathbf{k} = (2, 1, 0, 2, 1)$ will appear on the right-hand side as an entry in the sum over both $\mathbf{k}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{k}^{(4)}$. We can extract the two guaranteed entries of $k_i^{(i)}$ out of the innermost sum by using the change of variable $\ell^{(i)} := \mathbf{k}^{(i)} - 2\mathbf{e}_i$, with \mathbf{e}_i the tuple whose elements are 0 with the exception of the i^{th} which is 1:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \right)^\alpha \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_m} + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell^{(i)} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\ell^{(i)}\| = \alpha - 2} \frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1)}{(\ell_i^{(i)} + 2)(\ell_i^{(i)} + 1)} \binom{\alpha - 2}{\ell^{(i)}} x_i^2 \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{\ell_m^{(i)}} \\ &\leq \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{m=1}^\alpha x_{i_m} + \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 \sum_{\ell^{(i)} \in \mathbb{N}^N: \|\ell^{(i)}\| = \alpha - 2} \binom{\alpha - 2}{\ell^{(i)}} \prod_{m=1}^N x_m^{\ell_m^{(i)}} \\ &= \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_\alpha) \in [N]_d^\alpha} \prod_{j=1}^\alpha x_{i_j} + \binom{\alpha}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 \left(\sum_{m=1}^N x_m \right)^{\alpha - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma is reminiscent of the bounds of [Möh98, pages 442–443].

Lemma 2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{a(m, i)\}_{m, i \in [N]}$ be an array of non-negative coefficients with $\sum_{m=1}^N a(m, i) = 1$ for each $i \in [N]$, i.e. it coincides with the elements of a left stochastic matrix. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in [N]$, and $(\ell^1, \dots, \ell^r) \in [N]_d^r$ be fixed. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]_d^r \\ \text{every } v_i \neq v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) \geq 1 - \sum_{i \in [r]} a(v, \ell^i) - \sum_{(h, h') \in [r]_d^2} \sum_{v' \in [N] \setminus \{v\}} a(v', \ell^h) a(v', \ell^{h'}). \quad (40)$$

Proof. Because $\sum_{m=1}^N a(m, \ell) = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \prod_{i \in [r]} \left(\sum_{m \in [N]} a(m, \ell^i) \right) = \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^r} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]_d^r \\ \text{every } v_i \neq v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) + \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^r \setminus [N]_d^r \\ \text{every } v_i \neq v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) + \sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^r \\ \exists i: v_i = v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i). \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^r \\ \exists i: v_i = v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) &\leq \sum_{h \in [r]} a(v, \ell^h) \sum_{(v_1, \dots, v_{h-1}, v_{h+1}, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^{r-1}} \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{h\}} a(v_i, \ell^i) \\
&= \sum_{h \in [r]} a(v, \ell^h) \prod_{i \in [r] \setminus \{h\}} \left(\sum_{m \in [N]} a(m, \ell^i) \right) \\
&= \sum_{h \in [r]} a(v, \ell^h),
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows by overcounting summands for which more than one element of (v_1, \dots, v_r) is equal to v , and the last equality again uses that $\sum_{m=1}^N a(m, \ell) = 1$.

Similarly, overcounting summands for which more than two elements of (v_1, \dots, v_r) are equal to another entry, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{(v_1, \dots, v_r) \in [N]^r \\ \text{every } v_i \neq v}} \prod_{i \in [r]} a(v_i, \ell^i) \\
&\leq \sum_{(h, h') \in [r]_d^2} \sum_{v' \in [N] \setminus \{v\}} a(v', \ell^h) a(v', \ell^{h'}) \sum_{(v_i: i \in [r] \setminus \{h, h'\}) \in ([N] \setminus \{v\})^{r-2}} \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{h, h'\}} a(v_i, \ell^k) \\
&\leq \sum_{(h, h') \in [r]_d^2} \sum_{v' \in [N] \setminus \{v\}} a(v', \ell^h) a(v', \ell^{h'}) \sum_{(v_i: i \in [r] \setminus \{h, h'\}) \in [N]^{r-2}} \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{h, h'\}} a(v_i, \ell^k) \\
&= \sum_{(h, h') \in [r]_d^2} \sum_{v' \in [N] \setminus \{v\}} a(v', \ell^h) a(v', \ell^{h'}) \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{h, h'\}} \left(\sum_{m \in [N]} a(m, \ell^k) \right) \\
&= \sum_{(h, h') \in [r]_d^2} \sum_{v' \in [N] \setminus \{v\}} a(v', \ell^h) a(v', \ell^{h'}), \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

where again we use $\sum_{m=1}^N a(m, \ell) = 1$ in the last step. Combining (41)–(42) yields (40). \square

Open access and data sharing

For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were generated or analyzed.

Acknowledgements

We thank Janique Krasnowska for help with proof-reading earlier versions of this manuscript. JK acknowledges the support of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Council of the United Kingdom (EPSRC; Grant Number EP/V049208/1). PJ acknowledges the support of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Council of the United Kingdom (EPSRC; Grant Number EP/Y028783/1). AMJ acknowledges the support of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Council of the United Kingdom (EPSRC; Grant Numbers EP/R034710/1 and EP/Y014650/1).

References

- [ADH10] Christophe Andrieu, Arnaud Doucet, and Roman Holenstein. Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3):269–342, 2010.
- [BJJK21] Suzie Brown, Paul A Jenkins, Adam M Johansen, and Jere Koskela. Simple conditions for convergence of sequential Monte Carlo genealogies with applications. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 26:Paper 1, 2021.
- [BJJK23] Suzie Brown, Paul A Jenkins, Adam M Johansen, and Jere Koskela. Weak convergence of non-neutral genealogies to Kingman’s coalescent. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 162:76–105, 2023.
- [Bro21] Suzie Brown. *Resampling and genealogies in sequential Monte Carlo algorithms*. PhD thesis, University of Warwick, 2021.
- [CCF99] James Carpenter, Peter Clifford, and Paul Fearnhead. Improved particle filter for nonlinear problems. *IEE Proceedings - Radar, Sonar and Navigation*, 146(1):2–7, 1999.
- [CDMG16] Frederic Cérou, Pierre Del Moral, and Arnaud Guyader. On particle Gibbs samplers. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 47:629–649, 2016.
- [Cho04] Nicolas Chopin. Central limit theorem for sequential Monte Carlo methods and its application to Bayesian inference. *Annals of Statistics*, 32:2385–2411, 2004.
- [CL97] Dan Crisan and Terry Lyons. Nonlinear filtering and measure-valued processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 109(2):217–244, 1997.
- [CP20] Nicolas Chopin and Omiros Papaspiliopoulos. *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer, 2020.
- [DM04] Pierre Del Moral. *Feynman-Kac Formulae: Genealogical and Interacting Particle Systems with Applications*. Springer, 2004.
- [DMG01] Pierre Del Moral and Alice Guionnet. On the stability of interacting processes with applications to filtering and genetic algorithms. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 37(2):155–194, 2001.
- [DMKP16] Pierre Del Moral, Robert Kohn, and Frédéric Patras. On particle Gibbs samplers. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 52(4):1687–1733, 2016.
- [DMM01] Pierre Del Moral and Laurent Miclo. Genealogies and increasing propagation of chaos for Feynman-Kac and genetic models. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 11(4):1166–1198, 2001.
- [DMMPR09] Pierre Del Moral, Laurent Miclo, Frédéric Patras, and Sylvain Rubenthaler. The convergence to equilibrium of neutral genetic models. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 28(1):123–143, 2009.
- [EK86] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 1986.

- [Fin15] Axel Finke. *On Extended State-Space Constructions for Monte Carlo Methods*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Warwick, 2015.
- [GCW19] Mathieu Gerber, Nicolas Chopin, and Nick Whiteley. Negative association, ordering and convergence of resampling methods. *Annals of Statistics*, 47(4):2236–2260, 2019.
- [GDW04] Simon J. Godsill, Arnaud Doucet, and Mike West. Monte Carlo smoothing for nonlinear time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99:159–168, 2004.
- [JLS20] Pierre E. Jacob, Fredrik Lindsten, and Thomas B. Schön. Smoothing with couplings of conditional particle filters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(530):721–729, 2020.
- [JMR15] Pierre E Jacob, Lawrence M Murray, and Sylvain Rubenthaler. Path storage in the particle filter. *Statistics and Computing*, 25(2):487–496, 2015.
- [Kin82a] John Kingman. The coalescent. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 13(3):235–248, 1982.
- [Kin82b] John Kingman. On the genealogy of large populations. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 19(A):27–43, 1982.
- [KJJS22] Jere Koskela, Paul A Jenkins, Adam M Johansen, and Dario Spanò. Erratum: Asymptotic genealogies of interacting particle systems with an application to sequential Monte Carlo. *Annals of Statistics*, 50(4):2467–2468, 2022.
- [KLSV23] Joonas Karjalainen, Anthony Lee, Sumeetpal S. Singh, and Matti Vihola. On the forgetting of particle filters. arXiv:2309.08517, 2023+.
- [KLW94] Augustine Kong, Jun S. Liu, and Wing Hung Wong. Sequential imputations and Bayesian missing data problems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(425):278–288, March 1994.
- [KN97] Stephen M. Krone and Claudia Neuhauser. Ancestral processes with selection. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 51:210–237, 1997.
- [Kün05] Hans R. Künsch. Recursive Monte Carlo filters: algorithms and theoretical analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 33:1983–2021, 2005.
- [LW18] Anthony Lee and Nick Whiteley. Variance estimation in the particle filter. *Biometrika*, 105(3):609–625, 2018.
- [Möh98] Martin Möhle. Robustness results for the coalescent. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 35(2):438–447, 1998.
- [Möh99] Martin Möhle. Weak convergence to the coalescent in neutral population models. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 36(2):446–460, 1999.
- [MS01] Martin Möhle and Serik Sagitov. A classification of coalescent processes for haploid exchangeable population models. *The Annals of Probability*, 29(4):1547–1562, 2001.
- [MS03] Martin Möhle and Serik Sagitov. Coalescent patterns in exchangeable diploid population models. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 47:337–352, 2003.

- [Pea88] Judea Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems*. Elsevier, 1988.
- [Rub23] Sylvain Rubenthaler. Counterexample to a transition probability formula for the ancestral process. arXiv:2305.03560, 2023+.
- [SD19] Alex Shestopaloff and Arnaud Doucet. Replica conditional sequential Monte Carlo. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Ruslan Salakhutdinov, editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5749–5757, Long Beach, California, USA, 09–15 Jun 2019. PMLR.
- [Whi94] Darrell Whitley. A genetic algorithm tutorial. *Statistics and Computing*, 4(2):65–85, 1994.