

# A calculus for Markov chain Monte Carlo: studying approximations in algorithms

Rocco Caprio, Adam M Johansen

Department of Statistics, University of Warwick

October 9, 2023

## Abstract

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms are based on the construction of a Markov Chain with transition probabilities  $P_\mu(x, \cdot)$ , where  $\mu$  indicates an invariant distribution of interest. In this work, we look at these transition probabilities as functions of their invariant distributions, and we develop a notion of *derivative in the invariant distribution* of a MCMC kernel. We build around this concept a set of tools that we refer to as *Markov Chain Monte Carlo Calculus*. This allows us to compare Markov chains with different invariant distributions within a suitable class via what we refer to as mean value inequalities. We explain how MCMC Calculus provides a natural framework to study algorithms using an approximation of an invariant distribution, also illustrating how it suggests practical guidelines for MCMC algorithms efficiency. We conclude this work by showing how the tools developed can be applied to prove convergence of interacting and sequential MCMC algorithms, which arise in the context of particle filtering.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Notation

It is convenient to begin by introducing some notation that will be used throughout.  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  is some underlying probability space.  $(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{X}))$  is a Polish space equipped with metric  $\varrho$  for which we assume that  $x \mapsto \varrho(x, y)$  is continuously differentiable for all  $y \neq x$ , and endowed with the associated Borel  $\sigma$ -field.  $B(x, r)$  denotes a ball in  $\mathbf{X}$  centered at  $x$  and having radius  $r > 0$ . We will slightly abuse notation and use  $1$  to denote the unit function on any space.  $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{X})$  denotes the set of finite signed measures on  $\mathbf{X}$ .  $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,0}(\mathbf{X}) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{X})$  denotes the set of  $0$ -mass signed measures with continuous bounded Radon-Nikodým derivatives w.r.t. a reference  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\lambda$ .  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}) \subset \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{X})$  denotes the set of probability measures on  $\mathbf{X}$ , and similarly  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  denotes the set of probability measures with continuous bounded densities w.r.t.  $\lambda$ .  $\Rightarrow$  denotes weak convergence. For  $\chi \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{X})$  and a measurable function  $f$ , we often write  $\chi(f) := \int f(x)\chi(dx)$ . When  $\chi \in \mathcal{M}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  for some  $\lambda$  which is implied by the context, we often abuse notation and just write  $\chi(x)$  for the value of  $d\chi/d\lambda$  at  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ . For  $V : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ , we define the  $V$ -norm of a measurable function  $f : \mathbf{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  as

$$|f|_V := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{X}} \frac{|f(x)|}{V(x)}.$$

$\mathbf{B}_V(\mathbf{X})$  denotes the space of measurable functions with  $V$ -norm lower or equal than  $1$ ;  $\mathbf{B}_1(\mathbf{X})$  that of measurable functions with supremum norm no greater than  $1$ . The  $V$ -norm of a signed measure  $\chi \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{X})$  is instead defined by

$$\|\chi\|_V := \sup_{f \in \mathbf{B}_V(\mathbf{X})} \left| \int f d\chi \right|.$$

When  $V = 1$ , the  $V$ -norm of a function and of a signed measure are just the supremum norm  $|\cdot|_\infty$  and the total variation norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{tv}}$ , respectively.  $\mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$  is the space of continuously differentiable functions with  $V$ -norm lower or equal than  $1$ . We endow  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  with the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathbf{B}_1(\mathbf{X})$ .

A Markov kernel on  $X \times \mathcal{B}(X)$  is a function  $P : X \times \mathcal{B}(X) \mapsto [0, 1]$  such that (i) for each  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ ,  $P(\cdot, A)$  is a non-negative measurable function on  $X$  and (ii) for each  $x \in X$ ,  $P(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .  $P$  acts on bounded measurable functions via  $P(x, f) := Pf(x) := \int f(y)P(x, dy)$ , and on probability measures via  $\rho P(dx) := P(\rho, dx) := \int \rho(dy)P(y, dx) \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Whenever a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $X$  satisfies  $\mu(dx) = P(\mu, dx)$ , we say that  $\mu$  is an invariant distribution for  $P$ . A Markov kernel having an invariant distribution  $\mu$  will be denoted  $P_\mu$  whenever the emphasis is important.

## 1.2 Markov chain Monte Carlo with approximations and calculus

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithms are based on the construction of a Markov Chain with transition probabilities  $P_\mu(x, \cdot)$ , where  $\mu$  indicates an invariant density of interest one can evaluate pointwise (up to a possibly unknown normalizing constant). It often happens, however, that  $\mu$  is intractable, or just very hard to target directly. In these situations, possible and popular remedies include simply using an approximation  $\mu_n$  of  $\mu$  and hence simulating a homogeneous Markov Chain with transitions  $P_{\mu_n}$ , or considering an evolving sequence  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converging to  $\mu$  in some sense, and simulating an inhomogeneous Markov Chain  $\{P_{\mu_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  perhaps in a tempering-like context. In these situations, one usually has control over how good the approximation is, and it might be of interest to ensure that the “approximate” chain  $P_{\mu_n}$  moves similarly to the “limiting” chain  $P_\mu$ , and perhaps to quantify how the “degree of similarity” depends on the quality of our approximation.

Roughly speaking, the ultimate goal of this paper is to look at Markov kernels as functions of their invariant distribution, and to be able to say that  $P_{\mu_n}$  and  $P_\mu$  are similar whenever we can say both that  $\mu$  and  $\mu_n$  are similar and that the derivative in the invariant distribution of  $P$  at  $\mu$  towards  $\mu_n$  is bounded. In this paper, we shall make sense of this sentence, first by introducing a notion of a family of Markov kernels, where one has a mapping from the invariant distribution to the Markov kernel (Section 2.1), and then of derivative in the invariant distribution and of boundedness thereof (Sections 2.2 and 2.3). We shall then provide a “Fundamental theorem of MCMC Calculus” to compare Markov chains with different invariant distribution within the same family. When  $\mu, \nu$  have positive densities, this result will allow us to easily derive *mean-value* type inequalities

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{\rho, t} dt$$

when  $\rho$  also has a positive density, and when  $\rho = \delta_x$ ,

$$\|P_\mu(x, \cdot) - P_\nu(x, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{1, t, x} dt + |\mu(x) - \nu(x)| \int_0^1 D_{2, t, x} dt,$$

for Hastings type and Gibbs kernels, with explicit values for the “Lipschitz constants”  $\int_0^1 D_{\rho, t} dt$ ,  $\int_0^1 D_{1, t, x} dt$  and  $\int_0^1 D_{2, t, x} dt$  (Propositions 2.7 and 2.9).

When  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of random measures and which has limiting Gaussian fluctuations around  $\mu$ , in a sense we shall make more precise later, we will see that provided the Markov kernel  $P$  is differentiable in the invariant distribution, then  $P_{\mu_n}$  will have also have limiting Gaussian fluctuations around  $P_\mu$ , with the magnitude of the fluctuations depending explicitly on its derivative (Proposition 2.10). These results are immediately useful when one is using an approximate Chain  $P_{\mu_n}$  and wants it to move like  $P_\mu$ : it suffices to pick a Markov kernel with finite Lipschitz constants (which will mean that the kernel has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution) or to minimize fluctuations around  $P_\mu$ . In Section 3 we use our calculus approach to study the efficiency of approximation based MCMC algorithms like Sequential MCMC or Interacting MCMC in terms of their asymptotic variance. Our approach allow for a very natural study of these, allowing us to state conditions for convergence simply in terms of good enough approximation quality, boundedness of the derivative, and enough uniformity of ergodic constants along the approximation sequence, and we improve some existent convergence results in some cases.

## 2 Markov Chain Monte Carlo Calculus

### 2.1 Families of Markov kernels

To compare Markov kernels with different invariant distributions, our main tool will be the derivative in the invariant distribution of a Markov kernel, which we introduce in the next section. This quantity will describe the variation of the transition probabilities of a Markov Chain when  $\mu$  is perturbed. Certainly, there are many possible transition probabilities associated with each invariant distribution, so to accomplish this we first have to restrict the class of Markov kernels considered. We introduce the notion of *family of Markov kernels*—which is a collection of Markov kernels indexed by a convex subset of invariant distributions:

**Definition 2.1** (Family of Markov kernels). *Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be a convex subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ . A family of Markov kernels  $\{P_\star\}$  is a set  $\{P_\mu : \mathsf{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}) \mapsto [0, 1] \mid \mu \in \mathcal{I}\}$ , where for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{I}$  one has  $\mu P_\mu = \mu$ .*

According to our definition, if for some  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ ,  $P_\mu, P_\nu \in \{P_\star\}$ , then defining the curve  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$ , as the map  $t \in [0, 1] \mapsto \mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ , interpolating  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , we have that  $P_{\mu_t} \in \{P_\star\}$  for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ .  $\mu_t$  and  $P_{\mu_t}$  will play an important role. The following two examples describe some Markov kernel families.

**Example 2.1** (The Hastings family). Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$  be a probability measure dominated by some measure  $\lambda$  in that  $\mu \ll \lambda$ , and write  $\mu(y)$  for  $d\mu/d\lambda(y)$ . Typically,  $\lambda$  will be the Lebesgue measure when  $\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and the counting measure when  $\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $Q$  be a *proposal* Markov kernel such that  $Q(x, dy) = q(x, y)\lambda(dy)$  for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  and let  $g$  be a *balancing function* satisfying  $g(x) = xg(1/x)$ ,  $g(x) \leq 1$ . Consider the Markov kernels of the form

$$P_\mu(x, f) := \int f(y)Q(x, dy)g(r_\mu(x, y)) + f(x) \left(1 - \int Q(x, dy)g(r_\mu(x, y))\right) \quad (1)$$

where

$$r_\mu(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\mu(y)q(y, x)}{\mu(x)q(x, y)} & \text{if } \mu(x)q(x, y) > 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mu(x)q(x, y) = 0. \end{cases}$$

These kernels have  $\mu$  as invariant distribution and are indexed by the convex set of all probability distributions  $\mu$  with a density w.r.t.  $\lambda$  on  $\mathsf{X}$ , or any convex subset thereof. That is, they form proper Markov families as per Definition 2.1. For generic  $Q$  and  $g$ , we refer to the *Hastings family*, as [24] introduced kernels of this general form. When, for instance,  $Q$  is a Gaussian Random Walk (RW) and  $g(x) = \min(1, x)$  one obtain the *RW Metropolis family* [34] over the same set of invariant distributions. If  $Q$  is a particular Gaussian RW and  $g(x) = x/(1+x)$ , they form the *RW Barker family* [7] etc. In general, our framework imposes no requirement that  $Q$  be fixed across the family as described in this simple example and in general it can depend upon  $\mu$ .

**Example 2.2** (The Gibbs family). Suppose  $\mu$  is the probability distribution of a random vector  $(U_1, U_2)$ . Let  $P_{1|2}$  and  $P_{2|1}$  two Markov kernels on  $\mathsf{X} \times \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})$  representing the conditional distributions of  $U_1$  given  $U_2$  and  $U_2$  given  $U_1$ , respectively. The Markov kernels on  $\mathsf{X}^2 \times \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}^2)$  given by

$$P_\mu((x, x'), f) := \int P_{1|2}(x', dy)P_{2|1}(y, dy')f(y, y') \quad (2)$$

are  $\mu$ -invariant. Kernels of the type (2) form a proper Markov family—the (two-stage) deterministic scan Gibbs family.

We considered here the two-stage Gibbs family purely for ease for exposition and simplicity of notation; corresponding results can be obtained for much more general Gibbs samplers. Considering other Markov kernel families is possible. For instance, if in Example 2.1 we also allow  $Q$  to depend on the gradient of  $\mu$  as in the Metropolis-Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA; [39]), one could obtain the MALA family (over the probability distributions with differentiable densities). If  $P_{1|2}$ ,  $P_{2|1}$  in Example 2.2 instead of being conditional distributions are Markov kernels invariant for the same, one could obtain a Metropolis-within-Gibbs family etc. It is also possible to consider a Markov family that is

using a given type of Markov kernel if the invariant distribution belong to a certain set (e.g. MALA if the invariant density is differentiable), and another Markov kernel otherwise (e.g. RW Metropolis if it is not). For Hastings-type and Gibbs-type algorithms of Examples 2.1 and 2.2 above, checking that they form a Markov family in the sense of Definition 2.1 is easily done because the dependence on the invariant distribution is somehow explicit. In principal one could define Markov families in which the dependence of kernels on the invariant distribution is not made so explicit, but checking Definition 2.1 would be harder.

## 2.2 The derivative in the invariant distribution

Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be a Markov family indexed by the convex set of probability measures admitting densities w.r.t. some  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\lambda$ , or any convex subset thereof. We will define the derivative with respect the invariant distribution of  $P$ . at a point  $\mu$  indexed by the family by first accurately defining the derivative of the functional  $P(\rho, f) : \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X}) \mapsto P_\mu(\rho, f) \in \mathbb{R}$ , for all  $(\rho, f)$  in some suitable class. The derivative of such functional will first be defined for all  $\rho$  in a subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , and then defined for initial distributions in its completion by extension.

Throughout this section, we fix a continuously differentiable function  $V : \mathbf{X} \mapsto [1, \infty)$ , and consider  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ . This function directly influences how stringent the differentiability statement is, but also what we are able to say with the objects we introduce next, and its role will become clear when we introduce mean value inequalities later.

**Definition 2.2.** For  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , the derivative of  $P(\rho, f)$  in the invariant distribution at  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  is the linear functional  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot] : \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,0}(\mathbf{X}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}(\rho, f) \right|_{t=0} = \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] \quad (3)$$

We denote with  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}(P, f)$  the set of  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  for which  $P(\rho, f)$  is differentiable at  $\mu$ . In all our examples, for  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , the action of the functional  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  will be expressible in integral form. In particular, for a measurable function abusively denoted as  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(\cdot) : \mathbf{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  we will have

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] = \int (\nu(y) - \mu(y)) \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) \lambda(dy) \quad \text{and} \quad (4)$$

$$\mu(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(\cdot)) = 0. \quad (5)$$

We sometimes distinguish the functional  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$  from the function of its integral representation only via the brackets that follow. The context will always make obvious to which object we are referring to. The function  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(\cdot)$  will be referred to as density of the derivative in the invariant distribution. The density of  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  corresponds to the *first variation* of  $P(\rho, f)$ , and its analogues appears for instance in [12] in the context of Mean Field Games and in Optimal Transport in [40]. Under some conditions on  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$ , these can be related to notions of derivatives in the Wasserstein geometry [2], see also Theorem 2.2. Here, (5) is a centering condition, and it guarantees that the integral representation is unique. Without, it would be unique only up to constants.

We defined the derivative in general as a linear functional  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$  despite in practice it admits an integral representation for  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  because this allows us an immediate extension to general  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  for which such representation will not in general be available. Let  $d_p$  be a distance function metrizing the weak topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$ .  $d_p$  could be the Lévy-Prokhorov or the Bounded Lipschitz metric [17, Chapter 11]. If the functional  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous w.r.t.  $d_p$  on some subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu,\lambda}(P, f)$ , we can uniquely extend  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  on the weak completion  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  in a very natural way via continuity.

**Proposition 2.1.** If  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous w.r.t.  $d_p$  on some subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , we can uniquely extend it on its weak completion  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  by defining

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho_j, f)[\nu - \mu], \quad \text{where } \{\rho_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}.$$

Furthermore, the extension is uniformly continuous w.r.t.  $d_p$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* See e.g. [28, Theorem 52]. □

We use this proposition to define the derivative of  $P(\rho, f)$  for initial distributions that are not in  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , but on which we have sufficient regularity to allow an extension. Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  be the weak completion of a subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}(P, f)$  for which  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous w.r.t.  $d_p$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}$ , the derivative of  $P(\rho, f)$  in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  is the linear functional  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot] : \mathcal{M}_{\lambda, 0}(\mathbf{X}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho_j, f)[\nu - \mu], \quad \text{where } \{\rho_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \mathcal{A}. \quad (6)$$

for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , where  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho_j, f)$  is the derivative in the invariant distribution of  $P(\rho_j, f)$  as per Definition 2.2.

The case we are mostly interested is defining  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\delta_x, f) =: \partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)$ , the derivative of  $P(x, f)$  in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$ . The results above supply its definition and its uniqueness whenever  $\delta_x$  is in the weak completion of a subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  where  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  is uniformly continuous. We denote with  $\mathcal{D}_\mu(P, f)$  the set of initial distributions  $\rho$  for which  $P(\rho, f)$  is differentiable at  $\mu$ . This comprise all initial distributions for which we may also obtain a definition by extension, and it has  $\mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}(P, f)$  as subset. It might happen that  $\rho$  is in the weak completion of two different sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  on which the derivative is uniformly continuous. In this case the definition of  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  can be defined by either the limit of  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho_j, \cdot)$  with  $\rho_j$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  or the limit  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho'_j, \cdot)$  with  $\rho'_j$  in  $\mathcal{A}'$ . We have not sought to establish that these limits coincide, but that is no cause of concern for our purposes. Any such derivative will satisfy the properties and equations we investigate next.

We can now leverage these quantities to define the derivative of transition probabilities.

**Definition 2.4.** The derivative of  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  is the operator  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, \cdot)[\cdot] : f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X}) \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$ , where  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$  is defined in Definitions 2.2 and 2.3.

The differentiability of  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  amounts to ask that  $P(\rho, f)$  is differentiable in the sense of Definitions 2.2 and 2.3 for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{D}_\mu(P) = \bigcap_{f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})} \mathcal{D}_\mu(P, f)$ . We are now in a position to naturally define the derivative of a Markov kernel itself.

**Definition 2.5.** The derivative of  $P$  in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  is the operator  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\cdot, \cdot)[\cdot] : (\rho, f) \in \mathcal{D}_\mu(P) \times \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X}) \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$ , where  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\cdot]$  is defined in Definitions 2.2 and 2.3.

We will sometimes refer to the differential and the derivative in the invariant measure of a Markov Kernel simply as “kernel differentials” and “kernel derivative”, respectively. Since that is defined indirectly for each point  $(\rho, f) \in \mathcal{D}_\mu(P) \times \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ , we sometimes also refer to  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  as a kernel derivative.

Let us come to the interpretation of these derivatives and differentials at  $\mu$ : they provide a map from the initial distribution to signed integral operators which capture the variation of the transitions associated with Markov kernels within a particularly family with small perturbations of the associated invariant measure,  $\mu$ . In other words, the derivative in the invariant measure quantifies how much the conditional expectation  $P_\mu(\rho, \cdot)$  changes when the invariant distribution  $\mu$  is perturbed by the 0-mass measure  $\chi = \nu - \mu$  or—alternatively—since  $\mu + t\chi = (1 - t)\mu + t\nu$ , when  $\mu$  is contaminated infinitesimally by any  $\nu$ . In a spatial perspective, it quantifies the variation in mean displacement of a particle in Markovian motion  $P_\mu$  initially distributed as  $\rho$  when  $\mu$  is perturbed by  $\nu$ . The density of the kernel derivative  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y)$ —when it exists—can be heuristically interpreted as the change in the transition probabilities when  $\mu$  is contaminated infinitesimally by a point mass  $\delta_y$  for all  $y \in \mathbf{X}$ . In fact, using (3)-(5) we informally see that

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) = \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\delta_y - \mu] = \int \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y') d(\delta_y - \mu)(y') = \left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\delta_y - \mu)}(\rho, f) \right|_{t=0}.$$

This is similar to the role played by Influence functions in robust statistics, which describe variations in estimators when the data distribution is contaminated - see [26].

In the remainder of this section we develop some basic properties to build up our intuition and understanding of kernel derivatives. In the end of the section we investigate the differentiability of Hastings and Gibbs families. The next proposition supplies a recursive formula for the derivative of iterated kernels. These recursions are really expression of the Chapman–Kolmogorov equations. Consider the conventions  $P_\mu^0(\cdot, f) := f$  and  $P_\mu^0(\rho, \cdot) := \rho$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and assume that  $P_\mu^j(\rho, \cdot) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}(P, f)$  and that  $P_\mu^j(\cdot, f) \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathcal{X})$  for all  $j \leq k$ . For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  the derivative in the invariant distribution of an iterated Markov kernel satisfy the formulæ*

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu^k(\rho, f) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \partial_\pi P_\mu(P_\mu^{k-j-1}(\rho, \cdot), P_\mu^j(\cdot, f)).$$

provided one can differentiate inside the integral  $P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}^k(\rho, f)$  at  $t = 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathcal{X})$  and  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathcal{X})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}^k(\rho, f) \right|_{t=0} &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}(\rho, dz) P_{\mu_t}^{k-1}(z, f) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}(\rho, P_\mu^{k-1}(\cdot, f)) \right|_{t=0} + \left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}^{k-1}(P_\mu(\rho, \cdot), f) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, P_\mu^{k-1}(\cdot, f))[\nu - \mu] + \partial_\pi P_\mu^{k-1}(P_\mu(\rho, \cdot), f)[\nu - \mu] \end{aligned}$$

therefore, exploiting this recursion yields,

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu^k(\rho, f) = \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, P_\mu^{k-1}(\cdot, f)) + \partial_\pi P_\mu^{k-1}(P_\mu(\rho, \cdot), f) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \partial_\pi P_\mu(P_\mu^{k-j-1}(\rho, \cdot), P_\mu^j(\cdot, f)).$$

□

Ergodicity can give us some information on how the derivative of iterated kernels behave when  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . A kernel derivative quantifies variations in transition probabilities  $P_\mu^k(\rho, f)$  when the invariant changes is perturbed infinitesimally by  $\chi := \nu - \mu$ . Under ergodicity for large  $k$  we will have  $P_\mu^k(\rho, f) \approx \mu(f)$ , hence, intuitively, in the limit the kernel derivative ought to be  $\chi(f)$ . Define

$$\mathcal{N}(\mu, \nu) := \{\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \mu_t = (1-t)\mu + t\nu, t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

This set is known as *contamination neighbourhood* in robust statistics [26], although it is not a neighbourhood in the sense of the total variation or the weak topology. For some starting distribution  $\rho$ , say that a Markov kernel is ergodic uniformly in  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \nu)$  if  $\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |P_{\mu_t}^k(\rho, f) - \mu_t(f)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . We note that this is a definition of ergodicity uniform over a collection of invariant distributions and is quite distinct from the notion of uniform ergodicity of an individual Markov kernel.

**Proposition 2.3.** *For all starting distributions  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu, \lambda}(P, f)$  for which the Markov kernel  $P$  is ergodic uniformly in  $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \nu)$ ,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu^k(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] = [\nu - \mu](f).$$

*Proof.* We compute directly

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \partial_\pi P_\mu^k(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}^k(\rho, f) - P_\mu^k(\rho, f)}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}^k(\rho, f) - P_\mu^k(\rho, f)}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\mu + t(\nu - \mu))(f) - \mu(f)}{t} = [\nu - \mu](f), \end{aligned}$$

where the limit exchange is justified by the uniformity across the neighbourhood. □

Hence, informally, its density in the limit is given by  $\lim_k \partial_\pi P_\mu^k(\rho, f)(y) = f(y) - \mu(f)$ . It is interesting to point out another connection between derivatives in the invariant distributions and ergodicity.  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\mu, f)$  is understood as the infinitesimal variation of the transition probability  $P_\mu(X, f)$  when the invariant measure is perturbed with a 0-mass measure, the starting point  $X$  follows the (non-perturbed) original distribution  $\mu$ . The density of the derivative takes a very natural expression in this case that does not require further computations. Denote  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$ . Write

$$P_{\mu_t}(\mu_t, f) = \mu_t(f).$$

Differentiating this expression w.r.t.  $t$  in  $t = 0$  one obtains, provided  $\frac{d}{dt}P_{\mu_t}(\mu, f)$  exists at  $t = 0$ ,

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt}P_{\mu_t}(\mu, f) \right|_{t=0} + P_{\mu_t}(\chi, f) \Big|_{t=0} + t \left. \frac{d}{dt}P_{\mu_t}(\chi, f) \right|_{t=0} = \chi(f)$$

Therefore,  $\left. \frac{d}{dt}P_{\mu_t}(\mu, f) \right|_{t=0} = \chi(f - P_\mu f)$ , which via (3) and (5) imply

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\mu, f)(y) = f(y) - P_\mu(y, f). \quad (7)$$

This relationship can also be heuristically proved using our interpretation of derivative in the invariant measure at a point  $y$  as the variation in conditional expectation caused by a point mass  $\delta_y$ . We have then, up to constants,

$$\partial_\pi P_\mu(\mu, f)(y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P_{\mu+t(\delta_y-\mu)}(\mu, f) - \mu(f)}{t},$$

but  $P_{\mu_t}(\mu, f) = \mu_t - tP_{\mu_t}(y, f) + tP_{\mu_t}(\mu, f)$  so that  $P_{\mu_t}(\mu, f) = (\mu_t - tP_{\mu_t}(y, f))/(1-t)$ . Hence, the right hand side of the expression above becomes

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t(f) - tP_{\mu_t}(y, f) - (1-t)\mu(f)}{(1-t)t} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(y) - P_\mu f(y)}{1-t} = f(y) - P_\mu(y, f).$$

This points out to an interesting connection with discrete-time generators and Foster-Lyapunov type arguments. One way to exploit this identity is simply by restating classical Markov Chains regularity conditions, very often expressed and verified in terms of drifts. The result below is a (partial) restatement of [35, Theorem 13.0.1].

**Theorem 2.1** (Ergodic Theorem with kernel derivatives). *Suppose that  $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is an aperiodic,  $\mu$ -irreducible Markov Chain with transition probabilities  $P_\mu$  and invariant distribution  $\mu$ . If there exists some petite set  $C$ , some  $b < \infty$  and a non-negative finite function  $f$  bounded on  $C$  such that*

$$-\partial_\pi P_\mu(\mu, f)(x) \leq -1 + b1_C(x), \quad x \in \mathsf{X}$$

whenever such kernel derivative exists, then for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\left\| P_\mu^k(x, \cdot) - \mu \right\|_{\text{tv}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Many other regularity conditions can be expressed in terms of drift conditions, and therefore in terms of  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\mu, f)$ . The main applications of kernel derivatives in this work will be however in the context of comparing Markov chains with different invariant distributions within the same family, and in particular in what we will refer to as mean value inequalities. First, for illustration, we compute the derivative in the invariant distribution for Markov kernels in the Hastings and Gibbs families of Examples 2.1 and 2.2 for  $V = 1$ . The next example also illustrates why we defined  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, \cdot)$  only as a weak limit.

**Example 2.3** (Derivatives of Hastings kernels). Consider the Hastings family of Example 2.1 with  $x \mapsto g(x)$  is twice differentiable, with  $g'$  and  $g''$  bounded. This class of kernel includes, for instance, the Barker form of the acceptance probability ( $g(x) = x/(1+x)$ ), but not the Metropolis-Hastings form ( $g(x) = \min(1, x)$ ). Further consider the following assumption which we discuss after.

H1 The indexed invariant distributions have upper bounded continuously differentiable positive densities. The proposal has an upper bounded continuously differentiable positive densities in both arguments. For all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  there exist an  $r > 0$  and  $L^1(\lambda)$  functions  $\psi_1, \psi_2$  such that

$$\sup_{z \in B(x, r)} |\partial_z(q(z, y)g'(r_\mu(z, y)))| \leq \psi_1(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{z \in B(x, r)} |\partial_z(q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y)))| \leq \psi_2(y).$$



Let  $\mathcal{W}_H := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X}) : d\rho/d\mu^2 \text{ is bounded for all indexed } \mu\}$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** *The Hastings kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_H$  provided only the proposal is upper bounded. In this case, the derivative  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, \cdot)$  admits an integral representation, with its density given for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$  by*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) &= \int (f(y) - f(z))q(y, z) \frac{\rho(z)}{\mu(z)} g'(r_\mu(z, y)) \lambda(dz) \\ &\quad - \frac{\rho(y)}{\mu(y)^2} \int (f(z) - f(y))q(z, y) g'(r_\mu(y, z)) \mu(z) \lambda(dz). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Furthermore, if Assumption **H1** holds,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu$  for all  $\rho$  in the weak completion of the set  $\mathcal{A}_x := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X}) : \text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq B(x, r)\}$ . In particular,  $P(x, \cdot)$  is also differentiable for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ . In this case,  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, \cdot)$  is given for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)[\nu - \mu] &= \int (f(y) - f(x)) \frac{g'(r_\mu(x, y))q(y, x)}{\mu(x)} (\nu - \mu)(y) \lambda(dy) \\ &\quad - \frac{(\nu - \mu)(x)}{\mu(x)^2} \int (f(y) - f(x))q(y, x) g'(r_\mu(x, y)) \mu(y) \lambda(dy). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* If we can interchange differentiation and integration, one has, with  $\chi := \nu - \mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}(\rho, f) \right|_{t=0} &= \int \int \rho(du) f(w) Q(u, dw) g'(r_\mu(u, w)) \left. \frac{d}{dt} r_{\mu_t}(u, w) \right|_{t=0} \\ &\quad + \int \rho(du) f(u) \left( 1 - \int Q(u, dw) g'(r_\mu(u, w)) \left. \frac{d}{dt} r_{\mu_t}(u, w) \right|_{t=0} \right) \\ &= \int \int (f(w) - f(u)) \frac{q(w, u) g'(r_\mu(u, w))}{\mu(u)} \rho(u) \chi(w) \lambda(du) \lambda(dw) \\ &\quad - \int \int (f(w) - f(u)) \frac{q(w, u) g'(r_\mu(u, w))}{\mu(u)^2} \mu(w) \rho(u) \chi(u) \lambda(du) \lambda(dw) \\ &= \int \left[ \int (f(w) - f(u)) \frac{q(w, u) g'(r_\mu(u, w))}{\mu(u)} \rho(u) \lambda(du) \right] \chi(dw) \\ &\quad - \int \left[ \int (f(w) - f(u)) \frac{q(w, u) g'(r_\mu(u, w)) \mu(w)}{\mu(u)^2} \lambda(dw) \right] \rho(u) \chi(du). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the expressions above and (3) one identifies (8). Integrating the latter w.r.t.  $\mu$  shows that (5) is also satisfied. Appendix A.2 shows that the limit exchange performed is justified under our assumptions. Now consider  $\mathcal{A}_x$ . In Appendix A.2 we show that  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous on  $\mathcal{A}_x$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X})$ . We can then apply Proposition 2.1 to prove the differentiability of  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  for all  $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_x$ . Since clearly  $\delta_x \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_x$ , this also proves the differentiability of  $P(x, \cdot)$  and the expression (9) follows from the direct computation  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)[\nu - \mu] = \lim_j \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho_{j,x}, f)[\nu - \mu]$  for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$ , where  $\rho_{j,x} \Rightarrow \delta_x$ .  $\square$

Let us notice that the operator  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)$  has no integral representation. The boundedness of  $\rho/\mu^2$  is a warm-start type condition. If  $\rho$  has lighter tails than  $\mu^2$ , it will hold. In particular, if  $\rho$  is compactly supported,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at all  $\mu$ . On the other hand, if  $\rho$  is heavy tailed,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  will seldom be differentiable. The assumptions in Assumption **H1** are rather weak and often verified in practice. The requirement that  $|\partial_z(q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y)))|$  is uniformly bounded by a  $L^1(\lambda)$  function on  $z \in B(x, r)$  is a requirement on the regularity of the proposal and the balancing function around the point  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  where we want to show  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu$ , and it is very often satisfied. For instance, for the Gaussian Random Walk we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_z(q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y)))| &\propto |y - z|q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y)) + q(y, z)g''(r_\mu(z, y))\mu(y)\partial_z\mu(z)/\mu(z)^2 \\ &\leq q(y, z)(|y|g'(r_\mu(z, y)) + |z|g'(r_\mu(z, y)) + g''(r_\mu(z, y))\mu(y)\partial_z\mu(z)/\mu(z)^2) \\ &\leq (|y| + |r| + \mu(y)c) \sup_{z \in B(x, r)} q(z, y) \end{aligned}$$



where  $c := \sup_{z \in B(x,r)} \partial_z \mu(z) / \mu(z)^2 < \infty$  due our positivity and continuous differentiability of the target assumption, and where we used  $g', g'' \leq 1$ . The other domination condition on  $|\partial_z(q(z,y)g'(r_\mu(z,y)))|$ —which is not used here but later to prove a Feller-type property—is equivalent to the former in the Random Walk case. It is possible to find kernel derivatives with other assumptions on the starting distributions, on the invariant distributions, the proposal, the balancing function, and for general  $V$  by adapting the arguments used above and in the relevant appendixes. For instance, for an unbounded  $V$  one would additionally require that  $\mu(V) < \infty$  for all  $\mu$  indexed by the family to perform the limit exchange justified in Appendix A.2. This naturally (and notationally) suggests the use of a  $V$  that is a suitable Lypunov function for the different distributions indexed by the family—see Section 3. The requirement that  $g$  is differentiable however cannot be immediately relaxed. Although the result above then does not guarantee differentiability of Metropolis-Hastings kernels, we will be able to obtain results for the Metropolis choice indirectly later.

In the example below, a probability distribution with a numerical subscript denotes the marginal in the indicated coordinate of the underlying probability distribution, we write  $y = (y_1, y_2)$  for a point  $y \in \mathsf{X}^2$ ,  $\lambda^2$  for  $\lambda \otimes \lambda$  and a single integral sign for multiple integrals when no confusion is possible.

**Example 2.4** (Derivatives of Gibbs kernels). Consider the MCMC kernels of Example 2.2 with  $P_{1|2}$  and  $P_{2|1}$  admitting a common dominating measure with  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . Further consider the following assumption.

- G1 The indexed invariant distributions have upper bounded continuously differentiable and positive densities. The full conditionals are bounded in the starting point and for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  they satisfy  $\sup_{z \in B(x,r)} |\partial_z P_{1|2}(z,y)| \leq \psi(y)$  for some function  $\psi \in L^1(\lambda)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{W}_G := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X}) : d\rho_2/d\mu_2 \text{ is bounded for all indexed } \mu\}$ .

**Proposition 2.5.** *The Gibbs kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_G$ . In this case, the derivative  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, \cdot)$  admits an integral representation, with its density given for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X}^2)$  by*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) &= \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{\rho(y_2)}{\mu_2(y_2)} P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2) - \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\rho(y_2)}{\mu_2(y_2)} P_{1|2}(y_2, dw_1) P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2) \\ &\quad + \int f(y_1, y_2) \frac{\rho(dw_2)}{\mu_1(y_1)} P_{1|2}(w_2, y_1) - \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{\rho(dw_2)}{\mu_1(y_1)} P_{1|2}(w_2, y_1) P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, if Assumption G1 holds,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu$  for all  $\rho$  in the weak completion of the set  $\mathcal{A}_x := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda^2}(\mathsf{X}^2) : \text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq B(x,r)\}$ . In particular,  $P(x, \cdot)$  is also differentiable for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}^2$ . In this case,  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, \cdot)$  is given for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X}^2)$  and  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda^2}(\mathsf{X}^2)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)[\nu - \mu] &= \\ &= \int \left( \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2)}{\mu_2(x_2)} - \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(x_2, dw_1) P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2)}{\mu_2(x_2)} \right) (\nu - \mu)(y_1, x_2) \lambda(dy_1) \\ &\quad + \int \left( f(y_1, y_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(x_2, y_1)}{\mu_1(y_1)} - \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(x_2, y_1) P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2)}{\mu_1(y_1)} \right) (\nu - \mu)(y) \lambda^2(dy). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

*Proof.* This is similar the proof of Proposition 2.4. First we notice that for the deterministic scan we can just write the full conditionals in terms of  $\mu$  as  $P_{1|2}(x', y) = \mu(y, x') / \int \mu(z, x') \lambda(dz)$  and similarly for  $P_{2|1}$ , hence

$$P_\mu((x_1, x_2), f) = \int \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\mu(w_1, x_2)}{\int \mu(z, x_2) \lambda(dz)} \frac{\mu(w_1, w_2)}{\int \mu(w_1, z) \lambda(dz)} \lambda^2(dw).$$

Then, by exploiting the fact that the transition probabilities do not depend on the first coordinate of

the starting point we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\left. \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu+t(\nu-\mu)}(\rho, f) \right|_{t=0} &= \int \int \chi(dw_1, du_2) \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\rho_2(u_2)}{\mu_2(u_2)} P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2) \\
&\quad - \int \int \chi(dz, du_2) \int \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\rho_2(u_2)}{\mu_2(u_2)} P_{1|2}(u_2, dw_1) P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2) \\
&\quad + \int \int \chi(dw_1, dw_2) \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\rho_2(dw_2)}{\mu_1(w_1)} P_{1|2}(u_2, dw_1) \\
&\quad - \int \int \chi(dw_1, dz) \int \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{\rho_2(dw_2)}{\mu_1(w_1)} P_{1|2}(u_2, dw_1) P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the expression above and (3) one identifies (10). Integrating the latter w.r.t.  $\mu$  shows that (5) is also satisfied. The details on the limit exchange are in Appendix A.2. To show differentiability for all starting distribution in the weak completion of  $\mathcal{A}_x$  we show that  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous on  $\mathcal{A}_x$  for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda^2}(\mathcal{X}^2)$ . This is similar to the proof of Proposition 2.4 - the details are in Appendix A.2.  $\square$

Again, the boundedness of  $d\rho_2/d\mu_2$  is a warm-start type condition, which we note is in general weaker than the warm-start required to differentiate Hastings kernels. We again note that the assumption Assumption G1 is rather weak, and it is somehow the analogue of the domination condition required in Assumption H1 discussed above. Let us notice that also here the operator  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(x, f)$  has no integral representation.

Using the fact that the balancing function  $g$  has to satisfy  $g(x) = xg'(x) + g'(1/x)$ , it is possible to check that when  $\rho = \mu$ , the derivative in the invariant measure of the Hastings kernels at  $y \in \mathcal{X}$  becomes (minus) the generator of the Markov chain, and the same is true for Gibbs kernels derivatives, as expected.

### 2.3 FTC Formula and bounded derivatives

We now state a formula that, under a weak-Feller type condition on which we comment below, allow us to compare Markov Chains with different invariant distributions belonging to the same Markov family in terms of the derivative in the invariant distribution. This is a Fundamental Theorem of Calculus-like formula, whose analogue appears in Robust Statistics [26, Chapter 2] and Mean Field Games [12].

A1 The Markov kernels family  $\{P_\star\}$  satisfies a Feller-type condition:  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathcal{X})$  implies  $P_\mu f \in \mathbf{C}_1^1(\mathcal{X})$  for all  $P_\mu \in \{P_\star\}$ .

**Theorem 2.2** (Fundamental Theorem of MCMC Calculus Formula). *For all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathcal{X})$  for which  $P_\cdot(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , i.e.  $\rho \in \bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t, \lambda}(P)$ ,*

$$P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f) = \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] dt. \quad (12)$$

for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathcal{X})$ .

If Assumption A1 holds and  $\partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu]$  is bounded in  $t$ , (12) is true also for all  $\rho \in \bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t}(P)$ .

Furthermore, if  $\partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)$  admits a continuously differentiable density and  $\nu$  can be expressed via some pushforward  $T$  from  $\mu$  in that  $\nu = T_*\mu$  we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f) &= \int_0^1 \int \int_{T(y)}^y D_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(s) ds d\mu(y) dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int (T(y) - y) \int_0^1 D_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(s(T(y) - y) + y) ds d\mu(y) dt, \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $D_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) := (d/dy)\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(\rho, f) \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X}) \times \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ . Write  $\mu_t = (1-t)\mu + t\nu$ , so that  $\mu_1 = \nu$  and  $\mu_0 = \mu$ . Then,

$$P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f) = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) dt = \int_0^1 \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{P_{\mu_{t+s}}(\rho, f) - P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)}{s} dt$$

Now, since for all fixed  $t$ ,  $\mu_{t+s} = \mu_t + s(\mu_1 - \mu_t)/(1-t) = \mu_t + s((\mu_1 - t\mu_t)/(1-t) - \mu_t)$ , and then using (3) with  $(\mu_1 - \mu_t)/(1-t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,0}(\mathbf{X})$  being a 0-mass perturbation one can write under our hypotheses that for  $t \in [0, 1]$

$$P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f) = \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) \left[ \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_t}{1-t} \right] dt = \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu] dt,$$

with last equality following because  $\mu_1 - \mu_t = \nu - \mu_t = (1-t)(\nu - \mu)$ . This proves the claim for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  for which the differentiability requirement is met. Now assume Assumption A1 and consider a  $\rho \in \bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t}(P)$  not necessarily in  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ . By definition,  $\rho$  is in the weak completion  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  of some set  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  on which  $\rho \mapsto \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu]$  is uniformly continuous for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Considering a sequence  $\rho_j \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  under Assumption A1 we compute

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_\mu(\rho_j, f) - P_\nu(\rho_j, f) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho_j, f) [\nu - \mu] dt \\ &=: \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu] dt, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the limit exchange follows from the assumed boundedness of  $t \mapsto \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu]$  via dominated convergence. To prove (13), use (12) with  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + tT_*\mu$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_{T_*\mu}(\rho, f) &= \int_0^1 \int \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(y) d(T_*\mu - \mu)(y) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \int [\partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(T(y)) - \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(y)] d\mu(y) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $y \mapsto \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(y)$  is continuously differentiable by assumption, an application of the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.1.** We have seen in Examples 2.3 and 2.6 that for Hastings and Gibbs type kernels in fact, under regularity conditions, such  $\bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t}(P)$  contains at least the set  $\{\delta_x\}_{x \in \mathbf{X}}$ .

**Remark 2.2.** When  $V$  is bounded, Assumption A1 is mild and satisfied by many MCMC kernel used in practice, including the Hastings and Gibbs families under assumption Assumptions H1 and G1. For instance, for the Hastings chain, if  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$  then  $Pf$  is clearly bounded, and to show it is also continuously differentiable in all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , we can show that each  $x$  is in a neighbourhood  $B(x, r)$  in which  $Pf$  is continuously differentiable. Under our assumptions  $q(x, y)g(r_\mu(x, y))$  is continuously differentiable and by the (first) domination condition we can conclude that  $\int f(y)q(x, y)g(r_\mu(x, y))\lambda(dy)$  and  $\int q(x, y)g(r_\mu(x, y))\lambda(dy)$  (and so  $Pf$ ) are too at  $x$  by e.g. [29, Theorem 6.28].

When  $V$  is not bounded,  $Pf$  might not be bounded. Thus to obtain (12) for  $\rho \in \bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t}(P)$  not necessarily in  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$ , we can instead require that for  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ ,  $Pf$  is continuously differentiable and it satisfies a suitable uniform integrability condition. Call  $\mathcal{A}$  the subset of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  that has  $\rho$  in its weak completion, and consider a sequence  $\rho_j \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \rho$ . If  $\sup_{j \geq 0} \int |Pf(y)|^{1+\epsilon} \rho_j(dy) < \infty$  and  $\sup_{j \geq 0} \int |P_\nu f(y)|^{1+\epsilon} \rho_j(dy) < \infty$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  for all such sequences  $\{\rho_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we would still obtain (14) (e.g. [10, Section 3.5]). For instance, using the preceding remark, we have seen that  $\delta_x \in \bigcap_{t=0}^1 \mathcal{D}_{\mu_t}(P)$ , and that  $\delta_x$  is the weak completion of  $\mathcal{A}_x := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X}) : \text{supp}(\rho) \subseteq B(x, r)\}$ . Clearly for any sequence  $\rho_j$  in  $\mathcal{A}_x$ , for  $\sup_{j \geq 0} \int |P_\mu f(y)|^{1+\epsilon} \rho_j(dy) < \infty$  to hold it is sufficient that  $P_\mu f$  is bounded in the compact  $B(x, r)$ , which is very often the case for Hastings and Gibbs kernels. In particular, the Hastings and Gibbs families under assumption Assumptions H1 and G1 satisfy this property.

**Remark 2.3.** The assumption of boundedness of  $t \mapsto \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu]$  is simply verified simply whenever  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu]$  and  $\partial_\pi P_\nu(\rho, f) [\nu - \mu]$  exist for our Hastings and Gibbs families.

We put together the last three Remark for reference.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For the Hastings and Gibbs families (12) is true for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_H$  and  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_G$ , respectively, and if Assumptions H1 and G1 hold, also for all  $\rho \in \{\delta_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ .*

**Remark 2.4.** The quantity  $D_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  can be related to rigorous notions of derivatives in the Wasserstein geometry studied in [2]. It describes variations of the transition probabilities when  $\mu$  is perturbed in the direction  $\nu$  along the curves that are not simple interpolations like  $\mu_t$  but rather *transport maps*. In fact, one can substitute  $T$  with  $\text{Id} - hT$  in (13) to obtain

$$P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_{T_*\mu}(\rho, f) = h \int_0^1 \int T(y) \int_0^1 D_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(sh + y) ds d\mu(y) dt.$$

Dividing by  $h$  and letting  $h \rightarrow 0$  we get

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{P_{(\text{Id} - hT)_*\mu}(\rho, f) - P_\mu(\rho, f)}{h} = \int D_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(y) T(y) d\mu(y).$$

We will employ Theorem 2.2 mainly as a way to obtain mean value type inequalities in the next section. However, formulæ such as (12) or (13) could be used in general to obtain a possibly hard to guess expression for the difference in expectations given by two Markov kernels with different invariant distributions within the same family. We will often think of one of them as being an approximation of the other. In this context, we think of  $T$  in (13) as a map that makes the distribution  $\mu$  easier to work with. For instance, for diffeomorphisms  $T_1, \dots, T_j$ , one can let  $T = T_1 \circ \dots \circ T_j$  obtaining a so-called normalizing flow, that can be used to smooth out complicated distributions when sampling via MCMC—see [21, 36] Notice that with  $\rho = \nu$  one also obtains

$$P_\mu(\nu, f) - \nu(f) = \int_0^1 \int \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\nu, f)(y) d(\nu - \mu)(y) dt;$$

an expression for the difference in expectation with respect to a Markov kernel applied to an initial distribution to that with respect to the distribution itself.

## 2.4 Bounded kernel derivatives and Mean-Value inequalities

We want to argue that if the derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  is bounded in some sense, then the Markov Chains associated with kernels  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  move similarly whenever  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are close. We define the concept of bounded derivative in the invariant distribution accordingly. We aim to provide a statement similar to the fact that on  $\mathbb{R}$  a differentiable function has a bounded derivative if and only if it is Lipschitz.

**Definition 2.6.** *We say that a differentiable Markov kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  if there exist constants  $M_{1,\rho}, M_{2,\rho} < \infty$  such that*

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_V \leq M_{1,\rho} \|\mu - \nu\|_V + M_{2,\rho} \rho(|\mu - \nu|). \quad (15)$$

Noting that  $d(\mu, \nu) = \|\mu - \nu\|_V + \rho(|\mu - \nu|)$  is itself a metric, this could be written as a standard statement of Lipschitz continuity with respect to that distance, with constant given by the larger of  $M_{1,\rho}$  and  $M_{2,\rho}$ . However, the form we have here allow us to separate the role of two separate contributions and we believe that this refinement can be informative. With this in mind, we will sometimes refer to  $M_{1,\rho}, M_{2,\rho}$  as Lipschitz constants, and to inequalities of the form (15) a mean value inequalities. The next Propositions show that Definition 2.6 work as intended: we will see that if  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable in  $\mu_t = (1 - t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and a boundedness condition on the derivative holds, then  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  will have a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ . Of course the boundedness depend on  $V$ , but we often silence this dependence because it is implicit in the context. When  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathcal{X})$ , this Definition 2.6 is equivalent to the existence of a constant  $M_\rho < \infty$  such that

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_V \leq M_\rho \|\mu - \nu\|_V. \quad (16)$$

i.e. to the operator  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  from  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  (via the invariant distribution) to  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  (the corresponding transition probabilities) being Lipschitz continuous w.r.t.  $\|\cdot\|_V$ . In fact, obviously if (16) is true then (15) holds with  $M_{2,\rho} := 0$ , and on the other hand when  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  we can bound  $M_{2,\rho}(\|\mu - \nu\|) \leq M_{2,\rho} \sup(\rho/V) \|\mu - \nu\|_V$ , and (16) holds true with  $M_\rho := M_{1,\rho} + M_{2,\rho} \sup(\rho/V)$ . If  $\rho = \delta_x$ , (15) becomes

$$\|P_\mu(x, \cdot) - P_\nu(x, \cdot)\|_V \leq M_{1,x} \|\mu - \nu\|_V + M_{2,x} |\mu(x) - \nu(x)|. \quad (17)$$

This express the fact that as for many kernels employed in MCMC settings in particular,  $P(x, \cdot)$  typically depends on the values of the density of the invariant distribution at  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , one cannot expect  $P_\mu(x, \cdot)$  to be close to  $P_\nu(x, \cdot)$  unless  $\mu(x)$  is close to  $\nu(x)$ , since the closedness of  $\mu$  to  $\nu$  in  $V$ -distance does not imply that their densities functions at single points are close, at least without further assumptions. Sometimes, like in the Gibbs case,  $P(x, \cdot)$  depends on the values of the invariant at some coordinate of the vector  $x$  only. In this situation, if  $\mathcal{J}$  is an index set,  $x_{\mathcal{J}}$  denote the element of the vector  $x$  indicated by  $\mathcal{J}$  and a sub-scripted probability measures indicate the marginal in the indicated coordinate, a more sensible definition of bounded derivative of  $P(x, \cdot)$  would be the existence of  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x} < \infty$  such that

$$\|P_\mu(x, \cdot) - P_\nu(x, \cdot)\|_V \leq M_{1,x} \|\mu - \nu\|_V + M_{2,x} |\mu_{\mathcal{J}}(x_{\mathcal{J}}) - \nu_{\mathcal{J}}(x_{\mathcal{J}})|$$

where  $dx_{\mathcal{J}}$  indicates that we integrate out all the coordinates in some index set  $\mathcal{J}$ . The case  $\mathcal{J} = \emptyset$  corresponds to (17). This relaxed definition, although useful in certain contexts, is slightly cumbersome so we opted for (17) to illustrate concepts parsimoniously.

Notice that if a Markov kernel has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  is close to  $\nu$ , the Markov Chains following  $P_\mu(x, \cdot)$  and  $P_\nu(x, \cdot)$  never move too differently starting from  $x$ , in that their  $V$ -distance is small. We can similarly consider other integral probability metrics and obtain related inequalities. Here we focused on the  $V$ -norm due its popularity within the MCMC literature arising from its close connection with Lyapunov functions for ergodicity [38, 35]. In Section 3 we exploit these connections. We now introduce a stronger form of boundedness.

**Definition 2.7.** *We say that a Markov kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  if there exist constants  $M_1, M_2 < \infty$  such that for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}$ :*

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_V \leq M_1 \|\mu - \nu\|_V + M_2 \rho(\|\mu - \nu\|).$$

If  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\delta_x\}_{x \in \mathbf{X}}$  the chains move alike uniformly in the space if their invariant distributions are close at all points. Notice that a Markov kernel has an  $\mathcal{Q}$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  if it has bounded derivative and the associated Lipschitz constants can be bounded uniformly over  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}$ . See at the end of this section for such an example where  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the set of warm-start distributions. Finding conditions for  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  to have a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution when  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  is rather immediate from Theorem 2.2.

**Proposition 2.6.** *For all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  for which the Markov kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  with its derivative admitting a density, and*

$$M_\rho := \sup_{f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})} \left| \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(\cdot) dt \right|_V < \infty,$$

*$P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  with Lipschitz constant  $M_\rho$ , i.e.*

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_V \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_V M_\rho$$

*Proof.* For all  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X})$  obeying the differentiability requirement and  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ , from (12) we obtain

$$|P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f)| = \left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(y) dt d(\nu - \mu)(y) \right|.$$

However, for any  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ , we have

$$\left| \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(y) dt d(\nu - \mu)(y) \right| \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_V \left| \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(\rho, f)(\cdot) dt \right|_V,$$

and the claim follows by Lemma A.2 upon taking the supremum over functions in  $\mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ .  $\square$

In other words, the mapping  $P(\rho, \cdot) : \mu \in (\mathcal{P}(X), \|\cdot\|_V) \mapsto P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) \in (\mathcal{P}(X), \|\cdot\|_V)$  is a Lipschitz continuous function of its invariant distribution with Lipschitz constant  $M_\rho$ .

Proposition 2.6 provides a condition for a Markov kernel to have bounded derivative when  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(X)$ . Proving boundedness for more general  $\rho$  and obtaining mean value inequalities is harder, and there is not in general a direct analogue to Proposition 2.6 since in this case  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, \cdot)$  is only defined weakly, and one has to retrieve Mean-Value inequalities on a case to case basis. In the next example we illustrate this point for  $\rho = \delta_x$  and we study when the kernel derivatives of the Hastings and Gibbs type kernels are bounded for  $V = 1$ .

**Example 2.5** (Bounded derivatives and Mean Value inequalities for Hastings kernels).

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be a Hastings family.*

1. Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(X)$ . If the Markov kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and  $M_\rho := \int_0^1 D_{t,\rho} dt < \infty$  with

$$D_{t,\rho} := 2 \sup_y \left| \int \frac{\rho(z)}{\mu_t(z)} q(y, z) g'(r_{\mu_t}(z, y)) \lambda(dz) + \frac{\rho(y)}{\mu_t(y)^2} \int \mu_t(z) q(z, y) g'(r_{\mu_t}(y, z)) \lambda(dz) \right|, \quad (18)$$

then  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  with Lipschitz constant  $M_\rho$  and we have the mean value inequality

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{t,\rho} dt. \quad (19)$$

2. If Assumption A1 holds, the Markov kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and  $M_{1,x} := \int_0^1 D_{1,t,x} dt < \infty$ ,  $M_{2,x} := \int_0^1 D_{2,t,x} dt < \infty$  with

$$D_{1,t,x} := 2 \sup_y \left| \frac{g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, y)) q(y, x)}{\mu_t(x)} \right|, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{2,t,x} := 2 \int \frac{\mu_t(z)}{\mu_t(x)^2} q(z, x) g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, z)) \lambda(dz), \quad (20)$$

then  $P(x, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  with Lipschitz constants  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x}$  and we have the mean value inequality

$$\|P_\mu(x, \cdot) - P_\nu(x, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{1,t,x} dt + |\mu(x) - \nu(x)| \int_0^1 D_{2,t,x} dt. \quad (21)$$

Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  such that  $M_\rho$  can be bounded uniformly in  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}$ , or  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\delta_x : x \in \mathfrak{X}\}$  and  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x}$  can be bounded uniformly in  $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ , then  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ .

*Proof.* The expression for  $D_{t,\rho}$  and (19) are immediate from Propositions 2.4 and 2.6 and the fact that if  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)$ ,  $|f(y) - f(z)| \leq 2$  when  $V = 1$ . To prove the inequality (21), notice that under our assumptions we can use Theorem 2.2 and then Proposition 2.4 to write

$$|P_\mu(x, f) - P_\nu(x, f)| = \left| \int_0^1 \partial_\pi P_{\mu_t}(x, f) [\nu - \mu] dt \right| \leq \|\mu - \nu\| \int_0^1 D_{1,f,t,x} dt + |\mu(x) - \nu(x)| \int_0^1 D_{2,f,t,x} dt,$$

with

$$D_{1,f,t,x} := \sup_y \left| (f(y) - f(x)) \frac{g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, y)) q(y, x)}{\mu_t(x)} \right| \leq 2 \sup_y \left| \frac{g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, y)) q(y, x)}{\mu_t(x)} \right| =: D_{1,t,x},$$

$$D_{2,f,t,x} := \int (f(z) - f(x)) \frac{\mu_t(z)}{\mu_t(x)^2} q(z, x) g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, z)) \lambda(dz) \leq 2 \int \frac{\mu_t(z)}{\mu_t(x)^2} q(z, x) g'(r_{\mu_t}(x, z)) \lambda(dz) =: D_{2,t,x}.$$

Taking the supremum over functions in  $\mathbf{C}_V^1(X)$  and using Lemma A.2 one obtains (21).  $\square$

Putting together Propositions 2.4 and 2.7 and Lemma 2.1 yields the following.



**Corollary 2.1.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_H$ . For all indexed  $\mu, \nu$ , the Hastings kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $M_\rho < \infty$ , where  $M_\rho$  is given in (18). Therefore,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ , and the mean value inequality (19) holds.*

**Corollary 2.2.** *Assume Assumption H1. For all indexed  $\mu, \nu$ , the Hastings kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x} < \infty$ , where  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x}$  are given in (20). Therefore,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ , and the mean value inequality (21) holds.*

Although Proposition 2.4 does not guarantee the differentiability of Metropolis-Hastings kernels in the invariant distribution, we can still obtain Lipschitz inequalities for such kernels indirectly by looking at Metropolis-Hastings kernels as limit of a sequence of differentiable ones. The function  $g_j(x) := (x + \dots + x^j)/(1 + x + \dots + x^j)$  is a proper balancing function, it yields a differentiable Markov family, and it satisfies  $g_j(x) \rightarrow \min(1, x) =: g(x)$  for all  $x > 0$  [1]. Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be now a Metropolis-Hastings family, with the same restrictions on the indexed invariants and  $q$  as above.

**Proposition 2.8.** *For all  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_H$  the Lipschitz inequality (19) holds with*

$$D_{t,\rho} := 2 \sup_y \left| \int \frac{\rho(z)}{\mu_t(z)} q(y, z) \lambda(dz) + \frac{\rho(y)}{\mu_t(y)^2} \int \mu_t(z) q(z, y) \lambda(dz) \right|. \quad (22)$$

*For all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  the Lipschitz inequality (21) holds with*

$$D_{1,t,x} := 2 \sup_y \left| \frac{q(y, x)}{\mu_t(x)} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad D_{2,t,x} := 2 \int \frac{\mu_t(z)}{\mu_t(x)^2} q(z, x) 1_{\{z: r_{\mu_t}(x,z) \leq 1\}}(z) \lambda(dz). \quad (23)$$

*Proof.* Let  $P_{\cdot,j}$  be the differentiable Hastings kernel employing the balancing function  $g_j$ . For  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_{2,H}$  proceeding as in Propositions 2.6 and 2.7 we obtain  $|P_{\mu,j}(\rho, f) - P_{\nu,j}(\rho, f)| \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{t,\rho,j} dt$ , where  $D_{t,\rho,j}$  is as in (18) with balancing function  $g_j$ . Noting then that  $\sup_j g_j \leq 1$  we can take the limit  $j \rightarrow \infty$  both sides. At the left hand side we obtain  $|P_\mu(\rho, f) - P_\nu(\rho, f)|$  via bounded convergence. At the right hand side we can use  $\sup_j |g'_j| \leq 1$  to bound  $D_{t,\rho,j} \leq D_{t,\rho}$  and prove the first claim upon taking the supremum across  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$ . The second claim is proved very similarly by following the second part of Proposition 2.7 and using  $g_j$  as above, however, upon taking the limit  $j \rightarrow \infty$  at the left hand side we also use the fact that  $g'_j(x) \rightarrow 1_{\{x \leq 1\}}(x)$  and the bounded convergence theorem to obtain the displayed Lipschitz constants.  $\square$

Roughly speaking, we have shown that we can ensure that if  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are close, two Hastings chain  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  move similarly with some proper choice of the initial distribution, the proposal distribution and the balancing function. Proposition 2.7 also allows to easily find conditions for  $\mathcal{Q}$ -uniformly bounded derivatives. If we let  $\mathcal{Q}_H := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X}) : d\rho/d\mu^2, d\rho/d\nu^2 \leq C\}$  for some finite  $C$ , then of course  $d\rho/d\mu_t^2 \leq C$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and it is easy to see that we can bound  $D_{t,\rho}$  uniformly in  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}_H$ . This means that we can get two Hastings chain  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  to move similarly, uniformly in the starting distribution, provided that a warm-start condition holds, i.e. that they are not initialized too far into the tails of their invariant distributions. On the other hand, if we start our Markov chains from a point  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ , to get  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  to move alike uniformly in the starting point  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  seems to be much harder on non-compact spaces, and conditions such as  $\sup_x q(y, x)/\mu(x)^2, \sup_x q(y, x)/\nu(x)^2 < \infty$  seem to be required.

**Example 2.6** (Bounded derivatives and Mean Value inequalities for Gibbs kernels).

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be a deterministic scan Gibbs family.*

1. *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X})$ . If the Markov kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and it holds that  $M_\rho := \int_0^1 D_{t,\rho} dt < \infty$  with*

$$D_{\rho,t} := \sup_y \left( \int \frac{\rho_2(y_2)}{\mu_{2,t}(y_2)} P_{2|1,t}(y_1, dw_2) + \int \frac{\rho_2(y_2)}{\mu_{2,t}(y_2)} P_{1|2,t}(y_2, dw_1) P_{2|1,t}(w_1, dw_2) \right. \\ \left. + \int \frac{\rho_2(du_2)}{\mu_{1,t}(y_1)} P_{1|2,t}(u_2, y_1) + \int \frac{\rho_2(du_2)}{\mu_{1,t}(y_1)} P_{1|2,t}(u_2, y_1) P_{2|1,t}(y_1, dw_2) \right) \quad (24)$$



then  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  with Lipschitz constant  $M_\rho$  and we have the mean value inequality

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{\rho,t} dt. \quad (25)$$

2. If Assumption [A1](#) holds, the Markov kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ , and it holds that  $M_{1,x} := \int_0^1 D_{1,t,x} dt < \infty$  and  $M_{2,x} := \int_0^1 D_{2,t,x,z} dt < \infty$  with

$$D_{1,t,x} := 4 \sup_y \left( \frac{P_{1|2,t}(x_2, y_1)}{\mu_{1,t}(y_1)} \right), \quad (26)$$

$$D_{2,t,x} := 2 \left( \frac{1}{\mu_{2,t}(x_2)} + \int \frac{P_{1|2,t}(x_2, dw_1) P_{2|1,t}(w_1, dw_2)}{\mu_{2,t}(x_2)} \right), \quad (27)$$

then,  $P(x, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  with Lipschitz constants  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x,z}$  and we have the mean value inequality

$$\|P_\mu(x, \cdot) - P_\nu(x, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \int_0^1 D_{1,t,x} dt + |\mu_2(x_2) - \nu_2(x_2)| \int_0^1 D_{2,t,x} dt \quad (28)$$

Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  such that  $M_\rho$  can be bounded uniformly in  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}$ , or  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\delta_x : x \in \mathfrak{X}\}$  and  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x}$  can be bounded uniformly in  $x \in \mathfrak{X}$ , then  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ .

*Proof.* This follows by basically the same arguments used in Proposition [2.7](#) by using Proposition [2.5](#) in place of Proposition [2.4](#).  $\square$

Combining Propositions [2.5](#) and [2.9](#) and Lemma [2.1](#) yields the following. The claim on the finiteness of the Lipschitz constants follows from Bayes' formula.

**Corollary 2.3.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{W}_G$ . For all indexed  $\mu, \nu$ , the Gibbs kernel  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\int_0^1 D_{t,\rho} dt < \infty$ , where  $D_{t,\rho}$  is given in [\(24\)](#). Therefore,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ , and the mean value inequality [\(25\)](#) holds.*

Similarly to the Hastings case, we can also envisage conditions to bound the Lipschitz constants uniformly in the starting distributions. In fact, recently, [\[5, Proposition 2.4\]](#) derived the inequality

$$\|P_\mu(\rho, \cdot) - P_\nu(\rho, \cdot)\|_{\text{tv}} \leq 2KM \|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{tv}} \quad (29)$$

for the deterministic scan Gibbs kernel, where  $K$  represents the number of stages, for  $\rho$  having a density and satisfying the warm-start conditions  $d\rho_2/d\mu_2 \leq M$ ,  $d\rho_2/d\nu_2 \leq M$  for some  $M > 0$ . In fact, we can verify using Bayes formula that for all initial distributions with warm-start  $\rho \in \mathcal{Q}_G := \{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathbf{X}) : d\rho_2/d\mu_2, d\rho_2/d\nu_2 \leq M\}$  we have  $M_\rho < \infty$ , with  $M_\rho$  given in Proposition [2.9](#) above, and that in particular  $\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{W}} M_\rho \leq 4M$ . That is, by Proposition [2.9](#), the deterministic Gibbs kernel has a  $\mathcal{Q}_G$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  and the mean value inequality [\(29\)](#) holds, providing an alternative proof of the result in [\[5\]](#) in the case  $K = 2$  studied here (and the argument could be extended to the general case at the expense of introducing some slightly cumbersome notation). As noted in [\[5\]](#), under warm-start we do not have to require any other regularity from the full conditionals  $P_{1|2}, P_{2|1}$  to obtain this mean value inequality. If we also require some extra regularity we can also obtain the following.

**Corollary 2.4.** *Assume Assumption [G1](#). For all indexed  $\mu, \nu$ , the Gibbs kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable at  $\mu_t := (1-t)\mu + t\nu$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\int_0^1 D_{1,t,x} dt, \int_0^1 D_{2,t,x} dt < \infty$ , where  $D_{1,t,\rho}, D_{2,t,\rho}$  are given in [\(26\)](#) and [\(27\)](#). Therefore,  $P(\rho, \cdot)$  has a bounded derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$ , and the mean value inequality [\(21\)](#) holds.*

As in the Hastings case, requiring uniformity in the starting point will typically restrict the results applicability to compact spaces.

### 2.4.1 Fluctuations of Markov kernels

One can use the kernel derivatives defined to infer weak laws for Markov kernels using random invariant distributions without much trouble. This result is potentially useful to design efficient MCMC algorithms when using approximations instead of an invariant distribution of interest. In the preceding section, we argued that one can ensure that the approximated chain move similarly to the limiting one by choosing a Markov kernel with a bounded derivative. An alternative is to minimize fluctuations of the approximated kernel around the limiting one. These fluctuations depend directly on the derivative in the invariant distribution.

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$  be some function class. Let  $P(\rho, f)$  be a Markov kernel differentiable in  $\mu$ , with  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  admitting a density. Suppose that  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{X})$  are random measures w.r.t.  $\mathbb{P}$  and suppose that the random field  $\{\sqrt{n}(\mu_n - \mu)(f); f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})\}$  converges in law to a Gaussian random field  $\{N(f); f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})\}$  specified by  $\mathbb{E}(N(f)) = m(f)$  and  $\mathbb{E}(N(f)N(g)) = v(f, g)$ . Then, if  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ ,*

$$\sqrt{n}(P_{\mu_n}(\rho, f) - P_\mu(\rho, f)) \Rightarrow N(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)). \quad (30)$$

*I.e. the random field  $\{\sqrt{n}(P_{\mu_n}(\rho, f) - P_\mu(\rho, f)), f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})\}$  converges in law to a Gaussian random field  $\{N'(f); f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})\}$  specified by  $\mathbb{E}(N'(f)) = m(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f))$  and  $\mathbb{E}(N'(f)N'(g)) = v(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f), \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, g))$ .*

*Proof.* Denoting  $\mu_{t,n} := (1-t)\mu + t\mu_n$ , we have by definition

$$|P_{\mu_{t,n}}(\rho, f) - P_\mu(\rho, f) - \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\mu - \mu_{t,n}]| = o(t)$$

as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Now, whenever  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$  admits a density such that  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$  one has

$$\sqrt{n}\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\mu_n - \mu] = \sqrt{n}(\mu_n - \mu)(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)) \Rightarrow N(\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)),$$

and the claim follows.  $\square$

## 3 Applications to Monte Carlo

We now demonstrate the applications of the tools developed in the previous section to Monte Carlo Methods. The tools we developed allow an easy comparison between Markov Chains of the same family with different invariant distributions. Usually we think of one of these distributions as an approximation of the other. Therefore, other than being of theoretical interest, this framework is naturally appealing to study the use of approximations in Markov Chain Monte Carlo. In this context, we compare a Markov Chain targeting a limiting distribution of interest,  $\mu$ , with a Markov Chain targeting an approximation thereof. Using an MCMC kernel with an approximation is common and can occur in a number of contexts. For instance, when  $\mu$  is intractable, or when  $\mu$  is tractable, but rather inefficient to target directly, so one targets an approximation instead. For instance, (i) Griddy Gibbs Sampling [37] proposes to use “griddy” approximations of the full conditionals when sampling from the latter is not possible; (ii) [36] proposes to use Normalizing Flows to smooth away distributions that are complicated to sample from via MCMC—see also [21] for an application; (iii) [31, 32] employ a stochastic collocation approach to approximate complicate target distribution to target via Metropolis-Hastings. These approximations could be evolved or not as the Markov Chain runs, or the output of the resulting MCMC can be used to approximate the invariant distribution of another MCMC, giving rise to the framework for Sequential MCMC and Interacting MCMC we study in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. In these two settings belong (iv) Sequential Particle Filters [9, 23, 41, 30] and Example 3.1, based on running a sequence of MCMC algorithms, each with an approximate invariant distribution obtained with another MCMC output; and (v) Interacting Particle Filters [4, 6, 11, 15, 19] and Example 3.2 where we run an inhomogeneous Markov Chain of which invariant distribution evolves, perhaps depending on another Markov Chain running on another level. Another natural context would be the Uncertainty Quantification literature, where the ideal distribution  $\mu$  to target as a distribution over a function space, and one instead targets  $\mu_n$  being measures over discretisations.

Let us denote with  $\nu$  an approximation of  $\mu$ . It might be of interest to ensure that the Markov chains  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  move similarly. We have seen that this can be ensured when the derivative in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$  towards  $\nu$  is bounded. Also, it might be of interest to study the rate of convergence of  $P_\mu$

to  $P_\nu$ , and this can be done via the Mean-Value inequalities of Section 2.4. If  $\nu$  is random, perhaps is also of interest to minimize the fluctuations of the kernel  $P_\nu$  around  $P_\mu$ —see Proposition 2.10. For Hastings type kernels, these strategies can be for instance implemented by choosing the initial distribution, the proposal  $q$  and the balancing function  $g$  accordingly, see Example 2.5.

As an illustration of why it might be of interest to ensure that  $P_\mu$  and  $P_\nu$  move similarly, we show in the next section that (under suitable regularity conditions) this ensures that estimators associated with the two associated Markov chains achieve similar asymptotic variances, up to an additional variability due to the fluctuations of  $\nu$  around  $\mu$ .

### 3.1 Efficiency of MCMC with approximations

In this section we combine MCMC Calculus tools with results from [19] and [20] to study the efficiency of Markov chains employing approximations in place of a limiting distribution of interest. Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be a Markov Family. Consider a “limiting” Markov chain  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  with transitions  $X_{k+1}|X_k = x_k \sim P_\mu(x_k, \cdot)$ , targeting a distribution  $\mu$  of interest, that might be intractable or inefficient to target directly. We consider two approaches to approximate  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . In the first we consider a situation in which one has access to a sequence  $\{\mu_n\}$  of increasingly good approximations of  $\mu$  and study the convergence of a sequence of approximating chains which make use of this sequence as its invariant measures; that is, it comprises a triangular array of Markov chains  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$ , where for each  $k \leq n$ ,  $Y_{n,k+1}|Y_{n,k} = y_{n,k} \sim P_{\mu_n}(y_{n,k}, \cdot)$ . Since in our examples below  $\mu_n$  comes from a previously run chain, we refer to this scheme as Sequential MCMC (sMCMC). In this framework belong [9, 23, 41, 30] among others. The second approach to approximate  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is to consider an (inhomogeneous) Markov chain  $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  targeting at each  $k$  a distribution  $\mu_k$  that is refined at each step and that is getting closer to  $\mu$  i.e. with transitions  $Z_{k+1}|Z_k = z_k \sim P_{\mu_k}(z_k, \cdot)$ . We refer to this scheme as Interacting MCMC (iMCMC). In this framework belong [4, 6, 11, 15, 19] among others. We are interested in studying the fluctuations of  $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_{n,i})$  and  $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i)$  around  $\mu(f)$  for some test functions  $f$  to be specified. Studying these fluctuations desirable as it provides information on the properties of sampled values viewed as estimators of expectations w.r.t.  $\mu$  and characterizes the additional variability of estimators arising from using Markov kernels targeting (random) approximations of distributions rather than the distributions themselves. Fluctuations for these algorithms have already been studied in some of the papers cited above, but we express the results somehow naturally in terms of boundedness of the derivatives in the invariant distributions and the quality of the approximation scheme  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu$ , and in some cases we improve on existing results.

For both sMCMC and iMCMC, we assume that  $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(\mathsf{X})$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we employ the following standard (if strong) assumptions.

- B1 (a) For all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $P_{\mu_n}$  are  $\mu_n$ -irreducible, aperiodic Markov kernels. Furthermore, there exists a function  $V : \mathsf{X} \mapsto [1, \infty)$  and constants  $b < \infty$ ,  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $n \geq 1$ :

$$P_{\mu_n} V \leq \lambda V(x) + b1_C(x),$$

where  $C := \{x : V(x) \leq d\}$  for some  $d \geq b/(2(1 - \lambda)) - 1$ .

- (b) There exist an integer  $j \geq 1$ , a positive constant  $\kappa_n$  with  $\inf_n \kappa_n > 0$  and a probability measure  $\nu_n$  such that for all  $x \in C$ ,  $P_{\mu_n}^j(x, A) \geq \kappa_n \nu_n(A)$  for all  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X})$ .

- B2 There exist an integer  $j > 1$  such that  $\sup_n \mu_n(V^j) < \infty$ ,  $\sup_n \mathbb{E}(V^j(Z_n)) < \infty$  (for  $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ) and  $\sup_{n,k} \mathbb{E}(V^j(Y_{n,k})) < \infty$  (for  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$ ).

Assumption B1 is an uniform (in the sequence of invariant distributions  $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ ) geometric drift and minorization assumption, similar to the conditions considered in [3] and in the adaptive MCMC literature (e.g. [19, 20]). For the algorithms under examination, we can in fact just look at the invariant distributions as an adaptation parameter living in the infinite dimensional space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ . Using the techniques in [19, 20] it is also possible to let  $(\lambda, b)$  depend on  $n$  in some judicious way, but we require their uniformity w.r.t.  $n$  to allow the arguments which follow to focus upon the use of MCMC Calculus tools rather than technical details. Verifying Assumption B1 requires that  $\mu_n$  does not behave too differently with  $n$ . By way of an illustration, to verify the minorization condition Assumption B1b, following [33, Lemma 1.2] one has  $P_{\mu_n}(x, A) \geq (\varepsilon/b_n)\mu_n(A)$ , with  $\varepsilon := \inf_{x,y \in B} q(x, y)$ ,  $b_n := \sup_{x \in B} \mu_n(x)$ ,  $B$  being any compact

set with positive Lebesgue measure. Therefore, it suffices to require that the approximation sequence satisfies  $\inf_n \sup_{x \in B} \mu_n(x) > 0$ , which is arguably not hard to verify in practice. If this holds, then any compact set is small, and adapting [27, Lemma 3.5] one can verify Assumption B1a whenever

$$\sup_n \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_{\mu_n} V(x)}{V(x)} < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_n \sup_{x \in X} \frac{P_{\mu_n} V(x)}{V(x)} < \infty$$

Which, adapting the proof of [33, Theorem 3.2], can be verified with the Lyapunov function  $V(x) = \exp(\gamma|x|)$  for Random Walk Metropolis (and other Random Walk Hastings kernels) if all  $\mu_n$  are uniformly log-concave in the tails i.e. when for all  $n \geq 1$  there exist a  $\gamma > 0$  and  $z > 0$  such that

$$\log(\mu_n(x)) - \log(\mu_n(y)) \geq \gamma(y - x) \quad \text{for } y \geq x \geq z \quad (31)$$

$$\log(\mu_n(x)) - \log(\mu_n(y)) \geq \gamma(x - y) \quad \text{for } y \leq x \leq -z. \quad (32)$$

See Example 3.1 later for a concrete setting where we verify this. In the case where  $P_{\mu_n}$  is a Hastings Independence sampler  $Q(x, dy) = Q(dy)$  and the proposal has heavier tail than any distribution in the approximation sequence in that  $\inf_n dQ/d\mu_n(y) \geq \beta$  for some  $\beta > 0$ , then the whole state space  $X$  is small for any  $P_{\mu_n}$  simultaneously, and the drift condition will hold with a bounded  $V$ . Assumption B2 is a growth condition which can actually always be verified with some drift function if Assumption B1 holds. In fact, via the drift condition Assumption B1a we have

$$\mathbb{E}(V(Z_n)) \leq \lambda \mathbb{E}(V(Z_{n-1})) + b \leq \lambda^n \mathbb{E}(V(Z_0)) + b \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \lambda^i$$

where we just iterated the first inequality in  $n$ , and upon taking the supremum in  $n$  we obtain that  $\sup_n \mathbb{E}(V(Z_n)) < \infty$  and also  $\sup_n \mu_n(V) < \infty$  via Lemma B.1 (i.e. Assumption B2 holds with  $j = 1$ ). On the other hand, for  $j > 1$ , we can adapt the proof of [22, Proposition 6.5] and define  $\tilde{V} := V^{1/j}$ , so that  $\sup_n \mu_n(\tilde{V}^j) = \sup_n \mu_n(V) < \infty$ . By Jensen's inequality,

$$P_{\mu_n} \tilde{V} \leq (P_{\mu_n} V)^{1/j} \leq (\lambda V + b1_C)^{1/j} \leq \tilde{\lambda} V + \tilde{b}1_C$$

with  $\tilde{\lambda} := \lambda^{1/j}$  and  $\tilde{b} := b^{1/j}$ . Hence,  $\tilde{V}$  also satisfies Assumption B1 and arguing as above we may verify  $\sup_n \mathbb{E}(V^j(Z_n)) < \infty$  and  $\sup_n \mu_n(V^j) < \infty$ . For  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$  it is similar.

### 3.1.1 Sequential MCMC

For the Sequential MCMC sampling scheme  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$  we employ the following assumptions. Let  $V$  satisfy Assumption B1.

C1  $\mu_n(x) \rightarrow \mu(x)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in X$ .

C2 The Markov kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$ , and has a  $V$ -bounded derivative at  $\mu$  towards every  $\mu_n$ .

C3 As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for all  $f$  in some functions class  $\mathcal{G}(X)$  and for some variance functional  $v$ ,

$$n^{-1/2}[\mu_n - \mu](f) \Rightarrow N(0, v(f)).$$

Assumption C1 is a requirement on the nature of the approximation scheme, which has to occur pointwise. Assumption C2 will ensure that the Markov Chains using  $\mu$  and  $\mu_n$  will in fact not move too differently when Assumption C1 holds. In fact, it is sufficient that a mean value inequality (17) holds, and by Proposition 2.8 also the Metropolis-Hastings kernels satisfy that under the boundedness conditions stated therein. Assumption C3 is a mild assumption that says that if the employed approximation is random w.r.t. some  $\mathbb{P}$ , it also has a limiting Gaussian fluctuations around  $\mu$ , and it will be fulfilled by most approximation schemes used in practice.

Let  $\sigma^2$  denote the asymptotic variance achieved by  $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** Assume Assumptions A1 to C2. For all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^n f(Y_{n,i}) - \mu_n(f) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(f)) \quad (33)$$

and if Assumption C3 holds too, for  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X}) \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^n f(Y_{n,i}) - \mu(f) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(f) + v^2(f)). \quad (34)$$

Theorem 3.1 tells us in fact  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$  possess a limiting Normal law around  $\mu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , with the asymptotic variance equal to the asymptotic variance of an ideal MCMC scheme targeting  $\mu$  plus the variability due of the fluctuations of  $\mu_n$ .

**Example 3.1** (Sequential MCMC for Feynman-Kac flow). [9, 23, 41, 30] among others consider the following algorithm, recently theoretically analyzed by [18]. Let  $\{G^{(p)}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of non-negative functions, and  $\{M^{(p)}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of Markov kernel, and  $\eta^{(1)}$  an initial distribution.

---

**Algorithm 1** sMCMC for Feynman-Kac flow

---

For  $p = 1$ ,

1. Simulate  $Y_{i+1}^{(1)} \sim P_{\eta^{(1)}}(Y_i^{(1)}, \cdot)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ .

Set  $\eta_n^{(1)} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^n \delta_{Y_i^{(1)}}$ .

For  $p \geq 2$ ,

1. Simulate  $Y_{n,i+1}^{(p)} \sim P_{\Phi(\eta_n^{(p-1)})}(Y_{n,i}^{(p)}, \cdot)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$ .

Set  $\eta_n^{(p)} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^n \delta_{Y_{n,i}^{(p)}}$ .

---

In the algorithm above, at each level  $p$ , the random variable  $Y_0^{(p)}$  is sampled according to some initial distribution possibly depending on  $p$ . Here,  $\Phi(\eta^{(p)})(dx) := \int \eta(dy) G^{(p)}(y) M^{(p)}(y, dx) / \eta(G^{(p)})$  is the so-called Boltzmann-Gibbs transformation associated to the Feynman-Kac model  $\{G^{(p)}, M^{(p)}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

This is very flexible class of models, used perhaps most popularly in the filtering context within state space models, where one has an underlying unobserved Markovian state space process with some transition kernels  $m^{(p)}$  at time  $p$ , and an observable process having likelihood  $g^{(p)}$  at  $p$ .  $\{G^{(p)}, M^{(p)}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$  can be identified with different relevant quantities related to  $m^{(p)}$  and  $g^{(p)}$ , giving rise to different filters. The classic but usually inefficient choice  $G^{(p)} = g^{(p)}$  and  $M^{(p)} = m^{(p)}$  for all  $p$  yields the Bootstrap particle filter, see [14, 13]. Sampling from  $\Phi(\eta^{(p)})$  with a particle filter amounts to being able to evaluate pointwise  $G$  and sample i.i.d. from  $M$ . When one tries to implement more sophisticated filters, this might not be possible. In such case, a natural choice is to try to target  $\Phi(\eta^{(p)})$  with a MCMC algorithm, giving rise to the algorithm above. By targeting otherwise non implementable filters, this class of algorithms can outperform standard particle filters in some settings—see [18], which gives the only CLT for  $\sqrt{n}[\eta_n^{(p)} - \eta^{(p)}](f)$  of which we are aware. This CLT holds under conditions that are both restrictive and difficult to verify, and that have only been shown to hold for independence samplers in finite spaces. We can extend their results using our theory. We prove below a CLT for bounded test functions for ease of exposition, but one can do much better using the theorems above. We consider the following very weak assumption regarding the Feynman-Kac flow.

FK1  $G^{(p)}$  is positive and  $M^{(p)}(x, \cdot)$  has a bounded density for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$  and  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Provided an LLN holds for the first Markov Chain  $\{Y_k^{(1)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ , for each subsequent Chain  $\{Y_{n,k}^{(p)}\}_{k \leq n}$ ,  $p > 1$  we are in the setting studied for the process  $\{Y_{n,k}\}_{k \leq n}$  earlier.

In particular, suppose that Assumption B1 holds. It follows that the Markov Chain  $\{Y_k^{(1)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $t > 1$  satisfies a LLN and a CLT in that  $\eta_n^{(1)}(f) \rightarrow \eta^{(1)}(f)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and  $\sqrt{n}[\eta_n^{(1)} - \eta^{(1)}](f) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}(f))$  for

all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_1^1$ . By the decomposition

$$[\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)}) - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})](f) = [\eta_n^{(1)} - \eta^{(1)}](\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta_n^{(1)})(f))) \quad (35)$$

with the integral operator  $\bar{Q}^{(p)}(x, f) := G^{(p)}(x)M^{(p)}(x, f)/\eta^{(p)}(G^{(p)})$ , under Assumption **FK1** one then also has  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)})(x) \rightarrow \Phi(\eta^{(1)})(x)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ ,  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)})(x) \rightarrow \Phi(\eta^{(1)})(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. by separability and  $\sqrt{n}[\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)}) - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})](f) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}^2(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})(f)))$ . If  $P$  has a bounded derivative at  $\Phi(\eta^{(1)})$  towards every  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)})$  then Theorem **3.1** shows

$$[\eta_n^{(2)} - \eta^{(2)}](f) \Rightarrow N\left(0, \sigma_{\eta^{(2)}}^2\left(f - \eta^{(2)}(f)\right) + \sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}^2\left(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \eta^{(2)}(f))\right)\right).$$

Repeating this argument allows us to establish the following result by induction.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f \in \mathbf{C}_1^1$ . Let  $\{P_\star\}$  be a Markov family such that  $\Phi(\eta^{(j)}), \Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})$  for all  $j \leq p$  belong to its index set, and for which Assumptions **A1** to **B2** hold. If  $P$  has a bounded derivative at  $\Phi(\eta^{(j)})$  towards every  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})$  for all  $j \leq p$  and if the Feynman-Kac model  $\{G^{(p)}, M^{(p)}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies Assumption **FK1** it holds*

$$[\eta_n^{(p)} - \eta^{(p)}](f) \Rightarrow N\left(0, \sum_{j=1}^p \sigma_{\eta^{(j)}}^2\left(\bar{Q}^{(j:p)}(f - \eta^{(j)}(f))\right)\right).$$

where we defined  $\bar{Q}^{(j:p)}(f) := [\bar{Q}^{(j+1)} \circ \dots \circ \bar{Q}^{(p)}](f)$  for  $j < p$  and  $\bar{Q}^{(j:p)}(f) = Id$  for  $j = p$ .

For a concrete setting where this theorem is applicable, consider the following simple example, which can be easily extended. Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\{P_\star\}$  be the Metropolis-Hastings kernel. Consider the State-Space model given by the latent process  $W_{j+1}|W_j \sim N(w_{j+1}; \varphi(w_j), 1/2)$  and the observable  $S_{j+1}|W_{j+1} \sim N(s_{j+1}; w_{j+1}, 1/2)$ , where  $\varphi$  is a function bounded away from  $-\infty$  and  $+\infty$ , say  $-\bar{\varphi} \leq \varphi(x) \leq \bar{\varphi}$  for some finite and positive  $\bar{\varphi}$ . State-space models provide a very flexible way to model quantities that evolve in time, and that are widely used in engineering, physics, quantitative finance and other fields, see e.g. [13] for more details. Let us consider a Bootstrap interpretation of the Feynman-Kac flow, by identifying the Markov kernels  $M^{(p)}$  with  $W$ 's transitions, and the potential functions  $G^{(p)}$  with the likelihoods of the observable. With this choice, it is easy to see that Assumption **FK1** always hold and that  $\Phi(\eta^{(j)}), \Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})$  are for all  $n \geq 1, j \leq p$ , continuously differentiable bounded above densities, and bounded away from 0 on any compact set. Hence, by Proposition **2.8**,  $P(x, \cdot)$  satisfies a mean value inequality at  $\Phi(\eta^{(j)})$  towards every  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})$  for all  $j \leq p$ . We now verify Assumption **B1** with  $V(x) = \exp(\gamma|x|)$  for any  $\gamma > 0$  by verifying (31) and (32) hence showing that  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})$  are for all  $n, j \geq 1$  uniformly log-concave in the tails. Let  $z := \bar{\varphi} + \gamma/2$ . If  $y \geq x \geq z$ , for  $x, y \in \mathbf{X}$ , we compute

$$\frac{\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})(x)}{\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})(y)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2} e^{-(x - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)}))^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2} e^{-(y - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)}))^2}} = e^{-x^2 + y^2} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2 + 2x\varphi(Y_i^{(j)}) - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)})^2}}{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2 + 2y\varphi(Y_i^{(j)}) - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)})^2}}.$$

Now, since  $e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2 + 2x\varphi(Y_i^{(j)}) - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)})^2} / e^{-(s_j - Y_i^{(j)})^2 + 2y\varphi(Y_i^{(j)}) - \varphi(Y_i^{(j)})^2} = e^{2\varphi(Y_i^{(j)})(x-y)} \geq e^{(2z-\gamma)(x-y)}$ , where the last inequality follows from  $\varphi(Y_i^{(j)}) \leq z - \gamma/2$ , we have

$$\frac{\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})(x)}{\Phi(\eta_n^{(j)})(y)} \geq e^{-x^2 + y^2} e^{(2z-\gamma)(x-y)} = e^{(y-x)(y+x-2z+\gamma)} \leq e^{\gamma(y-x)},$$

thus verifying (31). (32) follows from analogous computations when considering the case  $y \leq x \leq -z$ .

### 3.1.2 Interacting MCMC

For  $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  we strengthen the assumptions to

$$D1 \quad n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sup_x |\mu_k(x) - \mu_{k-1}(x)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\mu_k - \mu_{k-1}\|_V \rightarrow 0 \text{ } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$



D2 The Markov kernel  $P(x, \cdot)$  is differentiable in the invariant distribution at  $\mu$ , and has a  $(V, \{\delta_x\}_{x \in \mathbf{X}})$ -uniformly bounded derivative at  $\mu_n$  towards  $\mu_{n-1}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

D3 As  $n \rightarrow 0$ , for all  $f$  in some functions class  $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$  and for some variance functional  $w$ ,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n [\mu_k - \mu](f) \Rightarrow N(0, w(f)).$$

The first condition Assumption **D1** strengthen Assumption **C1** requiring that the approximation schemes is uniformly convergent on the space, and that the convergence occurs fast-enough. We believe that the second condition of Assumption **D1** will often follow from the first, just as Assumption **C1** implies  $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_V \rightarrow 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. (see Lemma **B.3**) and this is quite immediate if  $\mathbf{X}$  is compact. Assumption **D2** strengthens Assumption **C2** to require that the ‘‘Lipschitz constants’’ of the differentiable Markov kernel  $P$  are bounded in the starting point as per Definition **2.7**. Assumption **D3** is an asymptotic normality assumption concerning the approximation scheme that will often hold in the same situations as those in which Assumption **C3** does—see Example **3.2**.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ . If Assumptions **A1** to **B2**, as well as Assumptions **D1** and **D2**, hold, then for all  $f \in \mathbf{B}_{V^\alpha}(\mathbf{X})$ ,*

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i) - \mu_{i-1}(f) \Rightarrow N\left(0, \sigma^2(f)\right); \quad (36)$$

and if Assumption **D3** holds too, for  $f \in \mathbf{B}_{V^\alpha}(\mathbf{X}) \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i) - \mu(f) \Rightarrow N\left(0, \sigma^2(f) + w^2(f)\right). \quad (37)$$

Theorem **3.3** tells us that  $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  also possess a limiting Normal law, with asymptotic variance equal to that of an ideal MCMC scheme targeting  $\mu$  plus some additional variability due the approximation. This latter is often greater than the one we obtain with a Sequential MCMC scheme, as in the Example below.

**Example 3.2** (Interacting MCMC for Feynman-Kac flow). [4, 6, 11, 15, 19] study the following type of algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 2** iMCMC for Feynman-Kac flow

---

For  $n = 1, \dots$

1. Simulate  $Z_n^{(1)} \sim P_{\eta^{(1)}}(Z_{n-1}^{(1)}, \cdot)$ , set  $\eta_n^{(1)} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^{(1)}}$
  2. Simulate  $Z_n^{(2)} \sim P_{\Phi(\eta_n^{(1)})}(Z_{n-1}^{(2)}, \cdot)$ , set  $\eta_n^{(2)} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^{(2)}}$
  - $\vdots$
  - $p$ . Simulate  $Z_n^{(p)} \sim P_{\Phi(\eta_n^{(p-1)})}(Z_{n-1}^{(p)}, \cdot)$ , set  $\eta_n^{(p)} := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i^{(p)}}$
- 

At each level  $p$ , the random variable  $Z_0^{(p)}$  is sampled according to some initial distribution possibly depending on  $p$ . Each  $\{Z_k^{(p)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}, p > 1}$  is in the setting studied for the process  $\{Z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . On the top of Assumption **FK1**, consider

**FK2**  $y \mapsto M(x, y)$  is continuous on  $\mathbf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ .

Under Assumption **FK1**, as argued in Example **3.1**, one has  $\Phi(\eta_n^1)(x) \rightarrow \Phi(\eta^1)(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. If  $\mathbf{X}$  is compact and Assumption **FK2** holds too, the convergence can be made uniform, verifying Assump-



tion **D1**. To prove that Assumption **D3** holds too, use (35) to write

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n [\Phi(\eta_k^{(1)}) - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})](f) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{n^{-1/2}}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k [\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta_k^{(1)})(f))(Z_j^{(1)}) - \eta^{(1)}(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta_k^{(1)})(f))] \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{n^{-1/2}}{s} \sum_{j=1}^{s_k} [\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta_k^{(1)})(f))(Z_j^{(1)}) - \eta^{(1)}(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta_k^{(1)})(f))] ds + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &\Rightarrow \sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})(f))) \int_0^1 \frac{B_s}{s} ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the fact that a (functional) CLT holds for  $\{Z_n^{(1)}; n \geq 0\}$ , and where  $B$  is a standard Brownian Motion. The right hand side is a Gaussian random variable with variance  $w(f) := 2\sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}^2(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \Phi(\eta^{(1)})(f)))$ . Theorem 3.3 then applies to prove

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $f \in \mathbf{B}_1$ . Assume that  $X$  is compact, and that the Markov family  $\{P_\star\}$  Assumption **B1** holds and that  $P$  has an uniformly bounded derivative at  $\Phi(\eta^{(p)})$  towards every  $\Phi(\eta_n^{(p)})$  for all  $p \leq 2$ . Then, if the Feynman-Kac flow  $(G, M)$  satisfies Assumption **FK1** and Assumption **FK2** it holds*

$$[\eta_n^{(2)} - \eta^{(2)}](f) \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma_{\eta^{(2)}}^2 \left( f - \eta^{(2)}(f) \right) + 2\sigma_{\eta^{(1)}}^2(\bar{Q}^{(1)}(f - \eta^{(2)}(f))), \quad (38)$$

where we defined the operator  $\bar{Q}$  as in Theorem 3.2.

The case  $p > 2$  can be dealt with using Theorem 3.3, but it also requires complex multilevel expansion formulæ—we refer to [8].

## 4 Closing remarks and research directions

We have developed herein a basic theory for methods allowing an easy and natural comparison between Markov Chains of the same family with different invariant distributions, by deriving analogues of the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus and Mean-Value Inequality for MCMC kernels viewed as functions of their invariant distributions. These tools allow us to study when Markov chains with different invariant distributions will move alike. For instance, under regularity conditions, we have seen that this can be ensured for Hastings and Gibbs samplers if the Markov chain is started under warm-start Corollaries 2.1 to 2.4, with a slightly “warmer” condition required for Hastings chains.

Other than being of theoretical interest to derive interesting relationships and inequality per se (see also the discussion in Example 2.6), this framework is naturally appealing to study the use of approximations of invariant distributions in Markov Chain Monte Carlo, as shown in Section 3, where, roughly speaking, we have seen that under boundedness of the kernel derivatives estimators associated with a Markov chain employing an approximation  $\mu_n$  of the invariant distribution  $\mu$  achieve a similar asymptotic variances to the limiting chain employing  $\mu$ , up to an additional variability due to the fluctuations of the approximation.

In particular, we used our framework and the derived inequalities to prove Central Limit Theorems for Sequential and Interacting MCMC algorithms. We also notice that the techniques developed can also be adapted can to study Markov chain Monte Carlo kernels as functions of their proposal, for instance. We believe that interesting research directions include extending the methods developed in this article to compare Markov Chains in different but somehow related Markov families, explore the other notions of gradient and derivatives in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ , making further connections with the theory in [2], exploring the use of higher-order derivatives, and developing methods to study Markov families where the dependence on the invariant distribution is not explicit. Furthermore, it might be of interest to explore other applications of these tools, perhaps in the contexts discussed in Section 3.

## Acknowledgements

RC was funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) via studentship 2585619 as part of grant number EP/W523793/1; AMJ was partially funded by the EPSRC (grant

numbers EP/R034710/1 and EP/T004134/1). For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.

## References

- [1] Sanket Agrawal, Dootika Vats, Krzysztof Łatuszyński, and Gareth O Roberts. “Optimal scaling of MCMC beyond Metropolis”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 55 (2023), pp. 492–509.
- [2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Birkhäuser Verlag, 2005.
- [3] Christophe Andrieu, Laird A Breyer, and Arnaud Doucet. “Convergence of simulated annealing using Foster-Lyapunov criteria”. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 38 (2001), pp. 975–994.
- [4] Christophe Andrieu, Ajay Jasra, Arnaud Doucet, and Pierre Del Moral. “On nonlinear Markov chain Monte Carlo”. In: *Bernoulli* 17 (2011), pp. 987–1014.
- [5] Filippo Ascolani and Giacomo Zanella. “Complexity of Gibbs samplers through Bayesian asymptotics”. In: *arXiv:2304.06993* (2023).
- [6] Yves F Atchadé. “A cautionary tale on the efficiency of some adaptive Monte Carlo schemes”. In: *Annals of Applied Probability* 20 (2010), pp. 841–868.
- [7] Anthony A Barker. “Monte carlo calculations of the radial distribution functions for a proton-electron plasma”. In: *Australian Journal of Physics* 18 (1965), pp. 119–134.
- [8] Bernard Bercu, Pierre Del Moral, and Arnaud Doucet. “Fluctuations of interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo methods”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 122 (2012), pp. 1304–1331.
- [9] Carlo Berzuini, Nicola G Best, Walter R Gilks, and Cristiana Larizza. “Dynamic conditional independence models and Markov chain Monte Carlo methods”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92 (1997), pp. 1403–1412.
- [10] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [11] Anthony Brockwell, Pierre Del Moral, and Arnaud Doucet. “Sequentially interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo methods”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 38 (2010), pp. 3387–3411.
- [12] Pierre Cardaliaguet, François Delarue, Jean-Michel Lasry, and Pierre-Louis Lions. *The master equation and the convergence problem in mean field games*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019.
- [13] Nicolas Chopin and Omiros Papaspiliopoulos. *An introduction to sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer, 2020.
- [14] Pierre Del Moral. *Feynman-Kac formulae: genealogical and interacting particle systems with applications*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [15] Pierre Del Moral and Arnaud Doucet. “Interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo methods for solving nonlinear measure-valued equations”. In: *Annals of Applied Probability* 20 (2010), pp. 593–639.
- [16] Randal Douc and Eric Moulines. “Limit theorems for weighted samples with applications to sequential Monte Carlo methods”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 36 (2008), pp. 2344–2376.
- [17] Richard M Dudley. *Real Analysis and Probability*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [18] Axel Finke, Arnaud Doucet, and Adam M Johansen. “Limit theorems for sequential MCMC methods”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 52 (2020), pp. 377–403.
- [19] Gersende Fort, Eric Moulines, and Pierre Priouret. “Convergence of adaptive and interacting Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithms”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 39 (2011), pp. 3262–3289.
- [20] Gersende Fort, Eric Moulines, Pierre Priouret, and Pierre Vandekerkhove. “A central limit theorem for adaptive and interacting Markov chains”. In: *Bernoulli* 20 (2014), pp. 457–485.

- [21] Marylou Gabri e, Grant M Rotskoff, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. “Efficient Bayesian sampling using normalizing flows to assist Markov chain Monte Carlo Methods”. In: *ICML Workshop on Invertible Neural Networks, Normalizing Flows, and Explicit Likelihood Models*. 2021.
- [22] Marco A Gallegos-Herrada, David Ledvinka, and Jeffrey S Rosenthal. “Equivalences of Geometric Ergodicity of Markov Chains”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Probability* to appear (2023), pp. 1–27.
- [23] Andrew Golightly and Darren J Wilkinson. “Bayesian sequential inference for nonlinear multivariate diffusions”. In: *Statistics and Computing* 16 (2006), pp. 323–338.
- [24] Keith W Hastings. “Monte Carlo sampling methods using Markov chains and their applications”. In: *Biometrika* 57 (1970), pp. 97–109.
- [25] Bernd Heidergott and Haralambie Leahu. “Weak differentiability of product measures”. In: *Mathematics of Operations Research* 35 (2010), pp. 27–51.
- [26] Peter J Huber and Elvezio M Ronchetti. *Robust statistics*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [27] S oren Fiig Jarner and Ernst Hansen. “Geometric ergodicity of Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 85 (2000), pp. 341–361.
- [28] Irving Kaplansky. *Set Theory and Metric Spaces*. 1st ed. AMS Chelsea Publishing, 1972.
- [29] Achim Klenke. *Probability theory: a comprehensive course*. 2nd ed. Springer London, 2013.
- [30] Qing Li, Runze Gan, Jiaming Liang, and Simon J Godsill. “An Adaptive and Scalable Multi-Object Tracker Based on the Non-Homogeneous Poisson Process”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 71 (2023), pp. 105–120.
- [31] Youssef M Marzouk, Habib N Najm, and Larry A Rahn. “Stochastic spectral methods for efficient Bayesian solution of inverse problems”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 224 (2007), pp. 560–586.
- [32] Youssef M Marzouk and Dongbin Xiu. “A Stochastic Collocation Approach to Bayesian Inference in Inverse Problems”. In: *Communications in Computational Physics* 6 (2009), pp. 826–847.
- [33] Kerrie L Mengersen and Richard L Tweedie. “Rates of convergence of the Hastings and Metropolis algorithms”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 24 (1996), pp. 101–121.
- [34] Nicholas Metropolis, Arianna W Rosenbluth, Marshall N Rosenbluth, Augusta H Teller, and Edward Teller. “Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines”. In: *Journal of Chemical Physics* 21 (1953), pp. 1087–1092.
- [35] Sean P Meyn and Richard L Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [36] George Papamakarios, Eric Nalisnick, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, Shakir Mohamed, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. “Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference”. In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 22 (2021), pp. 2617–2680.
- [37] Christian Ritter and Martin A Tanner. “Facilitating the Gibbs Sampler: The Gibbs Stopper and the Griddy-Gibbs Sampler”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87 (1992), pp. 861–868.
- [38] Gareth O Roberts and Jeffrey S Rosenthal. “General state space Markov chains and MCMC algorithms”. In: *Probability surveys* 1 (2004), pp. 20–71.
- [39] Gareth O Roberts and Richard L Tweedie. “Exponential convergence of Langevin distributions and their discrete approximations”. In: *Bernoulli* 2 (1996), pp. 341–363.
- [40] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians: Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling*. Birkh user/Springer, 2015.
- [41] Fran ois Septier, Sze Kim Pang, Avishy Carmi, and Simon Godsill. “On MCMC-based particle methods for Bayesian filtering: Application to multitarget tracking”. In: *2009 3rd IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP)*. 2009, pp. 360–363.

## A Appendix to Section 2

### A.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

We collect here some technical results which are used throughout our proofs.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ . We have*

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_V := \sup_{f:|f| \leq V} |\mu(f) - \nu(f)| = (\mu - \nu)_+ V - (\mu - \nu)_- V = \int V(x) |\mu(x) - \nu(x)| \lambda(dx),$$

with the last equality holding only if  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(X)$ , and where  $(\mu - \nu)_+, (\mu - \nu)_-$  is the Hahn-Jordan decomposition of  $\mu - \nu$ .

*Proof.* This is immediate from the definition, and well known—see, e.g., equation 9 in [25].  $\square$

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $\chi$  be a finite regular signed measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ . If  $V$  is a continuously differentiable  $\chi$ -integrable function we have*

$$\|\chi\|_V := \sup_{f \in \mathbf{B}_V(X)} |\chi(f)| = \sup_{f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)} |\chi(f)|.$$

*Proof.* The inequality  $\sup_{f \in \mathbf{B}_V(X)} |\chi(f)| \geq \sup_{f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)} |\chi(f)|$  is immediate, so we focus on the converse. By Lemma A.1,  $\|\chi\|_V = \chi(V1_{X^+}) - \chi(V1_{X^-})$ , where  $X = X^+ \cup X^-$  is an Hahn decomposition w.r.t.  $\chi$ . Thus it suffices to prove that the latter is equal to  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\chi(\varphi_r)|$  for some sequence  $\{\varphi_r \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)\}_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$  as  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |\chi(\varphi_r)| \leq \sup_{f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)} |\chi(f)|$ . Since  $\chi$  is regular, one can find closed sets  $(\tilde{X}^+, \tilde{X}^-)$  such that  $\chi(1_{X^+ \setminus \tilde{X}^+})$  and  $\chi(1_{X^- \setminus \tilde{X}^-})$  are both as small as we wish. By the integrability of  $V$  one then has that for arbitrarily small  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\chi(V1_{X^+/\tilde{X}^+}) < \epsilon/2$  and  $\chi(V1_{X^-/\tilde{X}^-}) < \epsilon/2$ . Recall that  $\varrho$  denotes the (assumed continuously differentiable) metric on  $X$ . Employing the notation  $(a)_+ = \min(1, \max(0, 3a^2 - 2a^3))$  to denote a Hermite interpolant acting as a smooth, monotonic approximation of the positive part function on  $(-\infty, 1]$ , we define

$$\varphi_r^+ := V1_{\tilde{X}^+} + V(1 - \varrho(\cdot, \tilde{X}^+)/r)_+ 1_{X/\tilde{X}^+}, \quad \varphi_r^- := V1_{\tilde{X}^-} + V(1 - \varrho(\cdot, \tilde{X}^-)/r)_+ 1_{X/\tilde{X}^-}$$

and  $\varphi_r := \varphi_r^+ - \varphi_r^-$ . In fact,  $\varphi_r \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)$  and  $\varphi_r \rightarrow V1_{\tilde{X}^+} - V1_{\tilde{X}^-}$  pointwise almost everywhere as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore  $\chi(\varphi_r) \rightarrow \chi(V1_{\tilde{X}^+}) - \chi(V1_{\tilde{X}^-})$  by dominated convergence and then by choice of  $(\tilde{X}^+, \tilde{X}^-)$ ,

$$\left| \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \chi(\varphi_r) - \|\chi\|_V \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

We conclude by letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

### A.2 Technical conditions in Propositions 2.4 and 2.5

#### A.2.1 Technical conditions in Proposition 2.4.

**Limit exchange.** To justify the interchange of differentiation and integration performed in Proposition 2.4 one can simply show that for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(X)$ ,  $\varphi_t(u, w) := |(d/dt)f(w)g(r_{\mu_t}(u, w))q(u, w)\rho(u)|$  is uniformly bounded in  $t \in [0, 1]$  by an  $L^1(\lambda(du) \otimes \lambda(dw))$  function (e.g. [29, Theorem 6.28]). Since  $|f| \leq V = 1$  and  $g'$  is bounded, say by  $\bar{g}'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t(u, w) &= f(w)g'(r_{\mu_t}(u, w)) \frac{|\chi(w)q(w, u)\mu_t(u)q(u, w) - \chi(u)q(u, w)\mu_t(w)q(w, u)|}{(\mu_t(u)q(u, w))^2} q(u, w)\rho(u) \\ &\leq \bar{g}' \frac{|\chi(w)\mu_t(u) - \chi(u)\mu_t(w)|}{\mu_t(u)^2} q(w, u)\rho(u) = \bar{g}' \frac{|\mu(w)\nu(u) - \mu(u)\nu(w)|}{\mu_t(u)^2} q(w, u)\rho(u) \\ &\leq \bar{g}' |\mu(w)\nu(u) + \mu(u)\nu(w)| ab \end{aligned}$$

where  $a := \sup_{x,y} q(x, y)$ ,  $b := \sup_x \rho(x) / \min(\mu(x), \nu(x))^2 < \infty$  by our assumptions.

**Uniform continuity of  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$ .** We need to show that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{A}_x$  with  $d_p(\rho, \rho') < \delta$  we have  $|\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] - \partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho', f)[\nu - \mu]| < \epsilon$ . Let  $\rho, \rho' \in \mathcal{A}_x$ , and let  $d_p$  be the Bounded-Lipschitz metric [17, Chapter 11]  $d_p(\rho, \rho') := \sup \int f d(\rho - \rho')$ , the supremum being taken across functions  $f$  on  $B(x, r)$  with bounded Lipschitz norm  $|f|_{bl} := |f|_l + |f|_\infty$  no greater than 1,  $|f|_l$  denoting the Lipschitz seminorm. Notice that for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_x$  we have  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] = \rho(h_1 - h_2)$ , where

$$h_1(z) := \mu(z)^{-1} \int (f(y) - f(z))q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))(\nu - \mu)(dy)$$

and  $h_2(z) := (\nu - \mu)(z)\mu(z)^{-2} \int (f(z) - f(y))\mu(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))\lambda(dy)$ .

Since  $|h_1 - h_2|_{bl} \leq |h_1|_{bl} + |h_2|_{bl}$ , the claim follows with the choice  $\delta = \epsilon / (|h_1|_{bl} + |h_2|_{bl})$  provided  $h_1, h_2$  have finite bounded Lipschitz norm on  $B(x, r)$ . Since  $g'$  is bounded, and  $q, \mu$  are continuous and bounded away from 0 on the (compact closure of)  $B(x, r)$ , it follows immediately that both  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are bounded on  $B(x, r)$ . To show that they are Lipschitz, we show they are continuously differentiable on  $B(x, r)$ . Since  $\mu, \nu$  are assumed to be continuously differentiable and  $f$  is too, we only need to show that  $z \mapsto \int f(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))\mu(dy)$  and  $z \mapsto \int f(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))(\nu - \mu)(dy)$  are continuously differentiable on  $B(x, r)$ . Whenever the assumed domination condition hold, we have

$$\partial_z \int f(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))\mu(dy) = \int f(y)\partial_z(q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y)))\mu(dy)$$

(e.g. [29, Theorem 6.28]) which is a continuous function of  $z$  on  $B(x, r)$  too, because the integrand is continuous in  $z$  and we have shown above it can be bounded uniformly in  $z$  by a  $\mu$ -integrable function ([29, Theorem 6.27]). This proves that  $z \mapsto \int f(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))\mu(dy)$  is continuously differentiable on  $B(x, r)$ . For  $z \mapsto \int f(y)q(y, z)g'(r_\mu(z, y))(\nu - \mu)(dy)$  the proof is analogous.

## A.2.2 Technical conditions in Proposition 2.5.

**Limit exchange.** Much as in the proof of uniform continuity above, it suffices to show that for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbb{X}^2)$ ,  $\varphi_t(u, w) := |(d/dt)f(w_1, w_2)P_{1|2,t}(u_2, w_1)P_{2|1,t}(w_1, w_2)\rho_2(u_2)|$  is uniformly bounded in  $t \in [0, 1]$  by an  $L^1(\lambda(du) \otimes \lambda^2(dw))$  function. Write  $\varphi_t(u, w) = \varphi_{1,t}(u, w) + \varphi_{2,t}(u, w)$ , and compute, recalling that we take  $V = 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{1,t}(u, w) &= f(w_1, w_2)\rho_2(u_2) \frac{|\chi(w_1, u_2)\mu_{2,t}(u_2) - \chi_2(u_2)\mu_t(w_1, u_2)|}{\mu_{2,t}(u_2)^2} P_{2|1,t}(w_1, w_2) \\ &\leq \rho_2(u_2) \frac{|\chi(w_1, u_2) - \chi_2(u_2)P_{1|2,t}(u_2, w_1)|}{\min(\mu_2(u_2), \nu_2(u_2))} P_{2|1,t}(w_1, w_2) \\ &\leq b(|\chi(w_1, u_2)| + |\chi_2(u_2)P_{1|2,t}(u_2, w_1)|) P_{2|1,t}(w_1, w_2) \\ &\leq b(|\chi(w_1, u_2)| + |\chi_2(u_2)|(P_{1|2,0}(u_2, w_1) + P_{1|2,1}(u_2, w_1)))(P_{2|1,0}(w_1, w_2) + P_{2|1,1}(w_1, w_2)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $b := \sup_x \rho_2(x) / \min(\mu_2(x), \nu_2(x)) < \infty$  by assumption. To bound  $\psi_{2,t}(u, w)$  we use Bayes' formula to write

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{2,t}(u, w) &= f(w_1, w_2)\rho_2(u_2) \frac{\chi(w_1, w_2)\mu_{1,t}(w_1) - \chi_1(w_1)\mu_t(w_1, w_2)}{\mu_{1,t}(w_1)^2} P_{1|2,t}(u_2, w_1) \\ &= f(w_1, w_2)\rho_2(u_2) \frac{\chi(w_1, w_2)\mu_{1,t}(w_1) - \chi_1(w_1)\mu_t(w_1, w_2)}{\mu_{1,t}(w_1)\mu_{2,t}(u_2)} P_{2|1,t}(w_1, u_2) \end{aligned}$$

and then we proceed as for  $\psi_{1,t}(u, w)$ .

**Uniform continuity of  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)$ .** This is almost analogous to the proof of Proposition 2.4. We notice that for all  $\rho \in \mathcal{A}_x$  we have  $\partial_\pi P_\mu(\rho, f)[\nu - \mu] = \rho(h_1 - h_2 + h_3 - h_4)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(z) &:= \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2)}{\mu_2(z)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, z) \lambda(dy_1), \\ h_2(z) &:= \int f(w_1, w_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(z, dw_1) P_{2|1}(w_1, dw_2)}{\mu_2(z)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, z) \lambda(dy_1), \\ h_3(z) &:= \int f(y_1, y_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(z, dy_1)}{\mu_1(y_1)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, y_2) \lambda(dy_2), \quad \text{and} \\ h_4(z) &:= \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{P_{1|2}(z, dy_1) P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2)}{\mu_1(y_1)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, y_2) \lambda(dy_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, following the same reasoning, we just need to show that these functions are bounded and Lipschitz on  $B(x, r)$ . Since  $\mu$  being continuous, positive and bounded implies that the marginal densities  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are bounded away from 0 on  $B(x, r)$  and since we assumed that the full conditionals are upper bounded, we check that  $h_1(z), h_2(z) \leq (\nu_2 - \mu_2)(z)/\mu_2(z)$  are in fact bounded, we then use Bayes' formula to compute

$$\begin{aligned} h_3(z) &= \int f(y_1, y_2) \frac{P_{2|1}(y_1, z)}{\mu_2(z)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, y_2) \lambda^2(dy), \\ h_4(z) &= \int f(y_1, w_2) \frac{P_{2|1}(y_1, z) P_{2|1}(y_1, dw_2)}{\mu_2(z)} (\nu - \mu)(y_1, y_2) \lambda^2(dy) \end{aligned}$$

after which we can use our upper bounds on the full conditionals and lower bounds on the marginals on  $B(x, r)$ . To prove they are Lipschitz on  $B(x, r)$ , we show again they are continuously differentiable. This follows immediately using our domination assumption similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.4.

## B Appendix to Section 3

Before the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 can be given, a number of auxiliary Lemmas and results are required. We use an approach based on the Poisson equations and resolvents. For a Markov kernel  $P_\nu$  having  $\nu$  as invariant measure, the Poisson equation is

$$\begin{cases} (P_\nu - \text{Id})R_\nu = \nu - \text{Id}, \\ \nu R_\nu = 0, \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

with  $R_\nu$  being the resolvent operator defined by  $R_\nu f(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [P_\nu^k(x, f) - \nu(f)]$ . The following Lemma is an immediate consequence of [19, Lemma 2.3]

**Lemma B.1.** *If Assumption B1 holds, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the Markov chains  $\{P_{\mu_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are  $V$ -geometrically ergodic in that for all  $x \in \mathbf{X}$ , for some finite  $C_n$  and  $\rho_n \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\left\| P_{\mu_n}^k(x, \cdot) - \mu_n \right\|_V \leq C_n \rho_n^k V(x).$$

Furthermore,  $L := \sup_n L_n < \infty$ , where  $L_n := C_n \vee (1 - \rho_n)^{-1}$ .

Using the Lemma above and the definition of the Poisson resolvent we also immediately obtain that for  $f \in \mathbf{B}_V(\mathbf{X})$ ,  $|R_{\mu_n} f(x)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |P_{\mu_n}^k(x, f) - \mu_n(f)| \leq |f|_V V(x) C_n \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho_n^k$  and hence the following.

**Lemma B.2.** *If Assumption B1 holds then, for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ ,  $|R_{\mu_n} f(x)| \leq V^\alpha(x) L^2 |f|_{V^\alpha}$ . In particular,  $\sup_n \|R_{\mu_n} f\|_{V^\alpha} < \infty$ .*

The role of  $\alpha$  will become clear later.

**Lemma B.3.** *If Assumptions B1, B2 and C1 hold, then  $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_V \rightarrow 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_V = \int V(x) |\mu_n(x) - \mu(x)| \lambda(dx)$  by Lemma A.1, by Scheffé's lemma, and the point-wise convergence given by Assumption C1, it suffices to prove that  $\mu_n(V) \rightarrow \mu(V)$ . The convergence of  $V$ -moments is then verified by uniform integrability (e.g. [10, Theorem 3.5]) via Assumption B2.  $\square$

The following Theorem gives the Law of Large Numbers we will need to prove the Central Limit Theorems for sMCMC. The proof is similar to [19, Theorem 2.7] but in a sequential rather an interacting setting. This result extends the LLN of [18] under much less stringent conditions, although it does not supply non-asymptotic estimates.

**Theorem B.1.** *Let  $F : \mathsf{X} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  be a measurable function satisfying  $\sup_n |F(\cdot, \mu_n)|_V < \infty$  and assume  $\lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n) \mu_n(dx)$  exists and that Assumptions B1 and B2 hold. Then, in probability,*

$$\lim_n n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F(Y_{n,i}, \mu_n) = \lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n) \mu_n(dx). \quad (40)$$

If Assumption C1 also holds and  $F(\cdot, \mu) := \lim_n F(\cdot, \mu_n)$  exists, the latter limit is equal to  $\int F(x, \mu) \mu(dx)$ .

*Proof.* Write  $F_n := F(\cdot, \mu_n)$ ,  $R_n := R_{\mu_n}$ ,  $P_n := P_{\mu_n}$ . We first use the Poisson equation to obtain the following decomposition

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F_n(Y_{n,i}) - \mu_n(F_n) = M_n + r_n$$

where  $M_n := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n R_n F_n(Y_{n,i}) - P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,i-1})$ ;  $r_n := n^{-1} [P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,0}) - P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,n})]$ . The result follows if we show that both  $M_n, r_n$  converge to 0 in probability. Let  $U_{n,i} := n^{-1} [R_n F_n(Y_{n,i}) - P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,i-1})]$ .  $\{U_{n,i}; i \leq n\}$  is a triangular array of martingale difference sequences with respect to the triangular array of  $\sigma$ -fields  $\{\mathcal{F}_{n,i}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_{n,i} := \bigvee_{m \leq n} \sigma(Y_{m,j}; j \leq m) \vee \sigma(Y_{n,j}; j \leq i)$ .  $M_n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$  then follows by [16, Lemma A.1] if we establish the asymptotic negligibility of individual increments, i.e that for all  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|U_{n,i}| 1_{|U_{n,i}| \geq \epsilon} | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

For any  $\gamma > 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|U_{n,i}| 1_{|U_{n,i}| \geq \epsilon} | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] &\leq \epsilon^{-\gamma+1} \mathbb{E}[|U_{n,i}|^\gamma | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \\ &\leq \epsilon (n\epsilon)^{-\gamma} \mathbb{E}[|R_n F_n(Y_{n,i}) - P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,i-1})|^\gamma | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \\ &\leq \epsilon (n\epsilon)^{-\gamma} 2^{\gamma-1} \mathbb{E}[|R_n F_n(Y_{n,i})|^\gamma + |P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,i-1})|^\gamma | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \\ &\leq \epsilon (n\epsilon)^{-\gamma} 2^\gamma L^{2\gamma} |F_n(\cdot)|_V^\gamma P_n V^\gamma(Y_{n,i}) \\ &\leq \epsilon (n\epsilon)^{-\gamma} 2^\gamma L^{2\gamma} \sup_n |F_n(\cdot)|_V^\gamma P_n V^\gamma(Y_{n,i}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the third line we used the  $C_p$  inequality, and in the fourth Lemma B.2. Assumption B2 guarantees that, for some  $\gamma > 1$ ,  $P_n V^\gamma(Y_{n,i})$  is uniformly bounded in both  $i, n$  and  $M_n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$  follows. To prove  $r_n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$  we use again Lemma B.2 to estimate

$$|r_n| \leq n^{-1} [|P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,0})| + |P_n R_n F_n(Y_{n,n})|] \leq n^{-1} \sup_n |F_n(\cdot)|_V L^2 (P_n V(Y_{n,0}) + P_n V(Y_{n,n})).$$

By Lemma B.1,  $P_n V(Y_{n,n}), P_n V(Y_{n,0})$  are both bounded in  $n$ , and (40) is proved. Now let  $F := F(\cdot, \mu)$ , by the triangle inequality,

$$|\mu_n(F_n) - \mu(F)| \leq |\mu_n(F_n) - \mu(F_n)| + |\mu(F_n) - \mu(F)| \leq \|\mu_n - \mu\|_V |F_n|_V + |\mu(F_n) - \mu(F)|.$$

Since  $\sup_n |F_n|_V < \infty$ , under Assumption C1 the first term vanishes. Furthermore, we also have  $|F_n - F| \leq 2V$ , and the fact  $\mu(V) < \infty$  guarantees that the second term also vanishes by the Dominated Convergence Theorem. It follows that  $\lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n) \mu_n(dx) = \int F(x, \mu) \mu(dx)$ .  $\square$

The next result is instead a Law of Large Numbers for iMCMC. This follows straight from [19, Theorem 2.7] together with a mean value inequality.

**Theorem B.2.** *Assume that Assumptions B1, B2, D1 and D2 hold. Let  $F : \mathsf{X} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X}) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$  be a measurable function satisfying  $\sup_n \|F(\cdot, \mu_n)\|_V < \infty$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty i^{-1} \sup_x |F(\cdot, \mu_i) - F(\cdot, \mu_{i-1})|_V < \infty$ . Then, if  $\lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n) \mu_n(dx)$  exists, in probability,*

$$\lim_n n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F(Z_i, \mu_i) = \lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n) \mu_n(dx). \quad (41)$$



If  $F(\cdot, \mu) := \lim_n F(\cdot, \mu_n)$  exists, the latter limit is equal to  $\int F(x, \mu)\mu(dx)$ .

*Proof.* (41) follows from [19, Theorem 2.7]. By Lemma B.1, Assumption B2 and the implied fact that  $\sup_n V(Z_n)$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.-finite, their assumptions their assumptions A3, A5 are all verified. To verify their A4 we apply a mean value inequality and the assumed uniformly bounded derivative in the invariant distribution Assumption D2 to write, for some  $M_1, M_2 < \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-1} (L_{\mu_i} \wedge L_{\mu_{i-1}})^6 \sup_x \|P_{\mu_i}(x, \cdot) - P_{\mu_{i-1}}(x, \cdot)\|_V V(Z_i) \\ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-1} (L_{\mu_i} \wedge L_{\mu_{i-1}})^6 [M_1 \|\mu_i - \mu_{i-1}\|_V + M_2 \sup_x |\mu_i(x) - \mu_{i-1}(x)|] V(Z_i) \end{aligned}$$

and the last expression is finite by  $\sup_n L_{\mu_n} < \infty$ , Assumption D1 and the fact that  $\sup_n V(Z_n)$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.-finite by Lemma B.1, verifying the conditions in [19, Theorem 2.7] and proving the claim. The fact that under Assumption C1 or Assumption D1  $\lim_n \int F(x, \mu_n)\mu_n(dx) = \int F(x, \mu)\mu(dx)$  follows from the same arguments used in Theorem B.1.  $\square$

In the proof below, for  $\nu, \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathsf{X})$ , we employ the operator identity

$$R_\nu - R_\mu = R_\mu(P_\nu - P_\mu)R_\nu + (\mu - \nu)R_\nu. \quad (42)$$

The equation above is proved in [8, proof of Proposition 3.1]—we repeat the argument here for completeness. In operator sense,  $P_\mu R_\mu = R_\mu P_\mu$ . Therefore it holds that  $R_\mu(P_\mu - \text{Id}) = (P_\mu - \text{Id})R_\mu = \mu - \text{Id}$  by the Poisson equation, but then

$$R_\mu(P_\mu - \text{Id})R_\nu = (\mu - \text{Id})R_\nu$$

and from the other side, again from an application of the Poisson identities, and since  $R_\mu\nu(f) = 0$ ,

$$R_\mu(P_\nu - \text{Id})R_\nu = R_\mu(\nu - \text{Id}) = -R_\mu$$

It follows that  $R_\mu(P_\mu - (\text{Id} - \text{Id}) - P_\nu)R_\nu = R_\mu(P_\mu - \text{Id})R_\nu + R_\mu(\text{Id} - P_\nu)R_\nu = (\mu - \text{Id})R_\nu + R_\mu = (\mu - \nu)R_\nu - (R_\nu - R_\mu)$ , where in the last line we used  $\nu R_\nu = 0$ . Hence, (42) follows.

For brevity, we will denote  $P_n = P_{\mu_n}$ ,  $R_{\mu_n} = R$ ,  $P = P_\mu$ ,  $R = R_\mu$  in what follows.

**Lemma B.4.** *Assume Assumptions B1, B2, C1 and C2 hold. Then, for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$ ,  $R_n f(x) \rightarrow R_\mu f(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s..*

*Proof.* From (42) we have that  $R_n f - R f = R(P_n - P)R_n f + (\mu - \mu_n)R_n f$ . Since  $R_n f$  has uniformly bounded  $V$ -norm by Lemma B.2, the second term vanishes with  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under Assumption C1, and we just need to show that  $R(P_n - P)R_n f(x) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Since  $(P_n - P)R_n f \in \mathbf{B}_V(\mathsf{X})$  by Lemma B.2, the series

$$R(P_n - P)R_n f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} [P^k(x, (P_n - P)R_n f) - \mu((P_n - P)R_n f)]$$

must be convergent, again by Lemma B.2. In particular for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a finite  $\bar{k}$  independent of  $n$  such that

$$R(P_n - P)R_n f(x) = \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^{\infty} [P^k(x, (P_n - P)R_n f) - \mu((P_n - P)R_n f)] < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore, we just need to show that

$$P^k(x, (P_n - P)R_n f) - \mu((P_n - P)R_n f) \rightarrow 0 \quad (43)$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, \bar{k}$ . Since  $\bar{k}$  is finite and also independent of  $n$ , it is enough to show that (43) holds for a fixed finite  $k$ . In fact, by the derivative in the invariant measure being bounded by Assumption C2, by mean value, for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  we have some finite positive  $M_{1,x}, M_{2,x}$  such that

$$|(P - P_n)(x, R_n f)| \leq |R_n f|_V [M_{1,x} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_V + M_{2,x} |\mu_n(x) - \mu(x)|]$$

and the right hand side goes to 0  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. by Lemma B.2 and Assumptions C1 and C2 for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ . Also,  $|(P_- P_n)(x, R_n f)|$  is uniformly bounded in  $n$  by a function in  $\mathbf{B}_V(\mathsf{X})$  by Lemma B.2. Because  $P^k(x, V) < \infty$  (Lemma B.1), an application of the Dominated Convergence Theorem shows that (43) indeed holds  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ . This proves  $R_n f(x) \rightarrow Rf(x)$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$ .

We can now use a standard separability argument to prove that  $R_n f(x) \rightarrow Rf(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Let  $\{x_j\}$  be a countable dense subset of  $\mathsf{X}$ , its existence guaranteed by  $\mathsf{X}$  being separable. Notice that then it is enough for the claim to prove that  $R_n f(x) \rightarrow Rf(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathsf{X}$  if and only if  $R_n f(x_j) \rightarrow Rf(x_j)$  for all  $x_j \in \{x_j\}$ . This because  $\{x_j\}$  is countable, and because the intersection of countably many probability 1 events has probability 1. The only if direction is trivial. To prove the if direction, we can write, for some  $j$ ,

$$|R_n f(x) - Rf(x)| \leq |R_n f(x) - R_n f(x_j)| + |Rf(x) - Rf(x_j)| + |R_n f(x_j) - Rf(x_j)|$$

The last term is small with  $n$  by hypothesis. Since  $\{x_j\}$  is dense in  $\mathsf{X}$ , we can pick a  $x_j$  sufficiently close to  $x$  so that the continuity of  $x \mapsto R_n f(x)$  and  $x \mapsto Rf(x)$  (which follows from Assumption A1 and the definition of the Poisson resolvent) ensure the first two terms are small, too. The claim follows.  $\square$

For a kernel  $K$  on  $(\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathsf{X}))$  define  $\|K\|_V := \sup_x \|K(x, \cdot)\|_V$ . The next lemma is a more quantitative version of the one just proved.

**Lemma B.5.** *Assume that Assumptions B1, B2, D1 and D2 hold. Then, for  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|R_i - R_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} \rightarrow 0$   $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s..*

*Proof.* Using [20, Lemma A.1] and the hypothesis of uniformly bounded derivative in the invariant distribution Assumption D2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_i - R_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} &\leq 3(L_{\mu_i} \wedge L_{\mu_{i-1}})^6 \mu_i(V^\alpha) \sup_x \|P_i(x, \cdot) - P_{i-1}(x, \cdot)\|_{V^\alpha} \\ &\leq \sup_i \mu_i(V^\alpha) \sup_i L_{\mu_i}^6 [M_1 \|\mu_i - \mu_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} + M_2 \sup_x |\mu_i(x) - \mu_{i-1}(x)|] \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows by Lemma B.1 and Assumption D1.  $\square$

**Central Limit Theorem for sMCMC.** We come to the proof of Theorem 3.1. Let  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$  and denote

$$S_n(f) := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=0}^n f(Y_{n,i}) - \mu(f) = S_{1,n}(f) + S_{2,n}(f)$$

where  $S_{1,n}(f) = n^{-1/2} (\sum_{i=0}^n f(Y_{n,i}) - \mu_n(f))$  and  $S_{2,n}(f) = n^{-1/2} (\mu_n - \mu)(f)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* We first show that  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu S_{1,n}) | \mathcal{F}_{n,0}] \rightarrow \exp(-(u^2/2)\sigma^2)$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Similarly to Theorem B.1, we write  $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_{n,i}) - \mu_n(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n U_{n,i} + r_n$ , where  $U_{n,i} := n^{-1/2} [R_n f(Y_{n,i}) - P_n R_n f(Y_{n,i-1})]$ ,  $r_n := n^{-1/2} [P_n R_n f(Y_{n,0}) - P_n R_n f(Y_{n,n})]$ .

$r_n \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$  follows from the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem B.1. To verify the claim it then suffices to check  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu \sum_{i=1}^n U_{n,i}) | \mathcal{F}_{n,0}] \rightarrow \exp(-(u^2/2)\sigma^2)$ , and we aim to apply [16, Theorem A.3]. We need to check that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[U_{n,i}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|U_{n,i}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|U_{n,i}| \geq \epsilon} | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

The second condition follows using basically the same techniques we used in the proof of Theorem B.1 to check  $\mathbb{E}[|U_{n,i}| \mathbf{1}_{|U_{n,i}| \geq \epsilon} | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0$ . To prove the first, notice that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[U_{n,i}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}] = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N F_n(Y_{n,i})$ , where  $F_n(y) := P_n (R_n f(y))^2 - (P_n R_n f(y))^2$  and that  $\sigma^2 = \mu(F)$ , with  $F(y) := P(Rf(y)^2) - (PRf(y))^2$ . We prove this via the LLN Theorem B.1. Since by Lemma B.2  $\sup_n \|F_n\|_{V^\alpha} < \infty$ , we only need to check that  $F_n(y) \rightarrow F(y)$  for all  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathsf{X})$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |F_n(y) - F(y)| &\leq |P_n (R_n f(y))^2 - P(R_n f(y))^2| + |(P_n R_n f(y))^2 - (PR_n f(y))^2| \\ &\quad + |(PR_n f(y))^2 - (PRf(y))^2| + |P(R_n f(y))^2 - P(Rf(y))^2|, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

and we can check that, indeed, since the derivative in the invariant distribution of  $P$  is bounded at  $\mu$  towards every  $\mu_n$ ,

$$|P_n(R_n f(y)^2) - P(R_n f(y)^2)| \leq \left| R_n f^2 \right|_{V^\alpha} [M_{1,y} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{V^\alpha} + M_{2,y} |\mu_n(y) - \mu(y)|]. \quad (45)$$

The right hand side goes to zero under our assumptions by Lemma B.2. Similarly, the second term of the triangle inequality vanishes because

$$\begin{aligned} |(P_n R_n f(y))^2 - (P R_n f(y))^2| &= |P_n R_n f(y) + P R_n f(y)| |P_n R_n f(y) - P R_n f(y)| \\ &\leq |P_n R_n f(y) + P R_n f(y)| |R_n f|_{V^\alpha} [M_{1,y} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{V^\alpha} + M_{2,y} |\mu_n(y) - \mu(y)|] \\ &\leq 2 |R_n f|_{V^\alpha}^2 [M_{1,y} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{V^\alpha} + M_{2,y} |\mu_n(y) - \mu(y)|] \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Also, since  $|P(R_n f(y)^2) - P(R f(y)^2)| = |P(y, R_n f^2 - R f^2)|$ , the third and the fourth vanish by Bounded Convergence Theorem and Lemmas B.2 and B.4. Thus, we have proved

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu S_{1,n}(f)) | \mathcal{F}_{n,0}) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \exp(-u^2 \sigma^2(f)/2), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Furthermore, by Assumption C3, for  $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu S_{2,n}(f))) \rightarrow \exp(-u^2 v^2(f)/2), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for  $f \in \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ . It follows that for  $f \in \mathbf{C}_V^1(\mathbf{X}) \cap \mathcal{G}(\mathbf{X})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\exp(iu S_n(f))) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(\exp(iu S_{1,n}(f)) | \mathcal{F}_{n,0}) - \exp(-u^2 \sigma^2(f)/2)) \exp(iu S_{2,n}(f))) \\ &\quad + \exp(-u^2 \sigma^2(f)/2) \mathbb{E}(\exp(iu S_{2,n}(f))) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \exp(-u^2 (v^2(f) + \sigma^2(f))/2). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Central Limit Theorem for iMCMC.** We come to the proof of Theorem 3.3. Let  $f \in \mathbf{B}_{V^\alpha}(\mathbf{X})$  and denote

$$S_n(f) := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Z_i) - \mu(f) = S_{1,n}(f) + S_{2,n}(f)$$

where  $S_{1,n}(f) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(Y_i) - \mu_{i-1}(f)$  and  $S_{2,n}(f) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_{i-1} - \mu)(f)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.3.* We first show that  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(iu S_{1,n}) | \mathcal{F}_{n,0}] \rightarrow \exp(-(u^2/2)\sigma^2)$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . To do that, we check the conditions of [20, Theorem 2.2] to prove that  $S_{1,n} \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(f))$ . Their A1 and A2 are satisfied under our assumption by Assumption B1. To check their A3 we need to check that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n |P_i R_i f - P_{i-1} R_{i-1} f|_{V^\alpha} V^\alpha(Z_i) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0 \quad (47)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/2\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^n L_i^{2/\alpha} P_i V(Z_i) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

The last condition is satisfied by Lemma B.1 since  $\sup_n V(Z_n)$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.-finite and  $\sup_n L_n < \infty$ . To verify the first, we use [20, Lemma A.1] and then the uniformly bounded derivative Assumption D2 with a mean value inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned} |P_i R_i f - P_{i-1} R_{i-1} f|_{V^\alpha} &\leq |f|_{V^\alpha} 5L^6 \mu_i(V^\alpha) \sup_x \|P_i(x, \cdot) - P_{i-1}(x, \cdot)\|_{V^\alpha} \\ &\leq |f|_{V^\alpha} 5L^6 \mu_i(V^\alpha) [M_1 \|\mu_i - \mu_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} + M_2 \sup_x |\mu_i(x) - \mu_{i-1}(x)|] \end{aligned}$$

for some  $M_1, M_2 < \infty$ . Since Lemma B.1 shows that  $\limsup_n \mu_n(V) < \infty$ , under Assumption D1, (47) is verified. We now need to check A4 in [20, Theorem 2.2], namely, that  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F_i(Z_i) \rightarrow_{\mathbb{P}} \sigma^2(f) = \mu(F)$ ,

where  $F_n(y) := P_n(R_n f(y))^2 - (P_n R_n f(y))^2$  and  $F(y) := P(Rf(y)^2) - (PRf(y))^2$ . For this we use Theorem B.2. By Lemma B.2,  $\sup_n |F_n|_{V^\alpha} < \infty$ , and by using the same arguments of the proof of Theorem 3.1, we see that  $F_n(y) \rightarrow F(y)$  for all  $f \in \mathbf{B}_{V^\alpha}(\mathbf{X})$ . Hence we only need to verify that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-1} \sup_x |F(\cdot, \mu_i) - F(\cdot, \mu_{i-1})|_V < \infty$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} & |(P_{i-1} R_i f(x))^2 - (P_{i-1} R_{i-1} f(x))^2 + |P_{i-1}(R_i f(y)^2) - P_{i-1}(R_{i-1} f(y)^2)| \\ & \leq \sup_x |R_i f(x) + R_{i-1} f(x)| |R_i f(x) - R_{i-1} f(x)| + \sup_x |R_i f^2(x) - R_{i-1} f^2(x)| \\ & \leq \|R_i - R_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} c_i \end{aligned}$$

with  $c_i := [|f^2|_{V^\alpha} + |f|_{V^\alpha} \sup_x |R_i f(x) + R_{i-1} f(x)|]$ , using again the mean value estimates (44)-(46) with  $\mu_{i-1}$  instead of  $\mu$  and  $M_1, M_2$  instead of  $M_{1,y}, M_{2,y}$  (in light of Assumption D2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-1} \sup_x |F(\cdot, \mu_i) - F(\cdot, \mu_{i-1})|_V & \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-1} [M_1 \|\mu_i - \mu_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} + M_2 \sup_x |\mu_i(x) - \mu_{i-1}(x)|] d_i \\ & \quad + \|R_i - R_{i-1}\|_{V^\alpha} c_i \end{aligned}$$

where  $d_i := 2|R_i f^2|_{V^\alpha} + 2|R_i f|_{V^\alpha}^2$ . Since  $\sup_n c_n, d_n < \infty$  by Assumption D1 and Lemma B.5 the condition is verified. This proves that  $S_{1,n} \Rightarrow N(0, \sigma^2(f))$  and then (36). The proof for (37) from (36) follows the same steps as the one for (34) from (33).  $\square$