

Fast Mixing of Data Augmentation Algorithms: Bayesian Probit, Logit, and Lasso Regression

Holden Lee*

Kexin Zhang*

Abstract

Despite the widespread use of the data augmentation (DA) algorithm, the theoretical understanding of its convergence behavior remains incomplete. We prove the first non-asymptotic polynomial upper bounds on mixing times of three important DA algorithms: DA algorithm for Bayesian Probit regression [AC93] (ProbitDA), Bayesian Logit regression [PSW13] (LogitDA), and Bayesian Lasso regression [PC08, RSKZ15] (LassoDA). Concretely, we demonstrate that with η -warm start, parameter dimension d , and sample size n , the ProbitDA and LogitDA require $\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}))$ steps to obtain samples with at most ϵ TV error, whereas the LassoDA requires $\mathcal{O}(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \log(\frac{n}{\epsilon}))$ steps. The results are generally applicable to settings with large n and large d , including settings with highly imbalanced response data in Probit and Logit regression. The proofs are based on Markov chain conductance and isoperimetric inequalities. Assuming that data are independently generated from either a bounded, sub-Gaussian, or log-concave distribution, we improve the guarantees for ProbitDA and LogitDA to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n+d)$ with high probability, and compare it with the best known guarantees of Langevin Monte Carlo and Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm. We also discuss the mixing times of the three algorithms under feasible initialization.

Keywords: MCMC Algorithm, Gibbs Sampling, Data Augmentation Algorithm, Log-concave Sampling, Non-log-concave Sampling, Conductance Method, Isoperimetric Inequality

1 Introduction

A key task in Bayesian inference is to draw samples from posterior distributions. The data augmentation (DA) algorithm ([Hob11, RKH24]) is a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method that generates auxiliary variables to enable a Gibbs sampling procedure. Ever since the DA algorithms were proposed ([TW87]), they have been applied to a wide range of models. Some of the auxiliary variables are intrinsic to the model, including missing data, unobserved variables, and latent states (e.g., [DW16, DR94, JGC95, JP08, CE07]). Others carry no explicit meaning. They are introduced purely to facilitate the sampling algorithm. Although they vary across different models, a typical DA algorithm exhibits a two-block Gibbs sampling structure: To draw samples from the posterior $\pi(\beta|y)$, with $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denoting the observed data and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denoting the parameters, it alternatively updates the parameters β and the auxiliary variables z . Specifically, at the $(m+1)^{th}$ iteration, the algorithm draws sample according to

$$z^{(m+1)} \sim \pi(z|\beta^{(m)}, y) \quad \beta^{(m+1)} \sim \pi(\beta|z^{(m+1)}, y), \quad (1)$$

where $m, m+1$ denote which iteration the sample is drawn at.

DA algorithms, like other Gibbs samplers, are favorable because they are automatic with no user-tuned parameters. This motivates researchers to design DA algorithms for many posterior distributions that are difficult to handle, especially in common Bayesian inference settings. A key challenge is to find auxiliary variables z that make a full set of conditional distributions accessible. Concretely, under (1), an efficient DA algorithm requires easy sampling from both $\pi(z|\beta, y)$ and $\pi(\beta|z, y)$. Despite the simplicity in implementation, the DA algorithm has a complex structure and additional variables, making its running time the central practical concern. To address this, researchers have been trying to prove theoretical guarantees for the

*Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University

running time of DA algorithms. Roughly speaking, we can describe the running time as the product of the cost per iteration and the number of iterations needed. The cost per iteration is typically easily characterized and can probably be minimized using parallel computing. This leaves the number of iterations to be of central theoretical interest. In the context of MCMC algorithms, this refers to how fast the underlying Markov chain converges, which can be quantified by the *mixing time*, the number of iterations needed to get samples within ϵ -distance to the target distribution.

Among various perspectives of mixing time analysis, a basic theoretical question is to understand the *quantitative* relationship between mixing time and the quantities of interest. Typically, the focus is on how the mixing time scales with the parameter dimension d and the sample size n in nonasymptotic settings. Of particular interest is determining whether the chain has a polynomial dependency (*rapid/fast mixing*) or exponential dependency (*slow mixing*) in n and d . Fast mixing results are desirable, as they guarantee the algorithm runs fast in high-dimensional and large-sample settings.

This paper provides quantitative theoretical guarantees for the fast mixing of three DA algorithms. In particular, we focus on the three DA algorithms designed for the Bayesian probit, logit, and lasso regression, respectively. The three algorithms are representative because they address standard settings, have attracted long-standing theoretical attention, and are widely used (e.g. [NNT21, XLZ⁺17, DD18, GMB⁺20, ZSMS18, GMS⁺16]). We briefly introduce them below and will present the details in Section 2.

Albert and Chib’s DA algorithm for Bayesian Probit Regression (ProbitDA) [AC93] The pioneering work [AC93] proposes a DA algorithm for sampling from the posterior distribution of β in the following Bayesian probit regression with Gaussian prior:

$$y_i \sim \text{Ber}(\Phi(x_i^T \beta)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \quad \beta \sim \mathcal{N}(b, B),$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, Φ denotes the standard Gaussian c.d.f., and Ber is a shorthand for the Bernoulli distribution. The algorithm requires n independent truncated normal auxiliary variables in each iteration.

Polson, Scott, and Windle’s DA algorithm for Bayesian logistic Regression (LogitDA) [PSW13] Ever since [AC93], there has been considerable effort devoted to designing an analogous DA algorithm for the Bayesian logistic regression under Gaussian prior ([HH06, FSF07, PSW13, ZFSW23]):

$$y_i \sim \text{Ber}\left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{-x_i^T \beta}}\right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \quad \beta \sim \mathcal{N}(b, B).$$

We focus on [PSW13] which requires n independent Pólya-Gamma auxiliary variables in each iteration.

Park and Casella’s DA algorithm for Bayesian Lasso Regression (LassoDA) ([PC08, RSKZ15]) Bayesian Lasso regression is the Bayesian formulation of Lasso regression [Tib96]. Instead of using the L1 penalty, it imposes a shrinkage Laplace (double-exponential) prior to the parameters. Among various proposals ([Han09, MY14, PC08]), we focus on the earliest one [PC08] with the following setting:

$$y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu + X\beta, v\mathbb{I}_n), \quad \pi(\beta|v) = \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda}{2\sqrt{v}} e^{-\lambda \frac{|\beta_j|}{\sqrt{v}}},$$

where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Here, λ is a tuning parameter analogous to the weight of the penalty term in Lasso regression, and μ and v have independent flat prior and inverse-Gamma prior, respectively. The DA algorithm in [PC08] generates d independent inverse-Gaussian auxiliary variables in each iteration. In particular, we consider the two-block improved version studied by [RSKZ15].

1.1 Past Work on ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA

The convergence behaviors of ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA have received long-standing attention. Nevertheless, a theoretical understanding of this behavior remains incomplete, especially on how the mixing time scales with n and d .

A large body of early works are devoted to proving geometric ergodicity using drift and minorization conditions (d&m, [Ros95, Car01]): [RH07] for ProbitDA, [CH13] for LogitDA, [KH13] for the original version of LassoDA in [PC08], and [RSKZ15] for LassoDA. Geometric ergodicity is a desirable convergence property, which refers to the existence of a geometric convergence rate of the total variation distance to the stationary distribution. These works are only sufficient to show the existence of such a geometric rate, without explicit dependence on n and d , or imply an upper bound on mixing time with exponential dependence on n and d . The latter point is rigorously developed by [RS15], who show that the provided geometric convergence rates in [CH13] and [KH13] converge exponentially fast to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or $d \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, [QH22] and [QH21] point out the limitations of d&m in obtaining tight dependence on n and d .

To improve the early convergence results, recent attention has been drawn towards the dependency of convergence on n and d , which is referred to as the “convergence complexity” analysis by [RS15]. In particular, [RS15] demonstrates that the geometric convergence rate of LassoDA’s v -marginal chain is at most $\frac{d}{n+d-2}$, through constructing a lower bound on the correlation between consecutive v samples and running numerical experiments. Albeit promising, the study does not address the convergence of the joint (β, v) -chain. Following [RS15], [QH19] improves upon [RH07], providing two sets of results supporting that the geometric convergence rate of ProbitDA can be bounded away from one when (1) d is fixed, $n \rightarrow \infty$ or (2) n is fixed, $d \rightarrow \infty$. To address the problem with both n and d growing, the follow-up work [QH22] demonstrates that the geometric convergence rate can be bounded away from one in particular settings: (1) n and d are arbitrary and the prior provides enough shrinkage, or (2) $n \rightarrow \infty, d \rightarrow \infty$, and the design matrix has repeated structure. The joint dependency of n and d in general cases remains unknown. After all, albeit insightful, the asymptotic results generally have no direct implications for non-asymptotic settings.

More recently, [JSPD19] provides theoretical and empirical evidence to support that ProbitDA and LogitDA mix slowly with highly imbalanced response data. They perform the analysis under a 1-dimensional perfectly imbalanced model with the response data being the all-one vector. Precisely, they show upper bounds on the conductance: $\mathcal{O}(\frac{(\log n)^{2.5}}{\sqrt{n}})$ for ProbitDA and $\mathcal{O}(\frac{(\log n)^{5.5}}{\sqrt{n}})$ for LogitDA. These account for lower bounds on mixing times with a warm start: $\Omega(\frac{n}{(\log n)^5})$ for ProbitDA and $\Omega(\frac{n}{(\log n)^{11}})$ for LogitDA. They demonstrate that the two DA algorithms underperform a Metropolis-Hasting algorithm under the simplified model. As opposed to their study, ours provides upper bounds on mixing times under warm starts for ProbitDA and LogitDA in general settings, including the settings with imbalanced response data.

1.2 The Conductance-Based Method for Mixing Time Analysis

To show fast mixing in terms of n and d , we consult a body of mixing time analysis based on convex geometry and isoperimetric inequalities, originating from the sampling problem on convex bodies ([DFK91, KLS97, LV04, Lov99]). Within this literature, fast mixing has been justified for various important algorithms, including hit and run (e.g. [LV03, LV07, LV06]), ball walk (e.g. [LV07]), Langevin Monte Carlo (LMC, e.g. [DM19, Dal17a, DK19, DMM19]), Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA, e.g. [DCWY19, CLA⁺21, AC24]), Hamilton Monte Carlo (HMC, e.g. [MS21]), and Metropolis Adjusted Hamilton Monte Carlo (MAHMC, e.g. [CDWY20]). Instead of studying concrete target distributions, a typical study at this line analyzes a general class of target distributions satisfying a certain assumption, such as bounded support, log-concavity, or an isoperimetric inequality.

In particular, we employ the conductance-based method ([DCWY19, Nar16, CDWY18, Lov99, LV07, LV04, MHW⁺19, AK91, LS90, SJ89, CDWY20]) to upper bound mixing times. The conductance-based method requires a one-step overlap condition for the kernel and an isoperimetric inequality for the target distribution. Although the method is well-established, new technical ideas are needed to handle the two-step DA kernels and to make precise the isoperimetric constants for the three target distributions.

One-Step Overlap for the DA Kernels The main challenge of analyzing DA chains is to deal with the two-step Gibbs transition kernels. We notice that the special structure of DA kernels makes establishing the one-step overlap condition straightforward. Specifically, we observe that under (1), the auxiliary variables are sufficient for the parameters, meaning that $\beta^{(m+1)}$ is independent of $\beta^{(m)}$ if conditioned on $z^{(m+1)}$. To establish the one-step overlap condition, one needs to study the geometric distance of two points and the probabilistic distance between them after one iteration. The sufficiency of z for β reduces the problem to solely studying the probabilistic distance of the z step with independent variables. The independence allows

us to further simplify it from a high-dimensional problem to a 1-dimensional one. The same method can probably be extended to other DA chains with a similar structure.

Isoperimetric inequality for a Concrete Distribution Isoperimetry is a desirable property, indicating the absence of bottlenecks and a light tail. This makes isoperimetry a preferable assumption in the works that study the sampling problem for a general class of distributions, expressing the final results in terms of isoperimetric constants. These works include analyses using the conductance-based method, and a recent line of research that wishes to generalize some log-concave sampling problems to cover non-log-concave targets ([BCE⁺22, ZCL⁺23, VW19, EHZ22, Wib19, MHFH⁺23, CEL⁺24, ZXG21]).

Unlike many other works that use isoperimetric inequalities, our study deals with concrete problems. This requires us to specify the dependency of the isoperimetric constant on n and d . Although isoperimetric inequalities can potentially cover a large class of probability distributions, we found it an open question how to verify them for weakly log-concave and non-log-concave distributions, which are of practical interest. Apart from the results for special cases ([Che23, Section 2.3], [HS86, Tal91, Tal96, Cou20, BK19]), existing methods include establishing a Lipschitz transport map from a distribution with well-studied isoperimetric properties (e.g. the standard Gaussian measure) ([Caf00, Kol11, KM11, DGH⁺23, MS24]), using results regarding the famous KLS conjecture ([Kla23, Bob99, KLS95, LV17, Eld13, AGB15]), and employing a set of flexible transference inequalities ([BM13, Mil10, CG20]). Our solution to the non-log-concave LassoDA’s target is to apply a transference inequality to a transformed Markov chain with a log-concave target.

1.3 Our contribution

In summary, our main contributions are the following.

- Assuming bounded entries, we prove non-asymptotic polynomial mixing time guarantees for the three DA algorithms with η -warm start and ϵ -error tolerance in TV : $\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}))$ for ProbitDA and LogitDA, and $\mathcal{O}(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \log(\frac{\eta}{\epsilon}))$ for LassoDA. These are the first non-asymptotic polynomial guarantees for the three algorithms in general settings, in contrast with many previous results with exponential dependency or in restricted settings.
- We further demonstrate that with feasible starts, the mixing time of ProbitDA and LogitDA is $\mathcal{O}\left(nd \log\left(\frac{d \log nd}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$, whereas LassoDA mixes in $\mathcal{O}\left(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \left(d \log d + n \log n + \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)\right)$ steps. See Section 3.2 for details.
- Under the assumption of independent generation from a bounded, a sub-gaussian, or a log-concave distribution, we show an improved guarantee $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + d)$ for ProbitDA and LogitDA. See Theorem 3.6 for details.
- We compare the mixing time of the three DA algorithms with Langevin Monte Carlo and Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm in terms of upper bounds. See Section 4 for details.

We outline our theoretical results in Table 1.

1.4 Notations

We reserve c, c' for universal constants, independent of all the parameters of interest (in particular n and d), whose values can change from one occurrence to the other. We commonly employ superscripts ^{Probit}, ^{Logit}, and ^{Lasso} to restrict a general quantity to a particular algorithm, ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA, respectively.

Asymptotic We say $f(x) = \mathcal{O}(g(x))$ if there exists a universal constant such that $f(x) \leq cg(x)$ for all x . $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(g(x))$ is $\mathcal{O}(g(x))$ with the logarithmic terms concealed. We say $f(x) = \Omega(g(x))$ if there exists a universal constant such that $f(x) \geq cg(x)$ for all x .

Matrix We denote the operator norm of a matrix A by $\|A\|$. If A is a square matrix, we use $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ to represent its maximum and minimum eigenvalue, respectively. \mathbb{I}_d is the d -dimensional identity matrix. $\mathbf{1}_n$ is the n -dimensional all-ones vector.

Algorithm	Initialization	Data Distribution	Mixing Time	Thm
ProbitDA	η -warm	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}))$	3.2
	η -warm	bounded/log-concave/ sub-Gaussian & independent	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + d)$	3.6
	feasible	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{d \log nd}{\epsilon}))$	3.7
LogitDA	η -warm	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}))$	3.3
	η -warm	bounded/log-concave/ sub-Gaussian & independent	$\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + d)$	3.6
	feasible	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(nd \log(\frac{d \log nd}{\epsilon}))$	3.8
LassoDA	η -warm	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \log(\frac{\eta}{\epsilon}))$	3.4
	feasible	bounded	$\mathcal{O}(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2(d \log d + n \log n + \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})))$	3.10

Table 1: Summary of ϵ -mixing time in TV distance of DA algorithms for sampling from posteriors of Bayesian probit regression (ProbitDA, [AC93]), Bayesian logit regression (LogitDA, [PSW13]), and Bayesian Lasso (LassoDA, [RSKZ15, PC08]) under different conditions on initial distributions and data distributions. These statements hide the dependency on parameters of prior distributions and data distributions: the covariance matrix B of the prior for ProbitDA and LogitDA, ξ for the prior for LassoDA, the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -radius for bounded distributions, and parameters of the log-concave and sub-Gaussian distribution. We refer the readers to the links in the last column for the complete theorems.

Markov Chain We use Ψ to denote a general ergodic Markov chain on \mathbb{R}^d , with \mathcal{P} being its Markov transition kernel, π being its stationary distribution, and ν being its initial distribution. We use \mathcal{P}_x as a shorthand for $\delta_x \mathcal{P}$, where δ_x is the Dirac measure centered at x .

Probabilistic Distance For two probability measures μ_1, μ_2 in \mathbb{R}^d , we use $\text{TV}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ to denote their total variation distance given by

$$\text{TV}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \sup_{\text{measurable } A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d} |\mu_1(A) - \mu_2(A)| \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, we use $\text{KL}(\mu_1 || \mu_2) = \int \log\left(\frac{d\mu_1}{d\mu_2}\right) d\mu_1$ to denote their Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formally introduce the notion of mixing time, as well as the three DA algorithms under study. In Section 3, we present the main results of upper bounds on mixing times. We compare our results with the best known guarantees of alternative algorithms in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to the proofs of the main results. We conclude in Section 6 by discussing several future research directions.

2 Problem Setup

This section is devoted to formally stating the goal of our analysis and introducing the algorithmic details of ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA. To dive straight into our topic, we assume familiarity with the basic concepts of Markov chains, a rigorous introduction of which can be found in [LP17].

2.1 Mixing Time with a Warm Start

To sample from a target distribution π on the state space \mathbb{R}^d , one can design a Markov chain Ψ with a Markov transition kernel \mathcal{P} such that starting from any distribution ν , the distribution will eventually converge to π as the number of iterations k tends to infinity:

$$\nu \mathcal{P}^k \rightarrow \pi \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

To quantify how quickly this convergence occurs, the notion of mixing time is commonly adopted to describe the number of iterations needed to get ϵ -close in TV distance to the target distribution. It is not

hard to see that the mixing time depends on how close the initial distribution ν is to π . For ease of the analysis, we control and measure the distance between ν and π by the notion of **warm start**. Specifically, for a scalar $\eta \geq 1$, a η -warm start requires the initial distribution to satisfy

$$\sup_A \frac{\nu(A)}{\pi(A)} \leq \eta < \infty$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. In this work, we call a warm start **constant-warm** if η does not depend on n and d , and **exponential-warm** if η depends exponentially on n and d . If not specifically stated, a warm start refers to a constant-warm initialization. Throughout the paper, we denote the **mixing time** of the Markov chain Ψ with η -warm start to ϵ -accuracy in TV distance ($\epsilon \in (0, 1)$) by

$$t_\Psi(\eta, \epsilon) = \inf\{k : \text{TV}(\nu\mathcal{P}^k, \pi) \leq \epsilon, \nu \text{ is a } \eta\text{-warm start}\}.$$

We aim to obtain an upper bound of $t_\Psi(\eta, \epsilon)$ in terms of the sample size n and the dimension of the parameter space d .

2.2 Laziness of Markov chain

For technical reasons, in this paper, we study the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy version of the Markov chains underlying the three DA algorithms. We say a Markov chain is ζ -**lazy** if, at each iteration, the chain stays at the previous state with probability at least ζ . In particular, the $\frac{1}{2}$ -*lazy* version has the transition kernel \mathcal{T} that satisfies

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P} \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{P} is the transition kernel of the original chain.

Despite having the same stationary distribution, a lazy version is not practical as it slows down the convergence. However, laziness is a convenient assumption for theoretical analysis, as it guarantees the chain to be aperiodic, and we will use mixing time results that rely on this assumption. With $\zeta \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the laziness further ensures that the Markov transition kernel is positive semidefinite. In practice, using the lazy version of the chain only affects the mixing time by a constant factor.

2.3 ProbitDA

Model Given the binary response vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, and a gaussian prior $\mathcal{N}(b, B)$ with $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, a typical model for Bayesian probit regression is

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\sim \text{Ber}(\Phi(x_i^T \beta)) \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \beta &\sim \mathcal{N}(b, B), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we denote $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as the regression coefficients, y_i as the i^{th} entry of y , x_i as the i^{th} row of X , $\text{Ber}(p)$ as the Bernoulli distribution with parameter p , and $\Phi(x)$ as the standard Gaussian c.d.f. at x .

Posterior The posterior of this model is

$$\pi(\beta|y) \propto \pi(y|\beta)\pi(\beta) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \Phi(x_i^T \beta))^{1-y_i} \Phi(x_i^T \beta)^{y_i} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\beta-b)^T B^{-1}(\beta-b)}. \quad (5)$$

Auxiliary Variables and the Algorithm To address this complicated posterior, in each iteration, [AC93] introduces independent draws from n **truncated normal** variables. We use the notation $\text{TN}(\mu, 1; y)$ to denote the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ truncated to $[0, \infty)$ if $y = 1$, and truncated to $(-\infty, 0]$ if $y = 0$. Specifically, $\text{TN}(\mu, 1; 1)$ has a density

$$f(x) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\Phi(\mu)} \mathbb{1}\{x \geq 0\}, \quad (6)$$

while the density of $\text{TN}(\mu, 1; 0)$ is

$$f(x) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)^2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\Phi(-\mu)} \mathbb{1}\{x \leq 0\}. \quad (7)$$

With this notation, the concrete idea of ProbitDA is to augment the data

$$z_i | \beta, y \sim \text{TN}(x_i^T \beta, 1; y_i) \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (8)$$

The ProbitDA goes by alternatively generate samples from $\pi(z|\beta, y)$ and $\pi(\beta|z, y)$ as in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 The ProbitDA

- 1: **Input:** $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, b \in \mathbb{R}^d, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$
 - 2: Draw $\beta^{(0)}$ from an initial distribution.
 - 3: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 4: Draw independently $z_i^{(m)} \sim \text{TN}(x_i^T \beta^{(m-1)}, 1; y_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$
 - 5: Draw $\beta^{(m)} \sim \mathcal{N}((B^{-1} + X^T X)^{-1}(B^{-1}b + X^T z^{(m)}), (B^{-1} + X^T X)^{-1}).$
 - 6: **end for**
-

2.4 LogitDA

Model Bayesian logistic regression has the same setting as Bayesian probit regression in Section 2.3 except for the link function. That is, the model becomes

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &\sim \text{Ber}(l(x_i^T \beta)) \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \beta &\sim \mathcal{N}(b, B), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $l(x) = \frac{e^x}{1+e^x}$ is the logit link function.

Posterior The posterior of this model is

$$\pi(\beta|y) \propto \pi(y|\beta)\pi(\beta) \propto \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{e^{x_i^T \beta}}{1 + e^{x_i^T \beta}} \right)^{y_i} \left(\frac{1}{1 + e^{x_i^T \beta}} \right)^{1-y_i} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\beta-b)^T B^{-1}(\beta-b)}. \quad (10)$$

Auxiliary Variables and the Algorithm To cope with this complex posterior, [PSW13] develop an analogous DA algorithm to [AC93] for Bayesian logistic regression. Instead of generating additional truncated normal variables, they propose using the **Pólya-Gamma** random variable and making n independent draws from it in each iteration. The Pólya-Gamma variables take two arguments, denoted as $\text{PG}(a, c)$, are infinite convolutions of Gamma variables, and have efficient samplers. Two facts about Pólya-Gamma variables are most related to our study: First, their densities satisfy the following relationship

$$f(x; a, c) = e^{-\frac{c^2}{2}x} \cosh^a \left(\frac{c}{2} \right) f(x; a, 0), \quad (11)$$

where $f(x; a, c)$ is the density of $\text{PG}(a, c)$. Second, the mean of $\omega \sim \text{PG}(a, c)$ is

$$\mathbb{E}(\omega) = \frac{a}{2c} \tanh \left(\frac{c}{2} \right). \quad (12)$$

The key to the design of [PSW13] is to augment the data

$$z_i | \beta, y \sim \text{PG}(1, x_i^T \beta), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (13)$$

The LogitDA proceeds by alternately generate samples from $\pi(z|\beta, y)$ and $\pi(\beta|z, y)$ as in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 The LogitDA

- 1: **Input:** $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$
 - 2: Let $\kappa = y - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}_n$.
 - 3: Draw $\beta^{(0)}$ from an initial distribution.
 - 4: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 5: Draw independently $z_i^{(m)} \sim \text{PG}(1, x_i^T \beta^{(m-1)})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
 - 6: Let $\Omega^{(m)} = \text{diag}(z^{(m)})$.
 - 7: Draw $\beta^{(m)} \sim \mathcal{N}((B^{-1} + X^T \Omega^{(m)} X)^{-1}(X^T \kappa + B^{-1}b), (B^{-1} + X^T \Omega^{(m)} X)^{-1})$.
 - 8: **end for**
-

2.5 LassoDA

Model The Lasso [Tib96] estimates linear regression coefficients by L_1 -constrained least squares. Concretely, consider a linear regression model,

$$y = \mu \mathbf{1}_n + X\beta + \epsilon,$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response data, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ is the matrix of the regressors with centered columns, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the vector of coefficients, and ϵ is independent and identically distributed mean-zero Gaussian residuals. The Lasso estimates the coefficients by solving the following optimization problem

$$\min_{\beta} \|\tilde{y} - X\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1, \quad (14)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter and $\tilde{y} = y - \bar{y}\mathbf{1}_n$ is the centered response vector. Because of the nature of the L_1 penalty, the solution of the problem (14) tends to have some coefficients being exactly zero. This excludes non-informative variables and hence makes Lasso useful for variable selection.

[Tib96] points out that one can study the Lasso estimate from a Bayesian point of view. They interpret the solution of the problem (14) as the posterior mode of the coefficients under a Laplace (double-exponential) prior. [PC08] formulate the Bayesian Lasso model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu + X\beta, v\mathbb{I}_n) \\ p(\mu) &\propto 1 && \text{independent flat (improper) prior of } \mu \\ p(\beta|v) &= \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\lambda}{2\sqrt{v}} e^{-\lambda \frac{|\beta_j|}{\sqrt{v}}} && \text{conditional Laplace prior of } \beta \\ p(v) &\propto \frac{e^{-\xi/v}}{v^{\alpha+1}} && \text{inverse gamma prior of } v \end{aligned}$$

Posterior The model allows the users to perform inference for all three parameters, μ , β , and v . The joint posterior is

$$\pi(\mu, v, \beta|y) \propto \pi(y|\mu, \beta, v)\pi(\mu)\pi(\beta|v)\pi(v) \propto \frac{1}{v^{(n+d+2\alpha+2)/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2v}\|y - \mu\mathbf{1}_n - X\beta\|_2^2 - \lambda \frac{\|\beta\|_1}{\sqrt{v}} - \frac{\xi}{v}}. \quad (15)$$

As μ is rarely of interest, [PC08] marginalizes it out to consider the posterior of β and v . Using the fact that X is centered or $\mathbf{1}_n^T(y - X\beta) = n\bar{y}$, we have

$$p(\beta, v|y) \propto \int_{\mu} p(\mu, v, \beta|y) d\mu \propto \frac{1}{v^{(n+d+2\alpha+1)/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2v}\|\tilde{y} - X\beta\|_2^2 - \lambda \frac{\|\beta\|_1}{\sqrt{v}} - \frac{\xi}{v}}. \quad (16)$$

Auxiliary Variables and the Algorithm To generate samples from this posterior, [PC08] develop a DA algorithm that introduces d independent inverse of inverse Gaussian variables. We use IG as a shorthand for inverse Gaussian. Specifically, the augmented data is

$$\frac{1}{z_j} | \beta, v, y \sim \text{IG} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2 v}{\beta_j^2}}, \lambda^2 \right), \quad (17)$$




Figure 1: Illustration of the transition kernels of ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA. Here, the arrow represents conditional dependency.

where the density of $\text{IG}(\mu, \lambda')$ is

$$f(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda'}{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left[-\frac{\lambda'(x - \mu)^2}{2\mu^2 x}\right], \quad x > 0.$$

There are multiple ways to perform Gibbs sampling for the three blocks of variables β, v, z . [PC08] adopts a three-block structure to iteratively sample from $\pi(z|\beta, v, y)$, $\pi(v|\beta, z, y)$, and $\pi(\beta|v, z, y)$. [RSKZ15] proposes an improvement of taking a two-block update, meaning to sample alternately from $\pi(z|\beta, v, y)$ and $\pi(\beta, v|z, y)$, with the latter step splitting into $\pi(v|z, y)$ and $\pi(\beta|v, z, y)$. We focus on this improved algorithm, given as Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 The LassoDA

- 1: **Input:** $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$
 - 2: Let $\tilde{y} = y - \bar{y}\mathbf{1}_n$.
 - 3: Draw $\beta^{(0)}, v^{(0)}$ from initial distributions.
 - 4: **for** $m = 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 5: Draw independently $\frac{1}{z_j^{(m)}} \sim \text{IG}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2 v^{(m-1)}}{(\beta_j^{(m-1)})^2}}, \lambda^2\right), j = 1, \dots, d$.
 - 6: Let $D_z^{(m)} = \text{diag}(z^{(m)})$. Draw $v^{(m)} \sim \text{Inverse-Gamma}\left(\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}, \xi + \frac{\tilde{y}^T(\mathbb{I}_n - X(X^T X + (D_z^{(m)})^{-1})^{-1} X^T)\tilde{y}}{2}\right)$.
 - 7: Draw $\beta^{(m)} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\left(X^T X + (D_z^{(m)})^{-1}\right)^{-1} X^T \tilde{y}, v^{(m)} \left(X^T X + (D_z^{(m)})^{-1}\right)^{-1}\right)$.
 - 8: **end for**
-

We provide illustrative graphics for the three algorithms in Figure 1.

2.6 Log-Concavity and Important Quantities

Our analysis is closely related to the growing literature on log-concave sampling ([Che23]), whose focus lies on proving the dependency of mixing times on the dimension d and the condition number κ of a class of (strongly) log-concave distributions. It is helpful to study whether the target distributions of ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA satisfy the desirable log-concavity property. If so, we can characterize them using the quantities in the log-concave sampling literature for later use.

Formally, a probability distribution $\pi \propto e^{-f}$ is **log-concave** if f is a convex function. Otherwise, π is **non-log-concave**. Furthermore, π is **m -strongly log-concave** and **L -smooth** if

$$m\mathbb{I}_d \preceq \nabla^2 f \preceq L\mathbb{I}_d$$

for some $m > 0$. The **condition number** κ of a strongly-log-concave distribution is defined as $\kappa = \frac{L}{m}$. We call a log-concave distribution **weakly-log-concave** if $m = 0$. In practice, the exact m and L may not be

obtainable. One can only access a feasible lower bound of m , denoted as m' , and a feasible upper bound of L , denoted as L' . Before going forward, we make a basic regularity assumption on the prior covariance matrix B for the Bayesian probit and logit regression.

Assumption 2.1. For some $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $b_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we assume that the prior covariance matrix B in the Bayesian probit regression (4) and Bayesian logit regression (9) satisfies $0 \prec b_0 \mathbb{I}_d \preceq B \preceq b_1 \mathbb{I}_d$, where b_0 and b_1 are independent of n and d .

Next, we study how the targets of the three DA algorithms fit in this important setting.

ProbitDA The target of ProbitDA in equation (5) is **strongly log-concave**. This will be clear shortly. The target's log-concavity constant m^{Probit} and smoothness constant L^{Probit} can be studied by investigating the maximum and minimum eigenvalue of the Hessian of f^{Probit} . Let $\phi(x)$ be the standard Gaussian pdf at x . Noting that $\phi'(x) = -x\phi(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f^{\text{Probit}}(\beta) &= -\sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta)}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta)} + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - y_i) x_i \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta)}{1 - \Phi(x_i^T \beta)} + B^{-1}(\beta - b) \\ \nabla^2 f^{\text{Probit}}(\beta) &= -\sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i \left(\frac{-x_i^T \beta \phi(x_i^T \beta) x_i \Phi(x_i^T \beta) - \phi^2(x_i^T \beta) x_i}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta)^2} \right)^T \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - y_i) x_i \left(\frac{-x_i^T \beta \phi(x_i^T \beta) x_i (1 - \Phi(x_i^T \beta)) + \phi^2(x_i^T \beta) x_i}{(1 - \Phi(x_i^T \beta))^2} \right)^T + B^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \left(\frac{\phi^2(x_i^T \beta)}{\Phi^2(x_i^T \beta)} + x_i^T \beta \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta)}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta)} \right) x_i x_i^T + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - y_i) \left(\frac{\phi^2(-x_i^T \beta)}{\Phi^2(-x_i^T \beta)} - x_i^T \beta \frac{\phi(-x_i^T \beta)}{\Phi(-x_i^T \beta)} \right) x_i x_i^T + B^{-1}. \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n y_i q(x_i^T \beta) x_i x_i^T + \sum_{i=1}^n (1 - y_i) q(-x_i^T \beta) x_i x_i^T + B^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

where the quantity

$$q(x) = \frac{\phi^2(x)}{\Phi^2(x)} + x \frac{\phi(x)}{\Phi(x)} \quad (18)$$

is the negative derivative of the inverse Mill's ratio of the standard normal distribution, which is bounded between $(0, 1)$ [Sam53]. Therefore, we can get an upper bound L'^{Probit} for L^{Probit} and a lower bound m'^{Probit} for m^{Probit} such that

$$m'^{\text{Probit}} = \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}) \leq m^{\text{Probit}} \quad \text{and} \quad L'^{\text{Probit}} = \|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\| \geq L^{\text{Probit}} \quad (19)$$

The target is indeed strongly log-concave since $m'^{\text{Probit}} = \frac{1}{b_1^{\text{Probit}}} > 0$.

LogitDA The target of LogitDA in equation (10) is **strongly log-concave**. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f^{\text{Logit}}(\beta) &= -X^T y + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{x_i^T \beta}}{1 + e^{x_i^T \beta}} x_i + B^{-1}(\beta - b) \\ \nabla^2 f^{\text{Logit}}(\beta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{x_i^T \beta}}{(1 + e^{x_i^T \beta})^2} x_i x_i^T + B^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\frac{1}{4} - \left(\frac{e^{x_i^T \beta}}{1 + e^{x_i^T \beta}} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right] x_i x_i^T + B^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{e^{x_i^T \beta}}{1 + e^{x_i^T \beta}} \in (0, 1)$, we can obtain

$$m'^{\text{Logit}} = \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}) \geq m^{\text{Logit}} \quad \text{and} \quad L'^{\text{Logit}} = \frac{1}{4} \|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\| \geq L^{\text{Logit}}. \quad (20)$$

The target is indeed strongly log-concave since $m'^{\text{Logit}} = \frac{1}{b_1^{\text{Logit}}} > 0$.

LassoDA The target of LassoDA in equation (16) is **non-log-concave**. One can show that the target is log-concave in β , but non-log-concave in v . This makes the whole target non-log-concave. The main trick in our analysis is to consider an equivalent transformation of LassoDA, whose target is log-concave.

3 Main Results

This section presents our main results on mixing time upper bounds for the ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA. We show the mixing time guarantees with warm starts in Section 3.1. Though it simplifies theoretical analysis, a good warm start is rarely available. This motivates our analysis in Section 3.2, where we prove mixing time guarantees with feasible starting distributions.

3.1 Mixing Time with a Warm Start

In our first set of results, Theorem 3.2 for LogitDA, Theorem 3.3 for ProbitDA, and Theorem 3.4 for LassoDA, we make no assumptions about the data samples except for bounded entries: they do not need to be independent, identically distributed, or conform to any particular distribution. In addition to these general statements, we provide improved results assuming independent generation in Theorem 3.6.

Assumption 3.1 (Bounded Entries). *Assume that $|x_{ij}| \leq M$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$, where M is independent of n and d .*

Theorem 3.2. *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, we have for any $\eta \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy ProbitDA with η -warm start and ϵ -error tolerance satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Probit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c M^2 b_1^{\text{Probit}} nd \log \left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon} \right),$$

where c is a universal constant.

See Section 5.2 for proof of Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.3. *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, we have for any $\eta \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LogitDA with η -warm start and ϵ -error tolerance satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Logit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c M^2 b_1^{\text{Logit}} nd \log \left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon} \right),$$

where c is a universal constant.

See Section 5.3 for proof of Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose $n \geq 2 - 2\alpha$. With Assumption 3.1 and a proper prior for the variance $\xi > 0$, we have for any $\eta \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LassoDA with η -warm start and ϵ -error tolerance satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Lasso}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq cd^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \log \left(\frac{\eta}{\epsilon} \right),$$

where c is a constant depending on M and ξ .

See Section 5.4 for proof of Theorem 3.4.

It is common to assume the covariates $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are generated independently from a common distribution, as stated in Assumption 3.5. With this assumption, we improve the previous results for ProbitDA and LogitDA using matrix concentration in Theorem 3.6.

Assumption 3.5 (Independent generation). *Assume that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent realizations of random vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from a distribution \mathcal{L} . We assume that \mathcal{L} has a covariance matrix $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}xx^T$, and that $\|\Sigma\| \leq S$ for some S independent of n and d .*

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.5 are satisfied, as well as one of the following assumptions on the data:*

(a) Assumption 3.1

(b) \mathcal{L} is sub-Gaussian. More precisely, assume that there exists $K \geq 1$ such that

$$\|\langle X, x \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq K \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\langle X, x \rangle^2} \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $\|X'\|_{\psi_2} = \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp\{X'^2/t^2\} \leq 2\}$ is the sub-Gaussian norm for the sub-Gaussian random variable $X' \in \mathbb{R}$.

(c) \mathcal{L} is log-concave.

Let $t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon)$ be the mixing times of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy ProbitDA or LogitDA with η -warm start and ϵ -error tolerance in TV. We conclude the following:

1. If condition (a) holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq cM^2b_1 \left[nS + \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{dM^2}{3} + \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) ndM^2S} \right] \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right).$$

In other words, with high probability,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) = \mathcal{O}\left((n + d \log d) \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

2. If condition (b) holds, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq cM^2b_1 \left[nS + nK^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{d + \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n}} + \frac{d + \log \frac{2}{\delta}}{n} \right) S \right] \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right).$$

In other words, with high probability,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) = \mathcal{O}\left((n + d) \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

3. If condition (c) holds, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c'\sqrt{d})$,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq cM^2b_1(n + d)S \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right).$$

In other words, with high probability,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) = \mathcal{O}\left((n + d) \log\left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon}\right)\right).$$

In summary, if either one of condition (a), (b), or (c) is satisfied, we have that with high probability

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Probit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + d), \quad t_{\Psi^{\text{Logit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n + d).$$

See Appendix A.2 for proof of Theorem 3.6.

3.2 Mixing Time with a Feasible Start

In this subsection, we prove mixing time guarantees for the three DA algorithms starting from known and implementable distributions. For simplicity, we perform the analysis under Assumption 3.1. The results can be generalized to other data assumptions following the same procedure as in Theorem 3.6.

3.2.1 Feasible starts for ProbitDA and LogitDA

We use the same notations as in Section 2.6. Utilizing the strong log-concavity of ProbitDA and LogitDA target distributions, we adopt the following feasible starting distribution for general strongly log-concave targets π in \mathbb{R}^d proposed by [DCWY19],

$$\nu_\star = \mathcal{N}\left(x_\star, \frac{1}{L'}\mathbb{I}_d\right)$$

where x_\star is the mode of π . Following the steps in Section 3.2 of [DCWY19], one can demonstrate that

$$\sup_A \frac{\nu_\star(A)}{\pi(A)} \leq \left(\frac{L'}{m'}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} = \eta_\star, \quad (21)$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Using the m' and L' in equation (19) and equation (20), we can obtain

$$\eta_\star^{\text{Probit}} = \left(\frac{\|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\|}{\lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}, \quad \eta_\star^{\text{Logit}} = \left(\frac{0.25\|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\|}{\lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})}\right)^{\frac{d}{2}}. \quad (22)$$

We note that $\|X^T X\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^T\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i x_i^T\| = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2 \leq ndM^2$ under Assumption 3.1. Substituting $\eta_\star^{\text{Probit}}$ and $\eta_\star^{\text{Logit}}$ into Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.8, we can obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.7. *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, we have that for any error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy ProbitDA starting from $\mathcal{N}(x_\star^{\text{Probit}}, \frac{\mathbb{I}_d}{\|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\|})$ satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Probit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c M^2 b_1^{\text{Probit}} nd \log \frac{b_1^{\text{Probit}} d \log(ndM^2 + 1/b_0^{\text{Probit}})}{\epsilon},$$

where c is a universal constant.

Corollary 3.8. *Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1, we have for any error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LogitDA starting from $\mathcal{N}(x_\star^{\text{Logit}}, \frac{\mathbb{I}_d}{0.25\|X^T X\| + \|B^{-1}\|})$ satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi^{\text{Logit}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c M^2 b_1^{\text{Logit}} nd \log \frac{b_1^{\text{Logit}} d \log(ndM^2 + 1/b_0^{\text{Logit}})}{\epsilon},$$

where c is a universal constant.

Remark. v_\star is a valid feasible start only if we can efficiently compute x_\star . [DCWY19] comments that a δ -approximation of x_\star can be obtained in $\mathcal{O}(\kappa \log \frac{1}{\delta})$ steps using standard optimization algorithms such as gradient descent, and discusses how an inexact x_\star affects the mixing time. We refer interested readers to [DCWY19] (Section 3.2) for a detailed discussion. In the cases of ProbitDA and LogitDA, $\kappa = \mathcal{O}(nd)$ under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.1. The computational complexity of optimization does not exceed that of sampling in Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3, and thus is ignorable.

3.2.2 A Feasible start for LassoDA

One analyzable feasible start for LassoDA is the following:

$$\nu_\dagger(\beta, v|y) \propto \frac{1}{v^{\frac{n+d+2\alpha+1}{2}}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2v}\|y - X\beta\|_2^2 - \lambda \frac{\|\beta\|_2^2}{v} - \frac{\xi}{v}\right\}. \quad (23)$$

Despite the complicated form, one can directly sample from ν_\dagger by noticing that ν_\dagger is a push-forward measure of the following ν'_\dagger by the map $T^{-1} : (\varphi, \rho) \mapsto (\beta, v)$ such that $\beta = \varphi\sqrt{v}$ and $v = \frac{\xi}{\rho^2}$:

$$\nu'_\dagger(\varphi, \rho|y) \propto \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right\},$$

and that under ν'_\dagger ,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^2|y &\sim \text{Gamma}\left(\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}, \xi + \frac{1}{2}y^T(\mathbb{I}_n - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1}X^T)y\right) \\ \varphi|\rho, y &\sim \mathcal{N}(\rho(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1}X^T y, (X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

These altogether show a way to obtain samples from $\nu_\dagger(\beta, v|y)$, which we illustrate in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 A Feasible Start for LassoDA

- 1: **Input:** $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^+$
 - 2: Let $\tilde{y} = y - \bar{y}\mathbf{1}_n$.
 - 3: Draw $\gamma^{(0)} \sim \text{Gamma}(\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}, \xi + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{y}^T(\mathbb{I}_n - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1}X^T)\tilde{y})$.
 - 4: Let $\rho^{(0)} = \sqrt{\gamma^{(0)}}$.
 - 5: Draw $\varphi^{(0)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho^{(0)}(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1}X^T y, (X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}_d)^{-1})$.
 - 6: Let $v^{(0)} = \frac{1}{(\rho^{(0)})^2}$.
 - 7: Let $\beta^{(0)} = \varphi^{(0)}\sqrt{v^{(0)}}$.
 - 8: **Output:** $\beta^{(0)}, v^{(0)}$
-

The next lemma measures the distance between $\nu_\dagger(\beta, v|y)$ and the target of LassoDA. One can get an upper bound on mixing time starting from the feasible start (23) by plugging in this Lemma 3.9 to Theorem 3.4, as we will state in Corollary 3.10.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose $n \geq 2 - 2\alpha$. With Assumption 3.1 and a proper prior for the variance parameter $\xi > 0$,*

$$\sup_A \frac{\nu_\dagger(A)}{\pi_{\text{Lasso}}(A)} \leq e^{c(d \log d + n \log n)},$$

where the supremum is taken over all the measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, and c is a constant depending on M and ξ .

See Appendix A.3 for proof of Lemma 3.9.

Corollary 3.10. *Suppose $n \geq 2 - 2\alpha$. With Assumption 3.1 and a proper prior for the variance parameter $\xi > 0$, we have for any error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LassoDA starting from ν_\dagger satisfies*

$$t_{\Psi_{\text{Lasso}}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c \left(d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2 \left(d \log d + n \log n + \log \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \right)$$

where c is a constant depending on ξ and M .

4 Comparison to Best Known Guarantees of Alternatives

Apart from the DA algorithms, one can alternatively sample from the target distributions of the three DA algorithms using generic sampling algorithms, such as Metropolis-Hastings and gradient-based algorithms. It is a common problem in practice to decide which algorithms to choose. Certainly, without user-tuned parameters, the DA algorithms are the easiest to implement, as the Metropolis-Hastings and gradient-based algorithms usually require user-set proposal distribution or step size. Aside from the apparent advantage of convenience, it is important to compare the DA algorithms and the alternatives in terms of computational complexity. Furthermore, if the DA algorithms are slower, it is useful to specify how much the trade-off is for implementation convenience. One way that theoretical complexity analysis benefits empirical studies is by making quantitative and potentially comprehensive comparisons between alternative algorithms. This section presents our attempt to contribute to this endeavor for the mixing time of the DA algorithm.

However, a complete answer is impossible up to this point. Part of the challenge comes from the fact that a conclusive comparison relies on lower bound analysis, which is unavailable for DA algorithms and underdeveloped for alternative algorithms. Specifically, to demonstrate that Algorithm 1 is faster than

Algorithm 2, one needs to show that an upper bound of Algorithm 1 is smaller than a lower bound of Algorithm 2. As a compromise, we make the *comparison based on upper bounds*: the upper bound of DA algorithms from this work and the best known upper bounds of the alternative algorithms in the literature. We remark on the possibility that the upper bounds could not be tight, failing to reflect the actual complexity, and thus making the comparison invalid.

In addition, we remind the readers of the potential risk of understating the efficiency of the generic algorithm, if one directly applies the generic guarantees to specific algorithms. While the DA algorithms work for specific targets, most guarantees for alternative algorithms are proposed for a general class of distributions. They can be possibly improved for the three specific distributions. Furthermore, without access to their exact values, we can only substitute the best attainable upper bounds of the important quantities, such as condition numbers and isoperimetric constants, into the guarantees of alternative generic sampling algorithms. This could worsen the guarantees. As a result of these limitations, we only take our comparison as a heuristic discussion, without drawing an affirmed conclusion of the superiority of any algorithm.

We will focus on ProbitDA and LogitDA, as the target of LassoDA is not regular enough to fit in the settings of most existing analyses. As we introduce in Section 2.6, standard assumptions of the analysis on the generic sampling algorithm include a strong log-concavity constant $m > 0$ and a gradient Lipschitz constant L . It is not hard to generalize the strong log-concavity to isoperimetry, which is satisfied for the transformed LassoDA’s target (Lemma 5.9). However, the transformed LassoDA’s target does not have a uniform gradient Lipschitz constant, making it hard to apply the existing guarantees.

We choose Langevin Monte Carlo (LMC) and Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) as representative examples of alternative sampling algorithms. The choice is based on a general classification of sampling algorithms: low-accuracy sampler and high-accuracy sampler. **Low-Accuracy Sampler** refers to the sampling algorithm obtained by discretization of stochastic processes, where the discretization introduces bias for the stationary distribution. Examples of low-accuracy samplers include Langevin Monte Carlo and Hamiltonian Monte Carlo. On the other hand, **High-Accuracy Sampler** refers to the sampling algorithm that has an unbiased stationary distribution, such as Gibbs samplers and Metropolis-Hasting algorithms. The DA algorithms are high-accuracy samplers. Considering the simplicity of theoretical results, we employ LMC as an example of an alternative low-accuracy sampler and MALA as an example of an alternative high-accuracy sampler.

ProbitDA/LogitDA v.s. LMC Langevin Monte Carlo (LMC) is a canonical sampling algorithm, which iterates according to the discretization of the Langevin diffusion. Despite the long history, it was only analyzed in non-asymptotic settings recently (e.g. [CB18, DMM19, VW19, DM17, DT12, Dal17a, Dal17b, DM19]). Among the works in the standard m -strongly log-concave and L -smooth setting, [DMM19] obtains the mixing time guarantee $\tilde{O}(\kappa d/\epsilon)$ in KL divergence for LMC with the Euler–Maruyama discretization, where the dependencies on both d and κ are currently the best. This can be translated into $\tilde{O}(\kappa d/\epsilon^2)$ in TV distance using Pinsker’s inequality. Applying the results in (19) and (20) and supposing that Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 2.1 hold, we can obtain that $\kappa^{\text{Probit}} = \mathcal{O}(nd)$ and $\kappa^{\text{Logit}} = \mathcal{O}(nd)$, resulting in a $\tilde{O}(nd^2/\epsilon^2)$ mixing time guarantee for LMC on the targets of ProbitDA and LogitDA. We first note that the LMC result has a polynomial dependence on the error parameter ϵ while our results for ProbitDA and LogitDA have a superior logarithmic dependence on ϵ . Furthermore, the guarantee for LMC has an extra d dependence compared to our results for ProbitDA and LogitDA.

Some more sophisticated designs could potentially make LMC faster. Motivated by the acceleration phenomenon in optimization, the Underdamped LMC (ULMC) is an important variant of LMC in which the momentum is refreshed continuously. The current best mixing time guarantees for ULMC is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{\epsilon}})$ in KL divergence ([MCC⁺21, ZCL⁺23]), equivalently $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\kappa^{\frac{3}{2}}\sqrt{d}}{\epsilon})$ in TV distance. Using the same method as in LMC, the bound becomes $\tilde{O}(\frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}}d^2}{\epsilon})$ for the targets of ProbitDA and LogitDA, which is worse than our guarantees for ProbitDA and LogitDA. Equipping ULMC with the randomized midpoint discretization, [SL19] obtains a mixing time guarantee $\tilde{O}(\frac{\kappa d^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{\kappa^{\frac{7}{6}}d^{\frac{1}{6}}}{\epsilon^{1/3}})$ in Wasserstein distance. Although Wasserstein distance and TV distance are not directly comparable, we can heuristically translate the bound into TV distance; however, the translated bound $\tilde{O}(\frac{nd^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}} + \frac{n^{\frac{7}{6}}d^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\epsilon^{1/3}})$ still has superlinear dependencies in n and d .

ProbitDA/LogitDA v.s. MALA Metropolis Adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) is a fundamental high-accuracy sampler. MALA runs an additional Metropolis accept-reject step in each iteration of LMC, which adjusts the bias in stationary distribution. Among the recent line of works analyzing the mixing time of MALA ([AC24, WSC22, CG23, CDWY20, DCWY19, LST20, CLA⁺21, AC24]), [WSC22, AC24] obtain the state-of-the-art $\mathcal{O}(\kappa d^{1/2})$ complexity bound in TV distance for MALA in m -strongly log-concave and L -smooth setting. Following the same argument as in our discussion of LMC, the bound can be translated into $\mathcal{O}(nd^{3/2})$ for the targets of ProbitDA and LogitDA. We note that the MALA guarantee has an extra $d^{1/2}$ dependence compared to our results for the two DA algorithms.

Despite the obstacles, the comparison provides insight into the superiority of ProbitDA and LogitDA over some generic sampling algorithms. We leave a more thorough and more conclusive comparison for future research.

5 Proofs

Our proofs for upper bounds on mixing times rely on isoperimetry inequalities and the conductance of Markov chains. We will first introduce the techniques and general ideas in Section 5.1 and dive algorithm-specific treatments in the rest of the subsections.

5.1 Proof Strategy Overview and Preliminaries

5.1.1 Isoperimetry

In order to define isoperimetric inequality, we first introduce the notion of the Minkowski content. The **Minkowski content**, or the **boundary measure**, of a measurable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as

$$\pi^+(A) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\pi(A^r) - \pi(A)}{r}$$

where $A^r = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \exists y \in A, \|x - y\| \leq r\}$. We say the measure π satisfies the **Cheeger-type isoperimetry inequality** with constant $\text{Ch}(\pi) > 0$ if for all measurable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\pi^+(A) \geq \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(A), \pi(A^c)\},$$

and this is the minimal such constant. We call $\text{Ch}(\pi)$ the **Cheeger constant** of π . We will employ the following lemmas to calculate or upper bound the Cheeger constants of the ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA's target distributions.

Lemma 5.1. *Let π be a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d .*

1. ([BH97, Tal91]) *If π is a product of double exponential measures, that is $\pi(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|x_i|}{b}}$, we have $\text{Ch}(\pi) = \frac{1}{b}$.*
2. ([CV14]) *If π is m -strongly log-concave, meaning that $\pi \propto e^{-f}$ with f being m -strongly convex, we have $\text{Ch}(\pi) = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$.*

Lemma 5.2 ([Mil12, Corollary 3.4 (1) and equation (3.7)]). *Let μ_1, μ_2 be two log-concave probability measures. If $\|\frac{d\mu_2}{d\mu_1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \exp(D)$, then*

$$\text{Ch}(\mu_2) \leq \mathcal{O}(D) \text{Ch}(\mu_1).$$

See Appendix B.1 for the proof of Lemma 5.2.

5.1.2 Conductance and Mixing Time

With the notion of isoperimetry, we are ready to introduce the conductance-based argument for studying the mixing times. Given an ergodic Markov chain on \mathbb{R}^d with transition kernel \mathcal{P} and stationary distribution π , we define the **conductance** as

$$\Phi = \inf_A \frac{\int_A \mathcal{P}_u(A^c) \pi(u) du}{\min\{\pi(A), \pi(A^c)\}} \quad (24)$$

where A is any measurable set in \mathbb{R}^d . The conductance measures how much probability mass flows between measurable partitions of the state space relative to the stationary measure of the two components, whichever is smaller. By the definition, we can expect a high conductance to contribute to fast mixing. The relationship is stated formally in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.3 ([LS93, Corollary 1.5]). *For a $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy reversible Markov chain with η -warm start ν ,*

$$\text{TV}(\nu \mathcal{P}^k, \pi) \leq \sqrt{\eta} e^{-k\Phi^2/2}.$$

Remark. *The β -marginal chain of the DA chain in (1) is reversible ([LWK94]).*

The lemma above shows that a lower bound on conductance gives an upper bound for the mixing time. The following lemma provides a way to obtain a lower bound on the conductance.

Lemma 5.4 ([Che23, Lemma 7.4.6] and [DCWY19, Lemma 2]). *Consider a Markov chain on \mathbb{R}^d with transition kernel \mathcal{P} and stationary distribution π satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *(Isoperimetry) π satisfies a Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality with constant $\text{Ch}(\pi) > 0$.*
2. *(One-step overlap) For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\|x - y\|_2 \leq \Delta$, we have $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathcal{P}_y) \leq 1 - h$.*

Then, the conductance of the Markov chain satisfies

$$\Phi = \Omega\left(\frac{h\Delta}{\text{Ch}(\pi)}\right).$$

See Appendix B.2 for the proof of Lemma 5.4.

One can obtain an upper bound on mixing time by applying the lower bound for Φ in Lemma 5.4 to Lemma 5.3 to give that

$$\text{TV}(\nu \mathcal{P}^k, \pi) \leq \sqrt{\eta} e^{-k\Phi^2/2} \leq \sqrt{\eta} e^{-ck \frac{\Delta^2}{\text{Ch}^2(\pi)}}.$$

For any error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $k \leq c \frac{\text{Ch}(\pi)^2}{\Delta^2} \log \frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{\epsilon}$ such that $\text{TV}(\nu \mathcal{P}^k, \pi) \leq \epsilon$. This implies

$$t_\Psi(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c \frac{\text{Ch}(\pi)^2}{\Delta^2 h^2} \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\epsilon^2}\right) \quad (25)$$

5.1.3 An Improved Technique based on Conductance Profile

Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.4 comprise the standard conductance-based method for bounding mixing times of Markov chains in general state space, which will result in logarithmic dependence on the warmness parameter (see equation (25)). Building upon this, [CDWY20] propose a technique that leads to mixing time guarantees with double-logarithmic dependence on the warmness parameter. This is a significant improvement especially when the warmness parameter depends exponentially on dimension. The new technique avoids introducing additional polynomial dependence in n or d in this case.

Instead of requiring the target distributions to satisfy a Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality, the new technique applies to distributions satisfying a log-isoperimetric inequality. Formally, a distribution π in

\mathbb{R}^d satisfies the **log-isoperimetric inequality** with constant $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi)$ if for any measurable partition $\mathbb{R}^d = S_1 \sqcup S_2 \sqcup S_3$, we have

$$\pi(S_3) \geq \frac{1}{2 \text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi)} d(S_1, S_2) \min\{\pi(S_1), \pi(S_2)\} \log^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\min\{\pi(S_1), \pi(S_2)\}} \right) \quad (26)$$

where $d(S_1, S_2) = \inf\{\|x - y\|_2 : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}$, and this is the minimal such constant. In particular, the class of strongly log-concave distributions satisfies the log-isoperimetric inequality, as shown in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.5 ([CDWY20, Lemma 16]). *A m -strongly log-concave distribution π satisfies the log-isoperimetric inequality (26) with constant $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$.*

With a log-isoperimetric inequality, [CDWY20] adapts the proof of Lemma 5.4 to lower bound the whole spectrum of conductance instead of the worst-case conductance. Specifically, they derive a lower bound for the **conductance profile** defined as

$$\Phi(v) = \inf_{\pi(A) \in (0, v]} \frac{\int_A \mathcal{P}(u, A^c) \pi(u) du}{\pi(A)} \quad \text{for any } v \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

One can see that the standard conductance in equation (24) is indeed the conductance profile with $v = \frac{1}{2}$ and is the least possible conductance profile over $(0, \frac{1}{2}]$. The next lemma states the lower bound on the conductance profile they obtain.

Lemma 5.6 ([CDWY20, Lemma 4]). *Consider a Markov chain on \mathbb{R}^d with transition kernel \mathcal{P} and stationary distribution π satisfying the following conditions:*

1. (Log-Isoperimetry) π satisfies a log-isoperimetric inequality (26) with constant $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi) > 0$.
2. (One-step overlap) For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\|x - y\|_2 \leq \Delta$, we have $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_x, \mathcal{P}_y) \leq 1 - h$.

Then, the conductance profile of the Markov chain satisfies

$$\Phi(v) = \Omega \left(\frac{h\Delta}{\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi)} \log^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{v} \right) \right) \quad \text{for any } v \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

Similar to conductance, the conductance profile can be used to upper bound the mixing time. This is formally stated in the next lemma, which utilizes the **extended conductance profile** $\tilde{\Phi}(v)$ defined as

$$\tilde{\Phi}(v) = \begin{cases} \Phi(v) & v \in (0, \frac{1}{2}] \\ \Phi(\frac{1}{2}) & v \in [\frac{1}{2}, \infty) \end{cases}.$$

Lemma 5.7 ([CDWY20, Lemma 3]). *Consider a reversible, irreducible, ζ -lazy, and smooth¹ Markov chain Ψ with stationary distribution π . Then, for any error tolerance $\epsilon > 0$, and a η -warm distribution, the mixing time of the chain is bounded as*

$$t_\Psi(\eta, \epsilon) \leq \int_{4/\eta}^{8/\epsilon} \frac{8dv}{\zeta v \tilde{\Phi}^2(v)}.$$

One can further lower bound the conductance profile in Lemma 5.6 by $\Omega(\frac{\Delta}{\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi)} \log^{1/2}(\frac{1}{v}))$ and apply it to Lemma 5.7. If $\eta \geq 8$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_\Psi(\eta, \epsilon) &\lesssim \frac{8 \text{Ch}_{1/2}^2(\pi)}{\zeta \Delta^2 h^2} \left(\int_{4/\eta}^{1/2} \frac{1/v}{\log 1/v} dv + \int_{1/2}^{8/\epsilon} \frac{1/v}{\log 2} dv \right) \\ &= \frac{8 \text{Ch}_{1/2}^2(\pi)}{\zeta \Delta^2 h^2} \left(\log \log t \Big|_2^{\eta/4} + \frac{\log v}{\log 2} \Big|_{1/2}^{8/\epsilon} \right) \quad \text{with } t = \frac{1}{v}. \end{aligned}$$

¹In our cases, the existence of transition kernel guarantees the Markov chain to be smooth. We refer interested readers to [CDWY20] for the formal definition of smoothness.

This implies the following useful upper bound on the mixing time for a ζ -lazy chain,

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq c \frac{\text{Ch}_{1/2}^2(\pi)}{\zeta \Delta^2 h^2} \log \left(\frac{\log \eta}{\epsilon} \right). \quad (27)$$

In the following sections, we dive into the proofs for mixing time upper bound for ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA. Thanks to the strong log-concavity and Lemma 5.5, we can use the improved technique in Section 5.1.3 for ProbitDA and LogitDA to get a better dependency on the warmness parameter. We turn to the standard conductance-based argument in Section 5.1.2 to analyze LassoDA. At a high level, the proof consists of two parts: First, we upper bound the Cheeger constant $\text{Ch}(\pi)$ or log-isoperimetric constant $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi)$. Second, we determine the order of Δ in the one-step overlap condition of Lemma 5.4 or Lemma 5.6. With these results in hand, we can obtain a lower bound of conductance and then use equation (25) or (27) to get an upper bound on the mixing time.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. As mentioned at the end of the last section, the proof will be structured as verifying the two conditions in Lemma 5.6 and then applying equation (27).

Log-Isoperimetry We recall from equation (19) that $m^{\text{Probit}} = \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})$ is a lower bound of m^{Probit} , the strong log-concavity constant of the target of ProbitDA. By Lemma 5.5 and Assumption 2.1,

$$\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi^{\text{Probit}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m^{\text{Probit}}}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m^{\text{Probit}}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(B)} \leq \sqrt{b_1^{\text{Probit}}}.$$

One-Step Overlap We study the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy chain for ProbitDA with kernel $\mathcal{T}^{\text{Probit}} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}^{\text{Probit}}$. Consider $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let z_i be the truncated normal auxiliary variables chosen for β_i , $i = 1, 2$. We are interested in how $\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{T}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}})$ can be upper bounded by $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2$. We have

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{T}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_A |\delta_{\beta_1}(A) - \delta_{\beta_2}(A)| + \frac{1}{2} \sup_A |\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}(A) - \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}(A)| = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}})$$

where the supremum is over measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) &\leq_{(i)} \text{TV}(z_1, z_2) \leq_{(ii)} \sqrt{2 \text{KL}(z_1 \| z_2)} \\ &\leq_{(iii)} \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{KL}(z_{1i} \| z_{2i})} = \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{KL}(TN(x_i^T \beta_1; y_i) \| TN(x_i^T \beta_2; y_i))}, \end{aligned}$$

where we obtain (i) by data processing inequality (DPI), (ii) by Pinsker's inequality, and (iii) by independence of auxiliary variables. This reduces the problem to studying the KL divergence of the 1-dimensional truncated normal distribution. First, we consider $y_i = 1$. Below, \mathbb{E}_{β_1} denotes the expectation taken over $x \sim TN(x_i^T \beta_1, 1; 1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(TN(x_i^T \beta_1, 1; 1) \| TN(x_i^T \beta_2, 1; 1)) &= \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} \log \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x - x_i^T \beta_1)^2} \mathbb{1}\{x \geq 0\}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1)} \Big/ \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x - x_i^T \beta_2)^2} \mathbb{1}\{x \geq 0\}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2)} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} \left[-\frac{1}{2}(x - x_i^T \beta_1)^2 - \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1) + \frac{1}{2}(x - x_i^T \beta_2)^2 + \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2) \right] \\ &= \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2) - \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1) + \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} \left[\frac{(x - x_i^T \beta_1 + x_i^T \beta_1 - x_i^T \beta_2)^2 - (x - x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{2} \right] \\ &= \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2) - \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1) + x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} [x - x_i^T \beta_1] + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \\ &= \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2) - \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1) + x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta_1)}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta_1)} + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last equation comes from the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{\beta_1}[x] = x_i^T \beta_1 + \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta_1)}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta_1)}$.

To study the dependency on $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2$, we define the unit vector $u = \frac{\beta_1 - \beta_2}{\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2}$ and a function $f_i(t) = \log \Phi(x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut))$. One can check that $f_i(0) = \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2)$ and $f_i(\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2) = \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1)$. By taking the second-order Taylor expansion of $f_i(t)$ at $t = \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2$, we have that there exists $t_i \in [0, \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2]$ such that

$$\log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_2) = \log \Phi(x_i^T \beta_1) + \frac{\phi(x_i^T \beta_1)}{\Phi(x_i^T \beta_1)} x_i^T (\beta_2 - \beta_1) - \frac{1}{2} q(x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i)) (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2)$$

where q is defined in (18). Plugging this back into the KL divergence formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(TN(x_i^T \beta_1, 1; 1) \| TN(x_i^T \beta_2, 1; 1)) &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - q(x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i))) (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \\ &\leq_{(i)} \frac{1}{2} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is due to $q(x) \in (0, 1)$ for all x .

We can derive a similar formula for $y_i = 0$: for some $t_i \in [0, \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(TN(x_i^T \beta_1, 1; 0) \| TN(x_i^T \beta_2, 1; 0)) &= \frac{1}{2} (1 - q(-x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i))) (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound of $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}})$ can be written as

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2)} = \sqrt{(\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T X^T X (\beta_1 - \beta_2)} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(X^T X)} \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2.$$

By Assumption 3.1, we can bound $\lambda_{\max}(X^T X)$ by

$$\lambda_{\max}(X^T X) = \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^T \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\max}(x_i x_i^T) = \sum_{i=1}^n \|x_i\|_2^2 \leq ndM^2. \quad (28)$$

Therefore,

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq c\sqrt{ndM^2} \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2.$$

Overall, we have

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{T}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + c\sqrt{ndM^2} \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2.$$

If we choose $\Delta = \frac{1}{4c\sqrt{ndM^2}}$ and $h = \frac{1}{4}$, we have $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq 1 - h$ whenever $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2 \leq \Delta$.

Theorem 3.2 follows if we substitute $\Delta = \frac{1}{4c\sqrt{ndM^2}}$, $h = \frac{1}{4}$, $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi^{\text{Probit}}) \leq \sqrt{b_1^{\text{Probit}}}$ into equation (27). \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. The proof of Theorem 3.3 is similar to Section 5.2 except for some special treatment for Pólya-Gamma variables. Similarly, we verify the two conditions in Lemma 5.6 and then apply equation (27).

Log-Isoperimetry By equation (20), $m'^{\text{Logit}} = \lambda_{\min}(B^{-1}) \leq m^{\text{Logit}}$, and thus by Lemma 5.5 and Assumption 2.1,

$$\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi^{\text{Logit}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m^{\text{Logit}}}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{m'^{\text{Logit}}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(B^{-1})}} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(B)} \leq \sqrt{b_1^{\text{Logit}}}$$

One-Step Overlap We study the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy version of LogitDA with kernel $\mathcal{T}^{\text{Logit}} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}^{\text{Logit}}$. Consider $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let z_i be the Pólya-Gamma auxiliary variables chosen for β_i , $i = 1, 2$. We have

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{T}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Probit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Probit}}).$$

Using data processing inequality in (i), Pinsker's inequality in (ii), and independence of the auxiliary variables in (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Logit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Logit}}) &\leq_{(i)} \text{TV}(z_1, z_2) \leq_{(ii)} \sqrt{2 \text{KL}(z_1 \| z_2)} \\ &=_{(iii)} \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{KL}(z_{1i} \| z_{2i})} = \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n \text{KL}(PG(1, x_i^T \beta_1) \| PG(1, x_i^T \beta_2))}. \end{aligned}$$

We use \mathbb{E}_{β_1} to denote the expectation taken over $PG(1, x_i^T \beta_1)$. Applying equations (11) and 12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(PG(1, x_i^T \beta_1) \| PG(1, x_i^T \beta_2)) &= \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} \log \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{(x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{2}} x \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) f(x; 1, 0)}{e^{-\frac{(x_i^T \beta_2)^2}{2}} x \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2}\right) f(x; 1, 0)} \right) \\ &= \frac{(x_i^T \beta_2)^2 - (x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{\beta_1} [x] + \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) - \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{(x_i^T \beta_2)^2 - (x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{4x_i^T \beta_1} \tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) + \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) - \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{(x_i^T \beta_2 - x_i^T \beta_1 + x_i^T \beta_1)^2 - (x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{4x_i^T \beta_1} \tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) + \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) - \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{(x_i^T \beta_2 - x_i^T \beta_1)^2}{4x_i^T \beta_1} \tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) + \frac{x_i^T (\beta_2 - \beta_1)}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) + \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right) - \log \cosh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2}\right). \quad (29) \end{aligned}$$

We define a unit vector $u = \frac{\beta_1 - \beta_2}{\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|}$ and a function $f_i(t) = \log \cosh \frac{x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut)}{2}$. By Taylor expansion of $f_i(0)$ at $t = \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|$, we obtain that there exists $t_i \in [0, \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|]$ such that

$$\log \cosh \frac{x_i^T \beta_2}{2} = \log \cosh \frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2} + \frac{\tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right)}{2} x_i^T (\beta_2 - \beta_1) + \frac{1}{8 \cosh^2\left(\frac{x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i)}{2}\right)} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2).$$

Plugging this back into the KL divergence formula (29) yields

$$\text{KL}(PG(1, x_i^T \beta_1) \| PG(1, x_i^T \beta_2)) = \left(\frac{\tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right)}{4x_i^T \beta_1} - \frac{1}{8 \cosh^2\left(\frac{x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i)}{2}\right)} \right) (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2)$$

Since $\cosh(x) \geq 1$ and $\frac{\tanh x}{x} \leq 1$, we have $\left(\frac{\tanh\left(\frac{x_i^T \beta_1}{2}\right)}{4x_i^T \beta_1} - \frac{1}{8 \cosh^2\left(\frac{x_i^T (\beta_2 + ut_i)}{2}\right)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{8}$. We can then express the upper bound for $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Logit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Logit}})$ in terms of $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Logit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Logit}}) &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T x_i x_i^T (\beta_1 - \beta_2)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} (\beta_1 - \beta_2)^T X^T X (\beta_1 - \beta_2)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} \lambda_{\max}(X^T X) \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2} \leq c\sqrt{ndM^2} \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2, \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows a similar argument as in equation (28). Therefore, we have

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Logit}}, \mathcal{T}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Logit}}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + c\sqrt{ndM^2} \|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2$$

By choosing $\Delta = \frac{1}{4c\sqrt{ndM^2}}$ and $h = \frac{1}{4}$, we can verify the one-step overlap condition in Lemma 5.6 that $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_{\beta_1}^{\text{Logit}}, \mathcal{P}_{\beta_2}^{\text{Logit}}) \leq 1 - h$ whenever $\|\beta_1 - \beta_2\|_2 \leq \Delta$.

We finish the proof of Theorem 3.3 by using $\Delta = \frac{1}{4c\sqrt{ndM^2}}$, $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}$, $h = \frac{1}{4}$, and $\text{Ch}_{1/2}(\pi^{\text{Logit}}) \leq \sqrt{b_1^{\text{Logit}}}$ in equation (27). \square

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Direct analysis of the LassoDA could be complicated. Instead, we consider a one-to-one transformation of the Markov chain underlying LassoDA. The transformation simplifies the problem in two ways: (1) it makes the non-log-concave target of LassoDA log-concave, and (2) it simplifies the transition kernel.

Next, we make precise the notion of transformation of a Markov chain. For simplicity of notation, given a Markov chain with state space Ω , we define a **Markov chain triple** as the composite of its target distribution π , its starting distribution ν , and its transition kernel \mathcal{P} , denoted as (ν, \mathcal{P}, π) . For any bijective measurable function $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$, we denote the **T -transformed Markov chain** of Ψ by Ψ_T . If Ψ is the Markov chain triple (ν, \mathcal{P}, π) , then Ψ_T is the triple $(\nu_T, \mathcal{P}_T, \pi_T)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_T &= T_{\#}\pi \\ \nu_T &= T_{\#}\nu \\ \mathcal{P}_T(x, \cdot) &= T_{\#}(\delta_{T^{-1}(x)}\mathcal{P})\end{aligned}$$

where δ_a is the Dirac measure centered at a , and $T_{\#}\pi$ is the push-forward measure of π by T . Additionally, we call π_T and \mathcal{P}_T the **T -transformed target distribution** and **T -transformed transition kernel**, respectively. Intuitively, the idea underlying the T -transformed Markov chain is to view the original Markov chain from a parameter space transformed by T . To validate the analysis under a transformed Markov chain, we establish the equivalence of the mixing time under one-to-one transformation in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose we have a Markov chain Ψ on Ω with transition kernel \mathcal{P} and stationary distribution π , and a bijection $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$. For any error tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and warmness $\eta \geq 1$ of the initial distributions, we have that $\pi_T = T_{\#}\pi$ is the stationary distribution of \mathcal{P}_T and*

$$t_{\Psi}(\eta, \epsilon) = t_{\Psi_T}(\eta, \epsilon).$$

Proof of Lemma 5.8. Suppose the Markov chain Ψ has an associated triple (ν, \mathcal{P}, π) . Then, its T -transformed Markov chain has the triple $(\nu_T, \mathcal{P}_T, \pi_T)$. First, note that

$$\mu\mathcal{P}_T = T_{\#}(((T^{-1})_{\#}\mu)\mathcal{P}).$$

In particular, for $\mu = \nu_T$, $\nu_T\mathcal{P}_T = T_{\#}(\nu\mathcal{P})$. Iterating this and putting $\mu = T_{\#}\nu$ gives $\nu_T\mathcal{P}_T^k = T_{\#}(\nu\mathcal{P}^k)$. By the invariance of TV distance under one-to-one transformation, we have for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ that

$$\text{TV}(\nu\mathcal{P}^k, \pi) = \text{TV}(\nu_T\mathcal{P}_T^k, \pi_T).$$

Furthermore, T being a bijection implies that ν_T is also an η -warm start, and thus the lemma follows. \square

Remark. *We remark that for any ergodic Markov chain Ψ , the T -transformation of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy Ψ is the same as $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy version of the T -transformed Ψ , because*

$$T_{\#}\left(\left((T^{-1})_{\#}\mu\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{T} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{2}T_{\#}\left(\left((T^{-1})_{\#}\mu\right)\mathcal{P}\right) + \frac{1}{2}T_{\#}\left(\left((T^{-1})_{\#}\mu\right)\right) = \mu\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}_T + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}\right)$$

That is, to study the mixing time of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy Ψ , it is equivalent to consider the mixing time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy version of the T -transformed Ψ .

This section is arranged as follows: Section 5.4.1 comprises the core of the proof for Theorem 3.4. Section 5.4.2 and Section 5.4.3 are devoted to the deferred proofs of the two lemmas used in Section 5.4.1. In order to simplify notation, we drop the superscripts $^{\text{Lasso}}$ from our notation for the rest of this section.

5.4.1 Mixing Time of the Transformed LassoDA Chain

By Lemma 5.8, we can study the mixing time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LassoDA with kernel $\mathcal{T} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_{(d+1)} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}$ on an equivalent one-to-one transformed chain. In particular, we use the same bijective map as in Appendix A of [PC08]: $T : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^+$ that transforms (β, v) to a new parameter space (φ, ρ) according to

$$\varphi = \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{v}}, \quad \rho = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}}.$$

We first analyze the effects of the transformation T on the target and Markov transition kernel. Then, we develop an upper bound of the mixing time for the transformed Markov chain using the standard conductance-based argument introduced in Section 5.1.2.

T -transformed Target Distribution of LassoDA The T -transformed target of LassoDA is $\pi_T = T_{\#}\pi$. We recall from (16) that the (non-log-concave) LassoDA target is

$$\pi(v, \beta|y) \propto \frac{1}{v^{(n+d+2\alpha+2)/2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2v}\|\tilde{y}-X\beta\|_2^2 - \lambda\frac{\|\beta\|_1}{\sqrt{v}} - \frac{\xi}{v}}.$$

Next, we will show that the transformation by T makes a log-concave target. We have that

$$\det(\nabla T^{-1}) = \det \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \frac{1}{\rho} & 0 \\ -\frac{\varphi_1}{\rho^2} & \cdots & \cdots & -\frac{\varphi_d}{\rho^2} & -\frac{2}{\rho^3} \end{bmatrix} = -\frac{2}{\rho^{3+d}}.$$

The T -transformed LassoDA target is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_T(\varphi, \rho|y) &\propto \rho^{n+2\alpha+d+1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \rho^2\xi\right) |\det(\nabla T^{-1})| \\ &\propto \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \rho^2\xi\right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Suppose that $\pi_T \propto e^{-f_T}$, we have

$$f_T = -(n+2\alpha-2)\log\rho + \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 + \lambda\|\varphi\|_1 + \rho^2\xi.$$

It is not hard to see f_T is a convex function for $n \geq 2 - 2\alpha$ in (β, v) . Therefore, π_T is log-concave.

$\frac{1}{2}$ -Lazy T -Transformed Transition Kernel of LassoDA The transformation also largely simplifies the Markov transition kernel. We claim that given the special structure of T -transformed LassoDA's kernel, it suffices to study the φ -marginal chain of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy T -transformed LassoDA.

By Lemma 5.8, the (non-lazy) T -transformed LassoDA's kernel \mathcal{P}_T is illustrated below:

$$(\varphi^{(m-1)}, \rho^{(m-1)}) \xrightarrow{T^{-1}} \underbrace{(\beta^{(m-1)}, v^{(m-1)}) \rightarrow z^{(m)} \rightarrow (\beta^{(m)}, v^{(m)})}_{\text{The original kernel of LassoDA}} \xrightarrow{T} (\varphi^{(m)}, \rho^{(m)}). \quad (32)$$

We first note that in (32), $z^{(m)}$ is sufficient for $\varphi^{(m)}$ and $\rho^{(m)}$. Furthermore, one can show that $z^{(m)}$ depends only on $\varphi^{(m-1)}$, and is independent of $\rho^{(m-1)}$, because

$$z^{(m)} = \text{IG}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2 v^{(m-1)}}{(\beta^{(m-1)})^2}}, \lambda^2\right) = \text{IG}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{(\varphi^{(m-1)})^2}}, \lambda^2\right) \quad (33)$$

These altogether imply that the φ sample is sufficient to generate next-step ρ and φ on the non-lazy T -transformed LassoDA. The transformed kernel is illustrated in Figure 2. The structure has the following important implications.

First, the independence of $z^{(m)}$ on $\rho^{(m-1)}$ ensure that the φ -marginal chain is well-defined. Specifically, we use $(\nu_{T_\varphi}, \mathcal{P}_{T_\varphi}, \pi_{T_\varphi})$ to denote the Markov chain triple of the φ -marginal chain of the T -transformed LassoDA Ψ_T . Furthermore, we use Ψ_{T_φ} to denote the φ -marginal chain of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy Ψ_T , with transition kernel $\mathcal{T}_{T_\varphi} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}_{T_\varphi} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_d$. Note that Ψ_{T_φ} is also $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy.

Second, the sufficiency of φ for the next-step ρ enables us to control the mixing time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy Ψ_T by that of Ψ_{T_φ} . To show this, we consider the samples or the corresponding distributions of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy Ψ_T at the m^{th} iterations as $\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}$ and $\rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}$, and the transition kernel as $\mathcal{T}_T = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I} + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}_T$. Interpreting the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy chain as the process of flipping a fair coin at each iteration to decide whether to stay at the previous state, we have

$$\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \varphi^{(k)} \quad \rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)} = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \rho^{(k)}. \quad (34)$$

To demonstrate the sufficiency of the φ -marginal chain, we consider another (non-lazy) Markov chain that evolves according to the same kernel as in equation (32), but starts from the stationary distribution π_T . Then the chain will remain at the distribution π_T . We use a subscript π to indicate the samples are from this stationary chain. Similarly, we define the samples of $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy stationary chain as $\varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)}$ and $\rho_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)}$. The same equations as (34) hold for the stationary chain.

Using $\mathcal{P}_{T_{\varphi \rightarrow \rho}}$ to denote the transition kernel from $\varphi^{(m-1)}$ to $\rho^{(m)}$, we have that under a η -warm start,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV} \left(\rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \rho_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right) \\ &= \text{TV} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \rho^{(k)}, \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \rho_{\pi}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= \text{TV} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \rho^{(0)} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} \varphi^{(k-1)} \mathcal{P}_{T_{\varphi \rightarrow \rho}}, \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \rho_{\pi}^{(0)} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \sum_{k=1}^m \binom{m}{k} \varphi_{\pi}^{(k-1)} \mathcal{P}_{T_{\varphi \rightarrow \rho}} \right) \\ &\leq_{(i)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \text{TV} \left(\rho^{(0)}, \rho_{\pi}^{(0)} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{k} \varphi^{(k)} \mathcal{P}_{T_{\varphi \rightarrow \rho}}, \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{k} \varphi_{\pi}^{(k)} \mathcal{P}_{T_{\varphi \rightarrow \rho}} \right) \\ &\leq_{(ii)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \text{TV} \left(\rho^{(0)}, \rho_{\pi}^{(0)} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{k} \varphi^{(k)}, \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{m-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{m}{k} \varphi_{\pi}^{(k)} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \text{TV} \left(\rho^{(0)}, \rho_{\pi}^{(0)} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV} \left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m-1)}, \varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m-1)} \right) \\ &\leq_{(iii)} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \eta + \frac{1}{2} \text{TV} \left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m-1)}, \varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m-1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is by the definition of TV distance in (2), (ii) is due to data processing equality, (iii) follows from the fact that

$$\text{TV} \left(\rho^{(0)}, \rho_{\pi}^{(0)} \right) \leq \text{TV} \left(\nu_T, \pi_T \right) = \sup_A |\nu_T(A) - \pi_T(A)| = \sup_A \pi_T(A) \left| \frac{\nu_T(A)}{\pi_T(A)} - 1 \right| \leq \eta.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV} \left(\nu_T \mathcal{T}_T^m, \pi_T \right) &= \text{TV} \left(\left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right), \left(\varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \rho_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \text{TV} \left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right) + \text{TV} \left(\rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \rho_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right) \\ &\leq \text{TV} \left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m-1)}, \varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m-1)} \right) + \text{TV} \left(\rho_{\text{lazy}}^{(m)}, \rho_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m)} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^m \eta + \frac{3}{2} \text{TV} \left(\varphi_{\text{lazy}}^{(m-1)}, \varphi_{\pi, \text{lazy}}^{(m-1)} \right) \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Illustration of the kernel of T -transformed LassoDA

Overall, we have

$$\text{TV}(\nu\mathcal{T}^m, \pi) = \text{TV}(\nu_T\mathcal{T}_T^m, \pi_T) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m \eta + \frac{3}{2} \text{TV}(\nu_{T_\varphi}\mathcal{T}_{T_\varphi}^{(m-1)}, \pi_{T_\varphi}) \quad (35)$$

Equation (35) gives us a way to control the mixing time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LassoDA by that of φ -marginal of its T -transformed chain. Therefore, studying the mixing times of the φ -marginal chain is sufficient.

The target of the marginal chain is

$$\pi_{T_\varphi}(\varphi) = \pi_T(\varphi|y) \propto \exp\{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1\} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right\} d\rho. \quad (36)$$

Note π_{T_φ} is log-concave because it is a marginal of the log-concave distribution π_T in (31).

Mixing Time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -Lazy T -Transformed Chain The analysis above reduces the problem to proving an upper bound of the mixing time of Ψ_{T_φ} . We perform the analysis using the standard conductance-based method in Section 5.1.2. For clarity, we extract the two main parts of the proof as lemmas below. We defer their proofs to Section 5.4.2 and Section 5.4.3.

Lemma 5.9. (*Isoperimetry of π_{T_φ}*) *The Cheeger constant of the φ -marginal of the T -transformed LassoDA's target in equation (36) satisfies*

$$\text{Ch}(\pi_{T_\varphi}) = \mathcal{O}(d \log d + n \log n).$$

See Section 5.4.2 for proof of Lemma 5.9.

Lemma 5.10. (*One-step overlap of Ψ_{T_φ}*) *The transition kernel of φ -marginal of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy T -transformed LassoDA satisfies*

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}'_x, \mathcal{P}'_y) \leq \frac{3}{4} \text{ whenever } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \|x - y\|_2 \leq \frac{c}{d},$$

where c is a universal constant.

See Section 5.4.3 for proof of Lemma 5.10.

Using Lemma 5.9, Lemma 5.10, and Lemma 5.4, we can obtain a lower bound on the conductance of the Ψ_{T_φ} ,

$$\Phi \geq c \frac{1}{d(d \log d + n \log n)}.$$

Lemma 5.3 implies that with a η -warm start, we have

$$\text{TV}(\nu_{T_\varphi}\mathcal{T}_{T_\varphi}^k, \pi_{T_\varphi}) \leq \sqrt{\eta} e^{-ck \frac{1}{d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2}}.$$

Then, by (34),

$$\text{TV}(\nu\mathcal{T}^k, \pi) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \eta + \frac{3}{2} \sqrt{\eta} e^{-c \frac{k-1}{d^2(d \log d + n \log n)^2}}.$$

To guarantee that $\text{TV}(\nu\mathcal{T}^k, \pi)$ is within ϵ , it suffice to ensure that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k \eta \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{\eta}e^{-c\frac{k-1}{d^2(d\log d+n\log n)^2}} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

which implies that $k \geq c \log\left(\frac{2n}{\epsilon}\right)$ and $k \geq 1 + cd^2(d\log d + n\log n)^2 \log\left(\frac{3\sqrt{\eta}}{\epsilon}\right)$. Therefore, the mixing time of the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy LassoDA satisfies

$$t_{\Psi\text{Lasso}}(\eta, \epsilon) \leq cd^2(d\log d + n\log n)^2 \log\left(\frac{\eta}{\epsilon}\right).$$

Theorem 3.4 follows.

5.4.2 Proof of Lemma 5.9

Proof. The target (36) is in general weakly-log-concave. We use Lemma 5.2 to relate the Cheeger constant of the target of LassoDA to the known Cheeger constant of the double exponential distribution (Lemma 5.1(1)). Let $\mu(\varphi) = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^d e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1}$ be the reference double exponential distribution. To utilize Lemma 5.2, we need to measure the infinity-divergence between π_{T_φ} and μ (the L^∞ norm of their ratio):

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d\pi_{T_\varphi}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^\infty} &= \max_{\varphi} \frac{e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1} \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\rho}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho} \frac{(2/\lambda)^d}{e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1}} \\ &= (2/\lambda)^d \max_{\varphi} \frac{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} d\rho}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho} \\ &\leq (2/\lambda)^d \frac{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} d\rho}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho} \tag{37} \\ &= \frac{(2/\lambda)^d \frac{1}{2} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}\right) \xi^{-\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}}}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to lower bound the partition function in the denominator. Since $\|\varphi\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d |\varphi_j| \leq \sum_{j=1}^d (\varphi_j^2 + 1) = d + \|\varphi\|_2^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho \\ &\geq e^{-\lambda d} \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2} d\varphi d\rho \\ &= e^{-\lambda d} \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\varphi^T(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})\varphi - 2\rho y^T X\varphi + \rho^2 y^T y)} d\varphi d\rho \\ &= e^{-\lambda d} \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 y^T (\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T) y} \\ &\quad \cdot \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\varphi - \rho(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T y)^T (X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}) (\varphi - \rho(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T y)} d\varphi d\rho \\ &= e^{-\lambda d} (2\pi)^{d/2} |(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}|^{1/2} \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} e^{-\rho^2\xi - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 y^T (\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T) y} d\rho \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda d} (2\pi)^{d/2} |(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}|^{1/2} \int_{\gamma} \gamma^{\frac{n+2\alpha-3}{2}} e^{-\gamma(\xi + \frac{1}{2} y^T (\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T) y)} d\gamma \quad (\gamma = \rho^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} e^{-\lambda d} (2\pi)^{d/2} |(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}|^{1/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}\right) \left(\xi + \frac{1}{2} y^T (\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1} X^T) y\right)^{-\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{d\pi_{T_\varphi}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \underbrace{e^{\lambda d} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\lambda\sqrt{\pi}} \right)^d}_{(a)} \underbrace{|X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}|^{1/2}}_{(b)} \underbrace{\left(\frac{\xi + \frac{1}{2}y^T(\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}X^T)y}{\xi} \right)^{\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}}}_{(c)}. \quad (38)$$

Next, we analyze the dependency on n and d of the logarithm of the three parts in (38).

Part (a)

$$\log e^{\lambda d} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\lambda\sqrt{\pi}} \right)^d = \lambda d + d \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\lambda\sqrt{\pi}} \right) = \mathcal{O}(d).$$

Part (b) Suppose $\lambda_d \geq \dots \geq \lambda_1 \geq 0$ are the eigenvalues of $X^T X$. Then, we have

$$\log |X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I}| = \log \prod_{i=1}^d (\lambda_i + 2\lambda) \leq \log \prod_{i=1}^d (\lambda_d + 2\lambda) = d \log(\lambda_d + 2\lambda) \stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathcal{O}(d \log nd)$$

where in (i) we use (28).

Part (c) We first notice that

$$y^T (\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}X^T)y \leq \|y\|_2^2 (1 - \lambda_{\min}(X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}X^T)) \leq \|y\|_2^2,$$

where the last inequality comes from the fact that $X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}X^T$ is positive semi definite. Then,

$$\log \left(\frac{\xi + \frac{1}{2}y^T(\mathbb{I} - X(X^T X + 2\lambda\mathbb{I})^{-1}X^T)y}{\xi} \right)^{\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}} \leq \log \left(\frac{\xi + \frac{1}{2}\|y\|_2^2}{\xi} \right)^{\frac{n+2\alpha-1}{2}} = \mathcal{O}(n \log n).$$

Putting the three parts together, we get that

$$\log \left\| \frac{d\pi_{T_\varphi}}{d\mu} \right\|_{L^\infty} = \mathcal{O}(d \log d + n \log n).$$

Applying Lemma 5.2 and 5.1(1), the Cheeger constant of π_{T_φ} satisfies

$$\text{Ch}(\pi_{T_\varphi}) \leq c(d \log d + n \log n) \text{Ch}(\mu) = \mathcal{O}(d \log d + n \log n).$$

□

5.4.3 Proof of Lemma 5.10

When studying the one-step overlap condition for ProbitDA and LogitDA, we upper bound the TV distance of the latent variables by the KL divergence for ease of calculation. This is not possible for the LassoDA at some extreme parameter values, as the KL divergence of the auxiliary inverse Gaussian random variables diverges. We use the following lemma to deal with the extreme cases. Intuitively, the lemma characterizes the limiting behavior of the IG variable with a growing mean and a fixed shape parameter.

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose $\mu_1, \mu_2, \lambda > 0$. Then*

$$\text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_1, \lambda), \text{IG}(\mu_2, \lambda)) \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\lambda}{\pi \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}}}.$$

See Appendix A.1 for the proof of Lemma 5.11.

Proof of Lemma 5.10. For simplicity, we use \mathcal{P}' to denote $\mathcal{P}_{T\varphi}$. We study the $\frac{1}{2}$ -lazy version of the φ -marginal of the T -transformed LassoDA with kernel $\mathcal{T}' = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{I}_d + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}'$. For any $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let z_i be the latent IG variables chosen for $\varphi_i, i = 1, 2$. We have

$$TV(\mathcal{T}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{T}'_{\varphi_2}) \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}TV(\mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_2}).$$

Then, by the data processing inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} TV(\mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_2}) &\leq TV(z_1, z_2) \\ &= TV\left(\left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=1}^d, \left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=1}^d\right). \end{aligned}$$

The TV distance of IG variables does not have a closed form. We can upper bound it by the KL divergence using Pinsker's inequality, as in the analysis of ProbitDA and LogitDA. We begin by showing that this is feasible only when either $|\varphi_{1j}|$ or $|\varphi_{2j}|$ is large. Below, $\mathbb{E}_{\varphi_{1j}}$ denotes the expectation taken over $\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right)$.

Let $\mu_{ij} = \frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{ij}|}$ for $1, 2$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}\left(\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right) \parallel \text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\varphi_{1j}} \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2(x-\mu_{1j})^2}{2\mu_{1j}^2 x}\right\}}{\sqrt{\frac{\lambda^2}{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda^2(x-\mu_{2j})^2}{2\mu_{2j}^2 x}\right\}}\right) \\ &= \lambda^2 \left[\left(\frac{1}{2\mu_{2j}^2} - \frac{1}{2\mu_{1j}^2}\right) \mathbb{E}_{\varphi_{1j}} x + \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{1j}} - \frac{1}{\mu_{2j}}\right) \right] \\ &= \lambda^2 \left[\left(\frac{\varphi_{2j}^2}{2\lambda^2} - \frac{\varphi_{1j}^2}{2\lambda^2}\right) \frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|} + \left(\frac{|\varphi_{1j}|}{\lambda} - \frac{|\varphi_{2j}|}{\lambda}\right) \right] \\ &= \lambda \left[\left(\frac{\varphi_{2j}^2}{2} - \frac{\varphi_{1j}^2}{2}\right) \frac{1}{|\varphi_{1j}|} + (|\varphi_{1j}| - |\varphi_{2j}|) \right] \end{aligned}$$

One can see that we cannot use the KL divergence to perform the analysis when both $|\varphi_{1j}|$ and $|\varphi_{2j}|$ are small, as KL divergence diverges in this case. (Either $|\varphi_{1j}|$ or $|\varphi_{2j}|$ being small is sufficient because we can bound TV distance by KL divergence in either direction.) We separate this extreme case and deal with it using the bound in Lemma 5.11. Let $m_j = \max\{|\varphi_{1j}|, |\varphi_{2j}|\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. WLOG, we assume that for some $1 \leq k \leq d$, $m_j \leq \frac{C}{d^2}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $m_j \geq \frac{C}{d^2}$ for $j = k+1, \dots, d$, where $C = \frac{\pi}{64}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &TV(\mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_2}) \\ &\leq TV\left(\left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=1}^k, \left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=1}^k\right) + TV\left(\left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=k+1}^d, \left\{\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right\}_{j=k+1}^d\right) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^k TV\left(\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right), \text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right)}_{\text{The extreme case: Using Lemma 5.11 to bound}} + \underbrace{\sqrt{2 \sum_{j=k+1}^d \text{KL}\left(\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right), \text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right)}}_{\text{The regular case: Using } \|\varphi_{1j} - \varphi_{2j}\|_2 \text{ to bound}} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The Extreme Case For $j \leq k$, we have that $\max\{|\varphi_{1j}|, |\varphi_{2j}|\} \leq \frac{C}{d^2}$. By Lemma 5.11,

$$TV\left(\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right), \text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right) \leq \sqrt{\frac{4\lambda}{\pi \max\{|\varphi_{1j}|, |\varphi_{2j}|\}}} \leq \frac{1}{4d}. \quad (40)$$

The Regular Case For $j \geq k+1$, WLOG, we assume that $|\varphi_{1j}| \geq |\varphi_{2j}|$, then $|\varphi_{1j}| \geq \frac{C}{d^2}$. To control $\text{KL}\left(\text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2\right) \parallel \text{IG}\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2\right)\right)$ using $|\varphi_{1j} - \varphi_{2j}|$, expand

$$\frac{\varphi_{2j}^2}{2} = \frac{\varphi_{1j}^2}{2} + \varphi_{1j}(\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j}) + \frac{1}{2}(\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j})^2.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL} \left(\text{IG} \left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{1j}|}, \lambda^2 \right) \parallel \text{IG} \left(\frac{\lambda}{|\varphi_{2j}|}, \lambda^2 \right) \right) &= \lambda \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{|\varphi_{1j}|} (\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j})^2 + \underbrace{\text{sign}(\varphi_{1j})(\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j}) + |\varphi_{1j}| - |\varphi_{2j}|}_{\leq 0} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{2C} d^2 (\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Using inequalities (40) and (41) in equation (39), we have

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_2}) \leq \frac{k}{4d} + cd \sqrt{\sum_{j=k+1}^d (\varphi_{2j} - \varphi_{1j})^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} + cd \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_2.$$

Overall, we obtain

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{T}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{T}'_{\varphi_2}) \leq \frac{5}{8} + cd \|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_2.$$

If we choose $\Delta = \frac{1}{8cd}$, $\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_2 \leq \Delta$ guarantees that $\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_1}, \mathcal{P}'_{\varphi_2}) \leq \frac{3}{4}$. \square

6 Conclusion and Discussion

By establishing fast mixing guarantees for three important DA algorithms (ProbitDA, LogitDA, and LassoDA), our work addresses the non-asymptotic aspect of the long-standing ‘‘convergence complexity’’ problem for the three DA algorithms ([RS15]), and methodologically builds on a long line of literature on mixing time using convex geometry and isoperimetric inequalities.

To conclude, we list a few directions that merit further investigation:

Lower Bounds It is an interesting open question to obtain lower bounds on the mixing time of the three DA algorithms. The lower bound analysis can provide insights for the tightness of the upper bounds, and contribute to a more thorough comparison between the three DA algorithms and alternative algorithms.

Dependency on Warmness and Isoperimetry Constant for LassoDA Unlike the case in ProbitDA and LogitDA, we found it challenging to study the isoperimetric constant of the target distribution and to improve the dependency on warmness of initial distribution for LassoDA. This is partially because many important underlying techniques that support the analysis for strongly log-concave distributions are not readily carried over to weakly log-concave settings. We believe better guarantees will be available with more research on the underlying techniques. Specifically, viewing the transformed-LassoDA’s target as a log-concave perturbation of the double exponential distribution, one can establish a better bound if given access to a generalized Caffarelli contraction theorem ([Caf00]) using the double exponential distribution as the source distribution. Moreover, one can make the dependence on the warmness parameter milder (e.g., double logarithmic) and hence allow good convergence from cold starts, if more results on log-isoperimetric inequalities for weakly log-concave distributions are available.

Despite these obstacles, we believe our guarantees provide useful insights for empirical studies using the three DA algorithms and theoretical studies of other MCMC algorithms.

References

- [AC93] James H Albert and Siddhartha Chib. Bayesian analysis of binary and polychotomous response data. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 88(422):669–679, 1993.
- [AC24] Jason M Altschuler and Sinho Chewi. Faster high-accuracy log-concave sampling via algorithmic warm starts. *Journal of the ACM*, 71(3):1–55, 2024.
- [AGB15] David Alonso-Gutiérrez and Jesús Bastero. *Approaching the Kannan-Lovász-Simonovits and variance conjectures*, volume 2131. Springer, 2015.

- [AK91] David Applegate and Ravi Kannan. Sampling and integration of near log-concave functions. In *Proceedings of the twenty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 156–163, 1991.
- [ALPTJ10] Radosław Adamczak, Alexander Litvak, Alain Pajor, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann. Quantitative estimates of the convergence of the empirical covariance matrix in log-concave ensembles. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 23(2):535–561, 2010.
- [ALPTJ11] Radosław Adamczak, Alexander E Litvak, Alain Pajor, and Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann. Sharp bounds on the rate of convergence of the empirical covariance matrix. *Comptes Rendus. Mathématique*, 349(3-4):195–200, 2011.
- [BCE⁺22] Krishna Balasubramanian, Sinho Chewi, Murat A Erdogdu, Adil Salim, and Shunshi Zhang. Towards a theory of non-log-concave sampling: first-order stationarity guarantees for langevin monte carlo. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2896–2923. PMLR, 2022.
- [BH97] Sergey G Bobkov and Christian Houdré. Isoperimetric constants for product probability measures. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 184–205, 1997.
- [BK19] Franck Barthe and Bo’az Klartag. Spectral gaps, symmetries and log-concave perturbations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.01823*, 2019.
- [BM13] Franck Barthe and Emanuel Milman. Transference principles for log-sobolev and spectral-gap with applications to conservative spin systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 323(2):575–625, 2013.
- [Bob99] Sergey G Bobkov. Isoperimetric and analytic inequalities for log-concave probability measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 27(4):1903–1921, 1999.
- [Caf00] Luis A Caffarelli. Monotonicity properties of optimal transportation and the FKG and related inequalities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 214:547–563, 2000.
- [Car01] Markov Chain Monte Carlo. Honest exploration of intractable probability distributions via. *Statistical Science*, 16(4):312–334, 2001.
- [CB18] Xiang Cheng and Peter Bartlett. Convergence of langevin mcmc in kl-divergence. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 186–211. PMLR, 2018.
- [CDWY18] Yuansi Chen, Raaz Dwivedi, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Fast mcmc sampling algorithms on polytopes. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(55):1–86, 2018.
- [CDWY20] Yuansi Chen, Raaz Dwivedi, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Fast mixing of metropolized hamiltonian monte carlo: Benefits of multi-step gradients. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(92):1–72, 2020.
- [CE07] Alma Cohen and Liran Einav. Estimating risk preferences from deductible choice. *American economic review*, 97(3):745–788, 2007.
- [CEL⁺24] Sinho Chewi, Murat A Erdogdu, Mufan Li, Ruoqi Shen, and Matthew S Zhang. Analysis of langevin monte carlo from poincare to log-sobolev. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–51, 2024.
- [CG20] Patrick Cattiaux and Arnaud Guillin. On the poincaré constant of log-concave measures. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar (GAFA) 2017-2019 Volume I*, pages 171–217. Springer, 2020.
- [CG23] Yuansi Chen and Khashayar Gatzmiry. When does metropolized hamiltonian monte carlo provably outperform metropolis-adjusted langevin algorithm? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04724*, 2023.

- [CH13] Hee Min Choi and James P Hobert. The polya-gamma gibbs sampler for bayesian logistic regression is uniformly ergodic. 2013.
- [Che23] Sinho Chewi. Log-concave sampling. *Book draft available at <https://chewisinho.github.io>*, 2023.
- [CLA⁺21] Sinho Chewi, Chen Lu, Kwangjun Ahn, Xiang Cheng, Thibaut Le Gouic, and Philippe Rigollet. Optimal dimension dependence of the metropolis-adjusted langevin algorithm. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1260–1300. PMLR, 2021.
- [Cou20] Thomas A Courtade. Bounds on the poincaré constant for convolution measures. 2020.
- [CV14] Ben Cousins and Santosh Vempala. A cubic algorithm for computing gaussian volume. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on discrete algorithms*, pages 1215–1228. SIAM, 2014.
- [Dal17a] Arnak Dalalyan. Further and stronger analogy between sampling and optimization: Langevin monte carlo and gradient descent. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 678–689. PMLR, 2017.
- [Dal17b] Arnak S Dalalyan. Theoretical guarantees for approximate sampling from smooth and log-concave densities. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 79(3):651–676, 2017.
- [DCWY19] Raaz Dwivedi, Yuansi Chen, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Log-concave sampling: Metropolis-hastings algorithms are fast. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(183):1–42, 2019.
- [DD18] Daniele Durante and David B Dunson. Bayesian inference and testing of group differences in brain networks. 2018.
- [DFK91] Martin Dyer, Alan Frieze, and Ravi Kannan. A random polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the volume of convex bodies. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 38(1):1–17, 1991.
- [DGH⁺23] Yin Dai, Yuan Gao, Jian Huang, Yuling Jiao, Lican Kang, and Jin Liu. Lipschitz transport maps via the follmer flow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03490*, 2023.
- [DK19] Arnak S Dalalyan and Avetik Karagulyan. User-friendly guarantees for the langevin monte carlo with inaccurate gradient. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(12):5278–5311, 2019.
- [DM17] Alain Durmus and Eric Moulines. Nonasymptotic convergence analysis for the unadjusted langevin algorithm. 2017.
- [DM19] Alain Durmus and Eric Moulines. High-dimensional bayesian inference via the unadjusted langevin algorithm. 2019.
- [DMM19] Alain Durmus, Szymon Majewski, and Błażej Miasojedow. Analysis of langevin monte carlo via convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(73):1–46, 2019.
- [DR94] Jean Diebolt and Christian P Robert. Estimation of finite mixture distributions through bayesian sampling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 56(2):363–375, 1994.
- [DT12] Arnak S Dalalyan and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Sparse regression learning by aggregation and langevin monte-carlo. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 78(5):1423–1443, 2012.
- [DW16] Michaela Dvorzak and Helga Wagner. Sparse bayesian modelling of underreported count data. *Statistical Modelling*, 16(1):24–46, 2016.

- [EHZ22] Murat A Erdogdu, Rasa Hosseinzadeh, and Shunshi Zhang. Convergence of langevin monte carlo in chi-squared and rényi divergence. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 8151–8175. PMLR, 2022.
- [Eld13] Ronen Eldan. Thin shell implies spectral gap up to polylog via a stochastic localization scheme. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 23(2):532–569, 2013.
- [FSF07] Sylvia Fruehwirth-Schnatter and Rudolf Frühwirth. Auxiliary mixture sampling with applications to logistic models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(7):3509–3528, 2007.
- [GMB⁺20] Jim E Griffin, Eleni Matechou, Andrew S Buxton, Dimitrios Bormpoudakis, and Richard A Griffiths. Modelling environmental dna data; bayesian variable selection accounting for false positive and false negative errors. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*, 69(2):377–392, 2020.
- [GMS⁺16] Evan H Campbell Grant, David AW Miller, Benedikt R Schmidt, Michael J Adams, Staci M Amburgey, Thierry Chambert, Sam S Cruickshank, Robert N Fisher, David M Green, Blake R Hossack, et al. Quantitative evidence for the effects of multiple drivers on continental-scale amphibian declines. *Scientific reports*, 6(1):25625, 2016.
- [Han09] Chris Hans. Bayesian lasso regression. *Biometrika*, 96(4):835–845, 2009.
- [HH06] Leonhard Held and Chris C Holmes. Bayesian auxiliary variable models for binary and multinomial regression. 2006.
- [Hob11] James P Hobert. The data augmentation algorithm: Theory and methodology. *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, pages 253–293, 2011.
- [HS86] Richard Holley and Daniel W Stroock. Logarithmic sobolev inequalities and stochastic ising models. 1986.
- [JGC95] Lawrence Joseph, Theresa W Gyorkos, and Louis Coupal. Bayesian estimation of disease prevalence and the parameters of diagnostic tests in the absence of a gold standard. *American journal of epidemiology*, 141(3):263–272, 1995.
- [JP08] Alejandro Justiniano and Giorgio E Primiceri. The time-varying volatility of macroeconomic fluctuations. *American Economic Review*, 98(3):604–641, 2008.
- [JSPD19] James E Johndrow, Aaron Smith, Natesh Pillai, and David B Dunson. Mcmc for imbalanced categorical data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2019.
- [KH13] Kshitij Khare and James P Hobert. Geometric ergodicity of the bayesian lasso. 2013.
- [Kla23] Bo’az Klartag. Logarithmic bounds for isoperimetry and slices of convex sets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14938*, 2023.
- [KLS95] Ravi Kannan, László Lovász, and Miklós Simonovits. Isoperimetric problems for convex bodies and a localization lemma. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13:541–559, 1995.
- [KLS97] Ravi Kannan, László Lovász, and Miklós Simonovits. Random walks and an $o^*(n^5)$ volume algorithm for convex bodies. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 11(1):1–50, 1997.
- [KM11] Young-Heon Kim and Emanuel Milman. A generalization of caffarelli’s contraction theorem via (reverse) heat flow, 2011.
- [Kol11] Alexander V Kolesnikov. Mass transportation and contractions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.1479*, 2011.
- [Lov99] László Lovász. Hit-and-run mixes fast. *Mathematical programming*, 86:443–461, 1999.

- [LP17] David A Levin and Yuval Peres. *Markov chains and mixing times*, volume 107. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- [LS90] László Lovász and Miklós Simonovits. The mixing rate of markov chains, an isoperimetric inequality, and computing the volume. In *Proceedings [1990] 31st annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 346–354. IEEE, 1990.
- [LS93] László Lovász and Miklós Simonovits. Random walks in a convex body and an improved volume algorithm. *Random structures & algorithms*, 4(4):359–412, 1993.
- [LST20] Yin Tat Lee, Ruoqi Shen, and Kevin Tian. Logsmooth gradient concentration and tighter runtimes for metropolized hamiltonian monte carlo. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 2565–2597. PMLR, 2020.
- [LV03] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Hit-and-run is fast and fun. *preprint, Microsoft Research*, 2003.
- [LV04] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Hit-and-run from a corner. In *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 310–314, 2004.
- [LV06] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Fast algorithms for logconcave functions: Sampling, rounding, integration and optimization. In *2006 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'06)*, pages 57–68. IEEE, 2006.
- [LV07] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. The geometry of logconcave functions and sampling algorithms. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 30(3):307–358, 2007.
- [LV17] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh Srinivas Vempala. Eldan’s stochastic localization and the kls hyperplane conjecture: an improved lower bound for expansion. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 998–1007. IEEE, 2017.
- [LWK94] Jun S Liu, Wing Hung Wong, and Augustine Kong. Covariance structure of the gibbs sampler with applications to the comparisons of estimators and augmentation schemes. *Biometrika*, 81(1):27–40, 1994.
- [MCC+21] Yi-An Ma, Niladri S Chatterji, Xiang Cheng, Nicolas Flammarion, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Is there an analog of nesterov acceleration for gradient-based mcmc? 2021.
- [MHFH+23] Alireza Mousavi-Hosseini, Tyler K Farghly, Ye He, Krishna Balasubramanian, and Murat A Erdogdu. Towards a complete analysis of langevin monte carlo: Beyond poincaré inequality. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1–35. PMLR, 2023.
- [MHW+19] Wenlong Mou, Nhat Ho, Martin J Wainwright, Peter L Bartlett, and Michael I Jordan. Sampling for bayesian mixture models: Mcmc with polynomial-time mixing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.05153*, 2019.
- [Mil10] Emanuel Milman. Isoperimetric and concentration inequalities: equivalence under curvature lower bound. 2010.
- [Mil12] Emanuel Milman. Properties of isoperimetric, functional and transport-entropy inequalities via concentration. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152:475–507, 2012.
- [Mor05] Frank Morgan. Manifolds with density. *Notices of the AMS*, 52(8):853–858, 2005.
- [MS08] Emanuel Milman and Sasha Sodin. An isoperimetric inequality for uniformly log-concave measures and uniformly convex bodies. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 254(5):1235–1268, 2008.
- [MS21] Oren Mangoubi and Aaron Smith. Mixing of hamiltonian monte carlo on strongly log-concave distributions: Continuous dynamics. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(5):2019–2045, 2021.

- [MS24] Dan Mikulincer and Yair Shenfeld. The brownian transport map. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–66, 2024.
- [MY14] Himel Mallick and Nengjun Yi. A new bayesian lasso. *Statistics and its interface*, 7(4):571, 2014.
- [Nar16] Hariharan Narayanan. Randomized interior point methods for sampling and optimization. 2016.
- [NNT21] Huan Huu Nguyen, Vu Minh Ngo, and Anh Nguyen Tram Tran. Financial performances, entrepreneurial factors and coping strategy to survive in the covid-19 pandemic: case of vietnam. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 56:101380, 2021.
- [PC08] Trevor Park and George Casella. The bayesian lasso. *Journal of the american statistical association*, 103(482):681–686, 2008.
- [PSW13] Nicholas G Polson, James G Scott, and Jesse Windle. Bayesian inference for logistic models using pólya–gamma latent variables. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 108(504):1339–1349, 2013.
- [QH19] Qian Qin and James P Hobert. Convergence complexity analysis of albert and chib’s algorithm for bayesian probit regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(4):2320–2347, 2019.
- [QH21] Qian Qin and James P Hobert. On the limitations of single-step drift and minorization in markov chain convergence analysis. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 31(4):1633–1659, 2021.
- [QH22] Qian Qin and James P Hobert. Wasserstein-based methods for convergence complexity analysis of mcmc with applications. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 32(1):124–166, 2022.
- [RH07] Vivekananda Roy and James P Hobert. Convergence rates and asymptotic standard errors for markov chain monte carlo algorithms for bayesian probit regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 69(4):607–623, 2007.
- [RKH24] Vivekananda Roy, Kshitij Khare, and James P Hobert. The data augmentation algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10464*, 2024.
- [Ros95] Jeffrey S Rosenthal. Minorization conditions and convergence rates for markov chain monte carlo. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(430):558–566, 1995.
- [RS15] Bala Rajaratnam and Doug Sparks. Mcmc-based inference in the era of big data: A fundamental analysis of the convergence complexity of high-dimensional chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00947*, 2015.
- [RSKZ15] Bala Rajaratnam, Doug Sparks, Kshitij Khare, and Liyuan Zhang. Scalable bayesian shrinkage and uncertainty quantification for high-dimensional regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.03697*, 2015.
- [Sam53] Michael R Sampford. Some inequalities on mill’s ratio and related functions. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 24(1):130–132, 1953.
- [SJ89] Alistair Sinclair and Mark Jerrum. Approximate counting, uniform generation and rapidly mixing markov chains. *Information and Computation*, 82(1):93–133, 1989.
- [SL19] Ruoqi Shen and Yin Tat Lee. The randomized midpoint method for log-concave sampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Tal91] Michel Talagrand. A new isoperimetric inequality and the concentration of measure phenomenon. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar (GAFA) 1989–90*, pages 94–124. Springer, 1991.

- [Tal96] Michel Talagrand. Transportation cost for gaussian and other product measures. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 6(3):587–600, 1996.
- [Tib96] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
- [Tro15] Joel A Tropp. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(1-2):1–230, 2015.
- [TW87] Martin A Tanner and Wing Hung Wong. The calculation of posterior distributions by data augmentation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 82(398):528–540, 1987.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [VW19] Santosh Vempala and Andre Wibisono. Rapid convergence of the unadjusted langevin algorithm: Isoperimetry suffices. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [Wib19] Andre Wibisono. Proximal langevin algorithm: Rapid convergence under isoperimetry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01469*, 2019.
- [WSC22] Keru Wu, Scott Schmidler, and Yuansi Chen. Minimax mixing time of the metropolis-adjusted langevin algorithm for log-concave sampling. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(270):1–63, 2022.
- [XLZ⁺17] Guangxu Xun, Yaliang Li, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Gao, and Aidong Zhang. A correlated topic model using word embeddings. In *IJCAI*, volume 17, pages 4207–4213, 2017.
- [ZCL⁺23] Shunshi Zhang, Sinho Chewi, Mufan Li, Krishna Balasubramanian, and Murat A Erdogdu. Improved discretization analysis for underdamped langevin monte carlo. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 36–71. PMLR, 2023.
- [ZFSW23] Gregor Zens, Sylvia Frühwirth-Schnatter, and Helga Wagner. Ultimate pólya gamma samplers—efficient mcmc for possibly imbalanced binary and categorical data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12, 2023.
- [ZSMS18] Zhen Zhang, Samiran Sinha, Tapabrata Maiti, and Eva Shipp. Bayesian variable selection in the accelerated failure time model with an application to the surveillance, epidemiology, and end results breast cancer data. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 27(4):971–990, 2018.
- [ZXG21] Difan Zou, Pan Xu, and Quanquan Gu. Faster convergence of stochastic gradient langevin dynamics for non-log-concave sampling. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1152–1162. PMLR, 2021.

A Deferred Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 5.11

Proof. WLOG, we assume that $\mu_2 > \mu_1$. Let $f_i(x), F_i(x)$ be the pdf and the cdf of $\text{IG}(\mu_i, \lambda)$ at x , respectively. By standard formulae,

$$f_i(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda(x - \mu_i)^2}{2\mu_i^2 x}\right)$$

$$F_i(x) = \Phi\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{x}}\left(\frac{x}{\mu_i} - 1\right)\right) + \exp\left(\frac{2\lambda}{\mu_i}\right) \Phi\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{x}}\left(\frac{x}{\mu_i} + 1\right)\right).$$

Solving for $f_1(x) = f_2(x)$, we get a unique solution $x^* = \frac{2\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1+\mu_2}$. Therefore,

$$\text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_1, \lambda), \text{IG}(\mu_2, \lambda)) = \int_0^{x^*} f_1(x) - f_2(x) dx = F_1(x^*) - F_2(x^*).$$

Then, we consider the limiting distribution as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$. Letting the pdf and cdf of the limiting distribution be $f_\infty(x), F_\infty(x)$, respectively, we have

$$f_\infty(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2x}\right),$$

$$F_\infty(x) = 2\Phi(-\sqrt{\lambda/x}).$$

We denote the error function as $\text{Erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_i, \lambda), \text{IG}(\infty, \lambda)) &\leq \int_{2\mu_i}^\infty f_\infty(x) - f_{\mu_i}(x) dx \leq \int_{2\mu_i}^\infty f_\infty(x) dx = 1 - 2\Phi\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{2\mu_i}}\right) \\ &=_{(i)} -\text{Erf}\left(-\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2\sqrt{\mu_i}}\right) =_{(ii)} \text{Erf}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{2\sqrt{\mu_i}}\right) \leq_{(iii)} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi\mu_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is due to $\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \text{Erf}(x/\sqrt{2}))$, (ii) is because that the error function is odd, and (iii) comes from the fact that $\text{Erf}'(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-x^2}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_1, \lambda), \text{IG}(\mu_2, \lambda)) &\leq \text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_1, \lambda), \text{IG}(\infty, \lambda)) + \text{TV}(\text{IG}(\mu_2, \lambda), \text{IG}(\infty, \lambda)) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi\mu_1}} + \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi\mu_2}} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{\pi \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.6

Under Assumption 3.5 and the condition in Theorem 3.6, we can improve the results for ProbitDA and LogitDA by getting a better bound for $\lambda_{\max}(X^T X)$ appearing in (28) and (30). We note that $X^T X$ can be written as the sum of independent matrices such that $X^T X = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^T$. This enables us to derive high probability bounds for $X^T X$ using matrix concentration techniques. In addition, one can see that $X^T X$ is closely related to the sample covariance matrix, defined as $\tilde{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i x_i^T - \Sigma)$. Specifically, $X^T X = n(\tilde{\Sigma} + \Sigma)$. Therefore, we can also draw upon a rich literature of high probability error bounds for covariance estimation. We first cite the techniques, and then use them to prove Theorem 3.6.

Lemma A.1 (Matrix Bernstein, [Tro15, Theorem 1.4]). *Consider a finite sequence $\{S_k\}$ of independent, random matrices with dimension $d_1 \times d_2$. Assume that*

$$\mathbb{E}S_k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \|S_k\| \leq L \quad \text{for each index } k.$$

Let $Z = \sum_{k=1}^n S_k$ and $v(Z) = \max\{\|\mathbb{E}(ZZ^T)\|, \|\mathbb{E}(Z^T Z)\|\} = \max\{\|\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(S_k S_k^T)\|, \|\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(S_k^T S_k)\|\}$. Then, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z\| \geq t) \leq (d_1 + d_2) \exp\left\{\frac{-t^2/2}{v(Z) + Lt/3}\right\}.$$

Lemma A.2 (Covariance Estimation for Sub-Gaussian Distributions, [Ver18, Exercise 4.7.3]). *Let X be a sub-gaussian random vector in \mathbb{R}^d . More precisely, assume that there exists $K \geq 1$ such that*

$$\|\langle X, x \rangle\|_{\psi_2} \leq K \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\langle X, x \rangle^2} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then for all $u \geq 0$,

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq cK^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{d+u}{n}} + \frac{d+u}{n} \right) \|\Sigma\|$$

with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-u}$.

Lemma A.3 (Covariance Estimation for Log-concave Isotropic Measures, [ALPTJ10, ALPTJ11]). *Assume X is a log-concave isotropic random vector in \mathbb{R}^d . Then, there exists absolute constants K and ψ such that*

1. If $d \leq n$,

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \mathbb{I}_d\| \leq c(\psi + K)^2 \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}$$

2. If $d > n$,

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \mathbb{I}_d\| \leq c(\psi + K)^2 \frac{d}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c\sqrt{d})$.

Proof of Theorem 3.6. We prove the theorem under each of the three conditions separately. First, we obtain a high-probability bound on $\|X^T X\|$ under all three conditions.

Under Condition (a) We define $Z = X^T X - n\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i x_i^T - \Sigma)$. Then, we have $L \leq dM^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v(Z) &= n \|\mathbb{E}(x_i x_i^T - \Sigma)^T (x_i x_i^T - \Sigma)\| = n \|\mathbb{E}[x_i x_i^T x_i x_i^T - 2\Sigma x_i x_i^T + \Sigma^2]\| \\ &= n \|\mathbb{E}\|x_i\|_2^2 x_i x_i^T - 2\Sigma \mathbb{E}x_i x_i^T + \Sigma^2\| = n \|\mathbb{E}\|x_i\|_2^2 x_i x_i^T - \Sigma^2\| \\ &\leq_{(i)} n \|dM^2 \mathbb{E}x_i x_i^T - \Sigma^2\| \leq_{(ii)} ndM^2 \|\Sigma\| \end{aligned}$$

where (i) is due to $\|x_i\|_2^2 \leq dM^2$ under assumption 3.1 and (ii) is because Σ^2 is semi-positive definite. We set $\delta = 2d \exp\left(\frac{-t^2/2}{v(Z)+Lt/3}\right)$, which implies

$$-\frac{t^2}{2} + \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) v(Z) + \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{Lt}{3} = 0.$$

Solving the equation for t yields,

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{L}{3} + \sqrt{\log^2\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{L^2}{9} + 2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) v(Z)} \\ &\leq \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{L}{3} + \sqrt{\log^2\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{L^2}{9} + 2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) v(Z)} \leq c \left(\log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{L}{3} + \sqrt{2 \left(\log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) v(Z)\right)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|X^T X\| \leq n\|\Sigma\| + \|Z\| \leq n\|\Sigma\| + c \left(\log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) \frac{dM^2}{3} + \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{2d}{\delta}\right) ndM^2 \|\Sigma\|} \right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

Under Condition (b) By Lemma A.2, we have

$$\|X^T X\| \leq n\|\Sigma\| + n\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq n\|\Sigma\| + n\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq n\|\Sigma\| + cnK^2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{d+u}{n}} + \frac{d+u}{n} \right) \|\Sigma\|.$$

This holds with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-u) = 1 - \delta$, for $u = \log \frac{2}{\delta}$.

Under Condition (c) We consider a general log-concave random vector X with covariance Σ . Applying Lemma A.3 to the isotropic random vector $\Sigma^{-1/2}X$, we have

$$\|\Sigma^{-1/2}\tilde{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1/2} - \mathbb{I}_d\| \leq c \left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{d}{n} \right)$$

By left- and right-multiplying both sides by $\|\Sigma^{1/2}\|$, we have

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma} - \Sigma\| \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}\| \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\tilde{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1/2} - \mathbb{I}_d\| \|\Sigma^{1/2}\| \leq c \left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \frac{d}{n} \right) \|\Sigma\|.$$

Therefore,

$$\|X^T X\| \leq c(n + \sqrt{nd} + d) \|\Sigma\| \leq 2c(n + d) \|\Sigma\|$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c'\sqrt{d})$.

We've shown that $\|X^T X\| = \tilde{O}(n + d)$ with high probability in all of the three situations. Plugging this into (28) and (30), the theorem follows. \square

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3.9

Proof. Since the map T is a bijection, we have

$$\sup_A \frac{\nu_{\dagger}(A)}{\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A)} = \sup_A \frac{T_{\#}\nu_{\dagger}(A)}{T_{\#}\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A)} = \sup_A \frac{\nu'_{\dagger}(A)}{T_{\#}\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A)},$$

where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. By (31), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\#}\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A) &\propto \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \rho^2\xi\right) \\ &\geq \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi - \lambda d\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality is due to $\|\varphi\|_1 \leq \|\varphi\|_2^2 + d$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_A \frac{\nu'_{\dagger}(A)}{T_{\#}\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A)} &\leq e^{\lambda d} \frac{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi} \\ &\leq e^{\lambda d} \frac{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi} \\ &= e^{\lambda d} \frac{\int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\lambda\|\varphi\|_1} d\varphi \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\rho^2\xi\right) d\rho}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi} \\ &= e^{\lambda d} \frac{(2/\lambda)^d \int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\rho^2\xi\right) d\rho}{\int_{\rho \in \mathbb{R}^+} \int_{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d} \rho^{n+2\alpha-2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\rho y - X\varphi\|_2^2 - \lambda\|\varphi\|_2^2 - \rho^2\xi\right) d\rho d\varphi}. \end{aligned}$$

The fraction is the same quantity as in (37). Following the same derivation as in Section 5.4.2, we can obtain

$$\sup_A \frac{\nu'_{\dagger}(A)}{T_{\#}\pi^{\text{Lasso}}(A)} \leq e^{\lambda d} e^{\mathcal{O}(d \log d + n \log n)} = e^{\mathcal{O}(d \log d + n \log n)}.$$

\square

B Auxiliary Proofs

The proofs in this Appendix are not new. We present them here to make the paper self-contained.

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.2

The complete proof is dispersed in a series of papers [MS08, Mil10, Mil12], where the authors consider distributions satisfying a general class of isoperimetric inequalities and a general convexity condition on manifolds. For simplicity, we present the proof restricted to the log-concave measures on \mathbb{R}^d satisfying the Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality.

The proof utilizes the equivalence between Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality and a type of concentration inequality for log-concave measures. Specifically, a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d is said to satisfy the **concentration inequality** with log-concentration profile $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mu(A) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$1 - \mu(A^r) \leq \exp\{-\alpha(r)\} \quad \forall r \geq 0.$$

We first introduce the concepts and a lemma that will be used in the proof. Given a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d , the **isoperimetric profile** is a pointwise maximal function $\mathcal{I} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, so that $\mu^+(A) \geq \mathcal{I}(\mu(A))$ for all Borel sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. The **isoperimetric minimizer** for a measure $v \in (0, 1)$ is a Borel set $A \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mu(A) = v$ and $\mu^+(A) = \mathcal{I}(v)$. Furthermore, we denote the **μ -total curvature** of an isoperimetric minimizer A as $H_\mu(A)$. The definition of μ -total curvature is not important in this proof. We use it only in the following lemma. We refer readers interested in this quantity to Section 2.3 of [Mil10].

Lemma B.1 ([Mor05, Theorem 2, Remark 3] and [Mil10, Theorem 2.3]). *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be an isoperimetric minimizer for a given measure $v \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $r \geq 0$,*

$$\mu(A^r) - \mu(A) \leq \mu^+(A) \int_0^r \exp\{H_\mu(A)t\} dt.$$

Lemma B.2 ([MS08, Corollary 3.3]). *Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be an isoperimetric minimizer for a given measure $v \in (0, 1)$. Then,*

$$H_\mu(A) \leq \frac{\mathcal{I}(v)}{v}.$$

Proof of Lemma B.2. By Lemma B.1,

$$1 - \mu(A^c) \leq \mu^+(A^c) \int_0^\infty \exp\{H_\mu(A^c)t\} dt.$$

Since $\mu^+(A) = \mu^+(A^c)$ and $H_\mu(A) = -H_\mu(A^c)$, we have

$$\frac{\mu(A)}{\mu^+(A)} \leq \int_0^\infty \exp\{-H_\mu(A)t\} dt.$$

If $H_\mu(A) \geq 0$, this implies

$$H_\mu(A) \leq \frac{\mu^+(A)}{\mu(A)} = \frac{\mathcal{I}(v)}{v}.$$

Otherwise, the statement trivially holds. □

Proof of Lemma 5.2. At a high level, the proof is structured as three steps. First, we translate the isoperimetric inequality of μ_1 into a concentration inequality. Second, using the condition that $\|\frac{d\mu_2}{d\mu_1}\|_{L^\infty} \leq \exp(D)$, we transfer the concentration inequality for μ_1 into a concentration inequality of μ_2 . One can see the transference between concentration inequalities is straightforward. Finally, we translate the concentration inequality of μ_2 into its isoperimetric inequality.

Step 1: Isoperimetric inequality for $\mu_1 \implies$ Concentration inequality for μ_1 ([MS08, Proposition 1.7]) Consider any Borel set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with measure $\mu_1(B) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Define $f(r) = -\log(1 - \mu_1(B^r))$. We have

$$\frac{df}{dr} = -\frac{1}{1 - \mu_1(B^r)}(-\mu_1^+(B^r)) \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \frac{1}{1 - \mu_1(B^r)} \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} \min\{\mu_1(B^r), \mu_1((B^r)^c)\} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)},$$

where (i) is by the Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality for μ_1 and (ii) is by $\mu_1(B^r) \geq \mu_1(B) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Then,

$$f(r) \geq f(0) + \int_0^r \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} dt = -\log(1 - \mu_1(B)) + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} \geq \log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)},$$

which is equivalent to the following concentration inequality

$$\mu_1(B) \geq \frac{1}{2} \implies 1 - \mu_1(B^r) \leq \exp\left\{-\left(\log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)}\right)\right\}. \quad (42)$$

Step 2: Concentration inequality for $\mu_1 \implies$ Concentration inequality for μ_2 ([Mil12, Lemma 3.1]) The concentration inequality for μ_1 in equation (42) is equivalent to its contrapositive: considering $A = (B^r)^c$, we have

$$\mu_1(A) > \exp\left\{-\left(\log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)}\right)\right\} \implies \mu_1(A^r) > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (43)$$

To obtain a concentration inequality for μ_2 , consider any Borel set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with measure $\mu_2(S) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We need to construct a related set with μ_1 measure greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ to invoke the concentration inequality for μ_1 . Since $\|\frac{d\mu_2}{d\mu_1}\|_{L^\infty} \geq \exp(D)$, $\mu_1(S) \geq \mu_2(S)(\|\frac{d\mu_2}{d\mu_1}\|_{L^\infty})^{-1} \geq \exp\{-\log 2 + D\}$. By equation (43), for any $r > \frac{D}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)}$, $\mu_1(S^r) > \frac{1}{2}$, therefore,

$$\mu_1(\overline{S^{r_1}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{for } r_1 = D \text{Ch}(\mu_1),$$

where $\overline{S^{r_1}}$ is the closure of S^{r_1} . By the concentration inequality for μ_1 in equation (42),

$$1 - \mu_1(\overline{S^{r_1+r}}) \leq \exp\left\{-\left(\log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)}\right)\right\}.$$

Again, by $\|\frac{d\mu_2}{d\mu_1}\|_{L^\infty} \geq \exp(D)$, $1 - \mu_1(S^{r_1+r}) = \mu_1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S^{r_1+r}) \geq \mu_2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus S^{r_1+r}) \exp(-D)$. Therefore, we obtain a concentration inequality for μ_2 : for any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu_2(A) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$1 - \mu_2(S^{r_1+r}) \leq \exp\left\{-\left(\log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} - D\right)\right\} \quad \text{for } r_1 = D \text{Ch}(\mu_1).$$

This can be written in the standard form

$$\mu_2(S) \geq \frac{1}{2} \implies 1 - \mu_2(S^r) \leq \exp\{-\alpha_2(r)\}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\alpha_2(r) = \begin{cases} \log 2 & r \leq 2D \text{Ch}(\mu_1) \\ \log 2 + \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} - 2D & r \geq 2D \text{Ch}(\mu_1) \end{cases}$$

Step 3: Concentration inequality for $\mu_2 \implies$ Isoperimetric inequality for μ_2 ([Mil10, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 3.4]) Given an isoperimetric minimizer A of measure $v \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we define $r_v = \alpha_2^{-1}(\log(\frac{1}{v})) = \text{Ch}(\mu_1)(\log(\frac{1}{v}) + 2D - \log 2) > 2D \text{Ch}(\mu_1)$. By the contrapositive of equation (44),

$$\mu_2(S) > \exp\{-\alpha_2(r)\} \implies \mu_2(S^r) > \frac{1}{2},$$

so we have $\mu_2(\overline{A^{r_v}}) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Applying Lemma B.1,

$$\frac{1}{2} - v \leq \mu_2(\overline{A^{r_v}}) - \mu_2(A) \leq \mu_2^+(A) \int_0^{r_v} \exp\{H_{\mu_2}(A)t\} dt.$$

Using Lemma B.2, letting \mathcal{I}_2 be the isoperimetric profile of μ_2 ,

$$\int_0^{r_v} \exp\{H_{\mu_2}(A)t\} dt \leq \int_0^{r_v} \exp\left\{\frac{\mathcal{I}_2(v)}{v}t\right\} dt \leq r_v \exp\left\{\frac{\mathcal{I}_2(v)}{v}r_v\right\}.$$

Let $f(v) = \frac{\mathcal{I}_2(v)}{v}r_v$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2} - v \leq \mu_2^+(A)r_v \exp\left\{\frac{\mathcal{I}_2(v)}{v}r_v\right\} \implies f(v) + \log f(v) \geq \log\left(\frac{1}{2v} - 1\right).$$

Then, $f(v) \geq b(v)$, where $b(v)$ is the unique solution of $x + \log x - \log(\frac{1}{2v} - 1) = 0$. We have for $v \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2(v) &\geq vb(v) \frac{1}{r_v} \geq v \frac{b(v)}{\log(1/v)} \frac{\log(1/v)}{r_v} = \frac{v}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} \frac{b(v)}{\log(1/v)} \frac{\log(1/v)}{\log(\frac{1}{v}) + 2D - \log 2} \\ &\geq \frac{v}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} \frac{b(v)}{\log(1/v)} \frac{\log 2}{2D}. \end{aligned}$$

Since μ_2 is log-concave, $\mathcal{I}_2(v)$ is increasing on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Therefore, for $v \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$,

$$\mathcal{I}_2(v) \geq \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\mu_1)} \frac{\log 2}{2D} \sup_{\lambda \in (0, v]} \frac{\lambda b(\lambda)}{\log(1/\lambda)}$$

It is elementary to check that $\sup_{\lambda \in (0, v]} \frac{\lambda b(\lambda)}{\log(1/\lambda)} \geq cv$ for some universal constant $c > 0$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{I}_2(v) \geq c \frac{v}{\text{Ch}(\pi_1)D}, \quad \forall v \in (0, \frac{1}{2}].$$

By the symmetry of the isoperimetric profile,

$$\mathcal{I}_2(v) \geq \frac{c}{\text{Ch}(\pi_1)D} \min\{v, 1-v\}, \quad \forall v \in (0, 1).$$

The cases with $v = 1$ and $v = 0$ trivially hold. We prove the lemma by recalling the definition of $\text{Ch}(\mu_2)$. \square

B.2 Proof of Lemma 5.4

The method of using conductance-based arguments and isoperimetric inequalities to analyze the mixing of Markov chains can be found in [CV14, DCWY19, Nar16, CDWY18, Lov99, LV07, LV04, MHW⁺19]. [Che23] generalizes the argument in [DCWY19] to Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequalities.

Proof. In order to fit in the conductance-based argument, we need the isoperimetric inequalities to be in the ‘‘integral’’ form. Specifically, consider any measurable partition of the state space $\mathbb{R}^d = S_1 \sqcup S_2 \sqcup S_3$. We define

$$r = d(S_1, S_2) = \inf\{\|x - y\|_2 : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}.$$

Integrating both sides of the Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality from 0 to r yields

$$\int_0^r \pi^+(S_1^\omega) d\omega \geq \int_0^r \frac{1}{\text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(S_1^\omega), \pi((S_1^\omega)^c)\} d\omega.$$

The definition of Minkowski content $\pi^+(S_1^\omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi((S_1^\omega)^\epsilon) - \pi(S_1^\omega)}{\epsilon}$ implies that $\int_0^r \pi^+(S_1^\omega) d\omega = \pi(S_1^r) - \pi(S_1) = \pi(S_1^r \setminus S_1)$. It follows from $S_1 \not\subseteq S_1^r \setminus S_1$ and $S_2 \not\subseteq S_1^r \setminus S_1$ that $S_1^r \setminus S_1 \subseteq S_3$, and thus $\pi(S_1^r \setminus S_1) \leq \pi(S_3)$. On the other hand, since $S_2 \subseteq (S_1^\omega)^c$, $\min\{\pi(S_1^\omega), \pi((S_1^\omega)^c)\} \geq \min\{\pi(S_1), \pi(S_2)\}$ for all $\omega \leq r$. Therefore,

$$\pi(S_3) \geq \frac{r}{\text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(S_1), \pi(S_2)\}. \quad (45)$$

In order to lower bound the conductance, we need to study the probability flows across all measurable partitions. Consider an arbitrary partition $\mathbb{R}^d = A_1 \sqcup A_2$ and define the bad sets in A_1 and A_2 by

$$B_1 = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) \leq \frac{h}{2} \right\}$$

$$B_2 = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathcal{P}_v(A_1) \leq \frac{h}{2} \right\}$$

We regard the rest as the good set $G = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2)$.

The Good Case: $\pi(B_1) \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_1)$ or $\pi(B_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_2)$. WLOG, assume $\pi(B_1) \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_1)$. Then,

$$\int_{A_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) d\pi(u) \geq \int_{A_1 \setminus B_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) d\pi(u) \geq_{(i)} \frac{h}{2} \pi(A_1 \setminus B_1) \geq_{(ii)} \frac{h}{4} \pi(A_1) \geq \frac{h}{4} \min\{\pi(A_1), \pi(A_2)\},$$

where (i) is by the definition of B_1 and (ii) is by $\pi(B_1) \leq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_1)$.

The Bad Case: $\pi(B_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_1)$ and $\pi(B_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\pi(A_2)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) du &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{A_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) d\pi(u) + \int_{A_2} \mathcal{P}_v(A_1) d\pi(v) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{A_1 \setminus B_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) d\pi(u) + \int_{A_2 \setminus B_2} \mathcal{P}_v(A_1) d\pi(v) \right) \\ &\geq \frac{h}{4} (\pi(A_1 \setminus B_1) + \pi(A_2 \setminus B_2)) = \frac{h}{4} \pi(G). \end{aligned}$$

Then, substituting $S_1 = B_1, S_2 = B_2$, and $S_3 = G$ into the integral form of the isoperimetric inequality (45), we have

$$\pi(G) \geq \frac{d(B_1, B_2)}{\text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(B_1), \pi(B_2)\} \geq \frac{d(B_1, B_2)}{2 \text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(A_1), \pi(A_2)\}.$$

The one-step overlap condition makes sure the two bad sets are far apart in Euclidean distance because for any $u \in B_1, v \in B_2$ and

$$\text{TV}(\mathcal{P}_u, \mathcal{P}_v) \geq \mathcal{P}_u(A_1) - \mathcal{P}_v(A_1) = 1 - \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) - \mathcal{P}_v(A_1) \geq 1 - \frac{h}{2} - \frac{h}{2} = 1 - h \implies \|u - v\|_2 \geq \Delta.$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{A_1} \mathcal{P}_u(A_2) d\pi(u) \geq \frac{h}{4} \pi(G) \geq \frac{d(B_1, B_2)h}{8 \text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(A_1), \pi(A_2)\} \geq \frac{\Delta h}{8 \text{Ch}(\pi)} \min\{\pi(A_1), \pi(A_2)\}.$$

Combining the two cases, the conductance satisfies

$$\Phi = \sup_A \frac{\int_A \mathcal{P}_u(A^c) du}{\min\{\pi(A), \pi(A^c)\}} \geq ch \min\left\{2, \frac{\Delta}{\text{Ch}(\pi)}\right\}.$$

By assuming $\frac{\Delta}{\text{Ch}(\pi)} \leq 2$, we prove the lemma. □