WEB APPENDIX FOR:
Markov Chain Convergence Rates from Coupling Constructions

by (in alphabetical order)

Yu Hang Jiang, Tong Liu, Zhiya Lou, Jeffrey S. Rosenthal, Shanshan Shangguan, Fei Wang, and Zixuan Wu

Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Toronto

(August 18, 2020)

This web appendix provides proofs of the computational lemmas in the main article, which is available at: www.probability.ca/NoticesArt.pdf

Proof of Lemma 1:

To avoid problematic configurations where the particles are very close together, we first set $\mathcal{X}' = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{X} : \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq 3, |x_i - x_j| \geq 1/4\}$. Since $\mathcal{X}'$ is a compact set, and π is continuous and positive on $\mathcal{X}'$, it must achieve its minimum $m := \min_{x,y\in\mathcal{X}'} \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} > 0$ there. Let $A \subset \mathcal{X}$. Then from any state $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the chain will move into A on the next step provided that the proposed new configuration y is within the subset A, and that the proposal is accepted. Hence,

$$P(x, A) \;=\; \int_A P(x, dy) \;=\; \int_A \min[1,\, \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)}]\, dy \;\geq\; \int_{A\cap\mathcal{X}'} m\, dy \;=\; m\,\mathrm{Leb}(A\cap\mathcal{X}')\,,$$

where Leb is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^6$. So, if we set $\epsilon = m\,\mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{X}')$, and $\nu(A) = \mathrm{Leb}(A \cap \mathcal{X}') \;/\; \mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{X}')$, then $\epsilon > 0$, and ν is a probability measure, and $P(x, A) \geq \epsilon\, \nu(A)$, i.e. a uniform minorization condition is satisfied.

To obtain quantitative convergence bounds, we need to estimate $\mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{X}')$ and m. In order for $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathcal{X}'$, we can choose any $x_1 \in [0, 1]^2$ (with two-dimensional area 1), then choose any $x_2 \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus B(x_1, 1/4)$ (with area $\geq 1 - 3.14(1/4)^2$), then choose any $x_3 \in [0, 1]^2 \setminus (B(x_1, 1/4) \cup B(x_2, 1/4))$ (with area $\geq 1 - 3.14(1/4)^2 - 3.14(1/4)^2$). [Here $B(x, r)$ is the two-dimensional disc centered at x of radius r, with area $3.14\, r^2$, where we write the constant as "3.14" to avoid confusion with the stationary distribution $\pi(\cdot)$.] Hence, $\mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{X}') \geq (1)(1 - \frac{3.14}{16})(1 - \frac{3.14}{8}) \geq 0.48$.

Also, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}'$, we must have $0 \leq |x_i| \leq \sqrt{2}$ and $1/4 \leq |x_i - x_j| \leq \sqrt{2}$, so therefore

$$0 \;\leq\; |x_1| + |x_2| + |x_3| \leq 3\sqrt{2}\,, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} \;\leq\; \sum_{i<j} |x_i - x_j|^{-1} \leq 12\,.$$

It follows that

$$m \;\geq\; \frac{e^{-C(3\sqrt{2})-D(12)}}{e^{-C(0)-D(3/\sqrt{2})}} \;=\; e^{-C(3\sqrt{2})-D(12-(3/\sqrt{2}))} \;\geq\; e^{-C(4.25)-D(7.76)}\,.$$

Hence,

$$\epsilon \;=\; m\,\mathrm{Leb}(\mathcal{X}') \;\geq\; (0.48)\,e^{-C(4.25)-D(7.76)}\,,$$

as claimed.

Proof of Lemma 2:

Let $x \in C$. Without loss of generality, assume $x \geq 0$. First consider $B \subset [-1,1]$, and let $z \in [0,1]$ and $y \in B$. Then we must have $[0,1] \subseteq [x-2, x+2]$, and $B \subseteq [z-2, z+2]$. Hence, the proposal density q satisfies that $q(x,z) = q(z,y) = \frac{1}{4}$. Also, $\pi(x) \leq e^0 = 1$, and $e^{-1} \leq \pi(y) \leq 1$, and $\pi(z) \geq e^{-1}$, so if $\alpha(x,z) = \min[1, \frac{\pi(z)}{\pi(x)}]$ is the probability of accepting a proposed move from x to z, then $\alpha(x,z) \geq e^{-1}$ and $\alpha(z,y) \geq e^{-1}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P^2(x,B) \;&\geq\; \int_B \int_{x-2}^{x+2} q(x,z)\,\alpha(x,z)\,q(z,y)\,\alpha(z,y)\,dz\,dy \\ &\geq\; \int_B \int_0^1 (1/4)(e^{-1})(1/4)(e^{-1})\,dz\,dy \;=\; \frac{1}{16e^2}\,\mathrm{Leb}(B)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$P^2(x,A) \;\geq\; P^2(x,\, A \cap [-1,1]) \;\geq\; \frac{1}{16e^2}\,\mathrm{Leb}(A \cap [-1,1]) \;=\; \frac{1}{8e^2}\,\nu(A)\,,$$

which gives the result.

Proof of Lemma 3:

Without loss of generality, assume $x \geq 0$. Note that

$$PV(x) \;=\; \int_{x-2}^{x+2} q(x,y)\;[V(y)\alpha(x,y) + V(x)(1-\alpha(x,y))]\;dy\,.$$

We first compute the "top half" of this integral, where $x \le y \le x-2$. Here $\alpha(x,y) = \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} = \frac{e^{-y}}{e^{-x}} = e^{x-y}$, and $q(x,y) = 1/4$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_x^{x+2} q(x,y)\ [V(y)\alpha(x,y) + V(x)(1-\alpha(x,y))]\ dy \\
&= \int_x^{x+2} \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{y}{2}} e^{x-y} dy + \int_x^{x+2} \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} (1 - e^{x-y}) dy) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} e^x \int_x^{x+2} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} dy + \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} (2) - \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{3x}{2}} \int_x^{x+2} e^{-y} dy \\
&= \frac{1}{4} e^x [-2e^{-\frac{x+2}{2}} + 2e^{-\frac{x}{2}}] + \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} (2) - \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{3x}{2}} [-e^{-x-2} + e^{-x}] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} (-2e^{-1} + 2 + 2 + e^{-2} - 1) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (3 + e^{-2} - 2e^{-1}) V(x) \ \equiv \ \lambda_1 V(x)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{4}(3 + e^{-2} - 2e^{-1}) \doteq 0.6$. Then we consider three different cases:

Case 1: $x \in (2, \infty) \not\subseteq C = [-2, 2]$. Then $\alpha(x,y) := \min\{1, \frac{e^{-|y|}}{e^{-|x|}}\} = 1$ for all $y \in [x-2, x)$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
PV(x) &= \int_{x-2}^{x} q(x,y) V(y) dy + \lambda_1 V(x) = \frac{1}{4} \int_{x-2}^{x} e^{\frac{y}{2}} dy + \lambda_1 V(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} 2(1 - e^{-1}) + \lambda_1 V(x) = (\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-1}) + \lambda_1) V(x) \le 0.916\, V(x)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $x \in [1, 2] \subseteq C$. Again $\alpha(x,y) = 1$ for all $y \in [x-2, x]$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
PV(x) &= \int_{x-2}^{x} V(y) q(x,y) dy + \lambda_1 V(x) = \frac{1}{4} (\int_{x-2}^{0} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} dy + \int_0^x e^{\frac{y}{2}} dy) + \lambda_1 V(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} (\int_0^{2-x} e^{\frac{y}{2}} dy + \int_0^x e^{\frac{y}{2}} dy) + \lambda_1 V(x) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{\frac{x}{2}} + e^{1-\frac{x}{2}}) - 1 + \lambda_1 e^{\frac{x}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $z = e^{\frac{x}{2}}$. Then, computing numerically,

$$\max_{x \in [1,2]} [PV(x) - 0.916 V(x)] \ = \ \max_{z \in [\sqrt{e}, e]} \left[\frac{1}{2}(z + \frac{e}{z}) - 1 + \lambda_1 z - 0.916\, z \right] \ \le \ 0.13\,.$$

Case 3: $x \in [0,1] \subseteq C$. Then $\alpha(x,y) = 1$ for any $y \in [-x, x]$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
PV(x) &= \int_{x-2}^{-x} \Big[q(x,y)\alpha(x,y)V(y) + q(x,y)(1-\alpha(x,y))V(x) \Big]\, dy \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_{-x}^{x} q(x,y)V(y)\, dy + \lambda_1 V(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{x}{2}} \int_{x}^{2-x} (e^{\frac{x-y}{2}} + 1 - e^{x-y})\, dy + \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{x} e^{\frac{y}{2}} dy + \lambda_1 e^{\frac{x}{2}} \\
&= \frac{e^{\frac{x}{2}}}{4} \Big[-2e^{x-1} + e^{2(x-1)} - 2x + 3 \Big] + e^{\frac{x}{2}} - 1 + \lambda_1 e^{\frac{x}{2}}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Computing numerically, this implies that

$$\max_{x \in [0,1]} [PV(x) - 0.916\, V(x)] \;\leq\; 0.285\,.$$

Combining these three cases (and their symmetric versions for $x < 0$) shows that the univariate drift condition

$$PV(x) \;\leq\; 0.916\, V(x) + 0.285\, \mathbf{1}_C(x)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, as claimed.