

# Understanding MCMC, Lancaster 2003

## Exercises

1. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and consider the Markov chain with transitions  $P(1, \{2\}) = P(2, \{3\}) = P(3, \{1\}) = 3/4$ , and  $P(1, \{3\}) = P(2, \{1\}) = P(3, \{2\}) = 1/4$ .
  - (a) Prove that the uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{X}$  is stationary for this chain.
  - (b) Prove that the chain is not reversible with respect to its stationary distribution.
2. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{R}$ , and consider the Markov chain defined as follows. Given  $X_n$ , we choose  $X_{n+1} \sim N(X_n/2, 3/4)$ . Let  $\pi(\cdot) = N(0, 1)$ . Prove that  $\pi(\cdot)$  is stationary for this Markov chain, in two ways:
  - (a) Given that  $X_n$  has standard normal density, compute directly the density of  $X_{n+1}$  and show it is the same.
  - (b) Use the fact that we can (why?) write  $X_{n+1} = X_n/2 + \sqrt{3/4}Z_{n+1}$ , where  $\{Z_n\}$  are i.i.d. standard normal.
3. For the multiplicative RWM algorithm with proposal

$$Q(x, \cdot) = xe^{N(0, \sigma^2)},$$

show that

$$\alpha(x, y) = \min \left[ 1, \frac{x\pi(y)}{y\pi(x)} \right].$$

4. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{R}$ , and let  $\pi(\cdot) = N(0, 1)$  be the standard normal distribution. Consider the Random-Walk Metropolis algorithm which uses the proposal kernel  $Q(x, \cdot) = \text{Uniform}[x - 1, x + 1]$ .
  - (a) Describe in detail how this algorithm proceeds.
  - (b) Prove that the resulting algorithm is  $\phi$ -irreducible.
  - (c) Prove that the resulting algorithm is aperiodic.
  - (d) What can we conclude from this?
5. Let  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ , and let  $\pi(d\mathbf{x}) = \pi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ , where  $d\mathbf{x}$  is two-dimensional Lebesgue measure, and where  $\pi(\mathbf{x}) = 4x_1^2x_2 + 2x_2^5$ . Consider running the Gibbs sampler on this distribution.
  - (a) Describe in detail how this algorithm proceeds.
  - (b) Prove that the resulting algorithm is  $\phi$ -irreducible.
  - (c) Prove that the resulting algorithm is aperiodic.
  - (d) Prove that the resulting algorithm is Harris recurrent.
  - (d) What can we conclude from all of this?
6. Suppose Markov chain transitions  $P(x, \cdot)$  on a state space  $\mathcal{X}$  have a density with respect to some reference measure  $\nu(\cdot)$ :  $P(x, dy) = p(x, y) \nu(dy)$ . Let  $C \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ . Show that  $P(x, \cdot) \geq \epsilon\rho(\cdot)$  for all  $x \in C$ , for some probability measure  $\rho(\cdot)$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , where  $\epsilon = \int_{y \in \mathcal{X}} (\inf_{x \in C} p(x, y)) \nu(dy)$ .

7. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{R}$ , and consider again the Markov chain such that given  $X_n$ , we choose  $X_{n+1} \sim N(X_n/2, 3/4)$ . Recall that  $\pi(\cdot) = N(0, 1)$  is stationary for this Markov chain. Let  $C = [-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3}]$ , and let  $V(x) = 1 + x^2$ .
- Compute  $E[V(X_{n+1}) | X_n = x]$  explicitly.
  - Use this to obtain a drift condition of the form  $PV(x) \leq \lambda V(x) + b\mathbf{1}_C(x)$  for some  $\lambda < 1$  and  $b < \infty$ .
  - Establish a minorisation condition of the form  $P(x, \cdot) \geq \epsilon\nu(\cdot)$  for all  $x \in C$ . [Hint: Use the previous exercise.]
  - Put this all together, to obtain a quantitative bound on the time to stationarity of this Markov chain.
8. Let  $\mathcal{X} = [0, \infty)$ , and let  $\pi(dx) = e^{-x}dx$  be the standard exponential distribution. Consider the Random-Walk Metropolis algorithm which uses the proposal kernel  $Q(x, \cdot) = \text{Uniform}[x - \delta, x + \delta]$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .
- Compute the rejection probability  $\mathbf{P}[X_{n+1} = X_n | X_n = x]$  for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .
  - What value of  $\delta$  do you think will lead to the most efficient algorithm? Why?
9. Let  $\pi$  denote the discrete uniform density on the following subset of  $S = \{0, 1\}^6$ . Let

$$\mathcal{X}(1) = \{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_6); \sum_{i=1}^5 |a_{i+1} - a_i| = 0 \text{ or } 1\}$$

and let

$$\mathcal{X}(2) = \{(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_6); \sum_{i=1}^5 |a_{i+1} - a_i| = 4 \text{ or } 5\},$$

so that  $\pi$  is the uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}(1) \cup \mathcal{X}(2)$ . We consider the Gibbs sampling algorithm which updates in turn each of the 6 components. Write down explicitly the elements of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

By considering how the Gibbs sampler changes  $\sum_{i=1}^5 |a_{i+1} - a_i|$ , show that the Gibbs sampler is reducible in this example.

Suppose we decided to try and ‘diagnose’ convergence by monitoring  $a_1$  from independent runs of the Gibbs sampler started at a collection of different starting points. Would we be able to ‘detect’ non-convergence? Why?

Methods which empirically monitor Markov chain output until approximate stationarity is observed are called *convergence diagnostics*. What conclusions can you draw about the use of one-dimensional convergence diagnostics from this simple example?

10. Suppose we consider the independence sampler with  $q(x, y) = q(y)$  and suppose that

$$\frac{q(y)}{\pi(y)} \geq \beta > 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{X} \tag{1}$$

then show that the transition density of the sampler (for  $y$  not equal to  $x$  is given by

$$p(x, y) = \left( q(y) \wedge \frac{q(x)\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \right) \geq \beta\pi(y) .$$

Hence show that

$$\|P^n(x, \cdot) - \pi\| \leq 2(1 - \beta)^n .$$

11. Consider the following random walk Metropolis sampler on the geometric distribution:

$$\pi(i) = (1 - a)a^i, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

for some constant  $0 < a < 1$ . From state  $x$  we propose a move to  $x + 1$  or  $x - 1$  with equal probability,  $1/2$ .

Verify that for  $x \geq 1$ , the downward move (ie to  $x - 1$ ) is always accepted, whereas upward moves are accepted with probability  $a$ . Now consider the Lyapunov drift function,  $V(x) = e^{\beta x}$ . Show that for  $x \geq 1$ ,

$$PV(x) = \mathbf{E}(V(X_1)|X_0 = x) = \frac{1}{2} (ae^{\beta(x+1)} + (1 - a)e^{\beta x} + e^{\beta(x-1)}) .$$

Show that the right hand side can be written as  $\lambda V(x)$  where

$$\lambda = 1 - \frac{(1 - e^\beta)(a - e^{-\beta})}{2} .$$

Hence by a suitable choice of  $\beta$ , show that the algorithm is geometrically ergodic.

12. Consider the bivariate normal distribution,  $\pi$ , with unit variances and correlation  $\rho$ . If  $(X, Y) \sim \pi$  show that the conditional densities are given by

$$(X|Y) \sim N(\rho Y, (1 - \rho^2))$$

and

$$(Y|X) \sim N(\rho X, (1 - \rho^2)) .$$

Hence show that if  $\{X_n\}$  is the  $X$  sequence of a Gibbs sampler under this parameterisation, then

$$X_{n+1} \sim N(\rho^2 X_n, 1 - \rho^4)$$

and that

$$X_n \sim N(\rho^{2n} X_0, 1 - \rho^{4n}) .$$