## The problem

Assume that for all  $(x,A)\in\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{X}$ , we have  $P_1(x,A\setminus\{x\})\geq P_2(x,A\setminus\{x\})$ . According to Tierney's result, if both Markov kernels are  $\pi$ -reversible, the asymptotic variance of  $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n f(X_n^1)$  is smaller than that of  $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n f(X_n^2)$ , where  $\left\{X_n^1\,;n\in\mathbb{N}\right\}$  and  $\left\{X_n^2\,;n\in\mathbb{N}\right\}$  are Markov chains with transitions  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively.

I wonder if this result still holds without the reversibility assumption.

## Some reflections

The assumption can be interpreted as follows: there exists a (normalized) kernel Q such that

- $Q(x, \{x\}) = 0$
- $ullet P_2(x,A) = ar{eta}(x)Q(x,A) + eta(x)\delta_x(A)$
- $P_1(x,A)=ar{eta}(x)Q(x,A)+eta(x)R(x,A),$  with  $ar{eta}=1-eta.$

Since  $\pi P_2 = \pi$ , it follows that the measure  $\bar{\beta} d\pi$  is invariant for Q. Together with  $\pi P_1 = \pi$ , this implies that  $\beta d\pi$  is invariant for R.

Now, define:

- $oldsymbol{ar{P}} oldsymbol{ar{P}}_1(x,u;\mathrm{d} x'\,\mathrm{d} u') = ig[\mathbf{1}_{ar{C}}(x,u)Q(x,\mathrm{d} x') + \mathbf{1}_C(x,u)\delta_x(\mathrm{d} x')ig]\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(u')\mathrm{d} u'$
- $oldsymbol{ar{P}} oldsymbol{ar{P}}_2(x,u;\mathrm{d} x'\,\mathrm{d} u') = ig[\mathbf{1}_{ar{C}}(x,u)Q(x,\mathrm{d} x') + \mathbf{1}_C(x,u)R(x,\mathrm{d} x')ig]\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}(u')\mathrm{d} u',$

where  $C=\{(x,u)\,;u\leq \beta(x)\}$  and  $\bar{C}$  is the complement of C. In what follows, we use the generic notation  $y=(x,u)\in {\sf Y}$  with  ${\sf Y}={\sf X}\times [0,1].$  Note that  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are Markov chains on  ${\sf Y}\times \mathcal{Y}$  and we let  $\big\{Y_n^1\,;n\in \mathbb{N}\big\}$ , resp  $\big\{Y_n^2\,:n\in \mathbb{N}\big\}$ , be a Markov chain with transition kernel  $P_1$ , resp.  $P_2$ . Write  $\sigma^k$  the k-th visit to the set C, with the convention that  $\sigma^1=\sigma_C$  is the first return time to the set C.