

Resampling and genealogies in sequential Monte Carlo algorithms

Susanna Elizabeth Brown

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Statistics

University of Warwick, Department of Statistics

January 2021

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
List of Abbreviations	vii
Notation and Conventions	viii
1 Introduction	1
2 Background	2
2.1 Sequential Monte Carlo	2
2.1.1 Motivation	2
2.1.2 Inference in SSMs	2
2.1.3 Exact solutions ✓	2
2.1.4 Feynman-Kac models	3
2.1.5 Sequential Monte Carlo for Feynman-Kac models	3
2.1.6 Theoretical justification	4
2.2 Coalescent theory ✓	4
2.2.1 Kingman's coalescent ✓	4
2.2.2 Properties of Kingman's coalescent ✓	5
2.2.3 Models in population genetics ✓	8
2.2.4 Particle populations ✓	10
2.3 Sequential Monte Carlo genealogies	10
2.3.1 From particles to genealogies	10
2.3.2 Performance	10
2.3.3 Mitigating ancestral degeneracy	11
2.3.4 Asymptotics	11
2.4 Resampling ~	11
2.4.1 Definition ✓	11
2.4.2 Examples ~	12
2.4.3 Properties ~	18
2.4.4 Stochastic rounding ✓	29
2.5 Conditional SMC ~	29
2.5.1 Particle MCMC ✓	29
2.5.2 Particle Gibbs algorithm ~	30

Contents

2.5.3	Ancestor sampling ~	31
3 Limits		36
3.1	Encoding genealogies ~	36
3.1.1	The genealogical process ✓	36
3.1.2	Time scale ✓	36
3.1.3	Transition probabilities ~	38
3.2	An existing limit theorem ~	41
3.3	A new limit theorem ✓	43
3.3.1	Proof of theorem ~	43
4 Applications		47
4.1	Multinomial resampling	47
4.2	Stratified resampling ~	47
4.3	Stochastic rounding ✓	49
4.4	Residual resampling with stratified residuals ~	52
4.5	Residual resampling with multinomial residuals	53
4.6	Star resampling	53
4.7	Conditional SMC ~	53
4.7.1	Effect of ancestor sampling ~	56
5 Weak Convergence ✓		58
5.1	Bounds on sum-products ✓	63
5.2	Main components of weak convergence ✓	66
5.3	Indicators ✓	84
5.4	Other useful results ✓	89
5.5	Dependency graph ✓	90
6 Discussion		92

List of Figures

2.1	Conditional dependence structure of SMC algorithm	4
2.2	The n -coalescent	5
2.3	Diagram illustrating the definitions of t_i , T_i in the n -coalescent.	6
2.4	Ancestral degeneracy illustration	10
2.5	Cases for stratified resampling with a fixed weight	15
2.6	Resampling using multinomial, stratified and systematic schemes	17
2.7	PLACEHOLDER. Copied from Lindsten and Schön (2013).	32
2.8	PLACEHOLDER. Interpretation of a resampling weight for the immortal offspring.	33
2.9	PLACEHOLDER. Illustration of how ancestor sampling prevents coalescence onto the immortal trajectory.	34
3.1	Illustration of how the sample genealogy is encoded	37
5.1	Structure of weak convergence proof	91

List of Tables

2.1	Abbreviations for resampling schemes	12
2.2	Analysis of distribution of offspring counts under stratified resampling	14
2.3	Properties of resampling schemes	28

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank...

This thesis is submitted to the University of Warwick in support of my application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It has been composed by myself and has not been submitted in any previous application for any degree.

The work presented (including data generated and data analysis) was carried out by the author except in the cases outlined below:

Parts of this thesis have been published by the author:

Abstract

List of Abbreviations

SMC	sequential Monte Carlo
i.i.d.	independent and identically distributed
MRCA	most recent common ancestor
PRNG	pseudo-random number generator
CDF	cumulative distribution function

Notation and Conventions

Also include indexing notation $X_{a:b}$, X_{-a} , and X_A where A is a set of indices.

\mathbb{N}	the natural numbers starting from one, $\{1, 2, \dots\}$
\mathbb{N}_0	the natural numbers starting from zero, $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$
$[a]$	the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a\}$ where $a \in \mathbb{N}$ also allow $a = 0$ in which case $[a] = \emptyset$?
S_k	the k -dimensional unit simplex $\{x_{1:k+1} \geq 0 : \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} x_i = 1\}$
$(a)_b$	the falling factorial $a(a - 1) \cdots (a - b + 1)$ where $a \in \mathbb{N}_0, b \in \mathbb{N}$ could even allow $a \in \mathbb{R}$ but I don't think I ever use it in that setting
$\binom{a}{b}$	binomial coefficient where $a, b \in \mathbb{N}_0$, defined to be 0 when $a < b$
\prod_\emptyset	the empty product is taken to be 1
\sum_\emptyset	the empty sum is taken to be 0, while the sum over an index vector of length zero is the identity operator ?
\mathcal{F}_t	the (backward) filtration generated by offspring counts up to time t
\mathbb{E}	expectation
\mathbb{E}_t	filtered expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$
Var	variance
Cov	covariance
A^c	denotes the complement of set A
1_N	asymptotic notation for a function that converges to 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$

1 Introduction

2 Background

Anyone who considers arithmetical methods of producing random digits is, of course, in a state of sin.

JOHN VON NEUMANN

2.1 Sequential Monte Carlo

2.1.1 Motivation

Being Bayesian. SSMs/HMMs. Example(s) of SSM (1D train?).

2.1.2 Inference in SSMs

What quantities do we want to infer? Why is this generally difficult? Filtering, prediction, smoothing, likelihood/normalising constant.

2.1.3 Exact solutions ✓

If the state space model has linear dynamics with Gaussian errors, the posterior distributions of interest are also Gaussian with mean and covariance satisfying recursions, implemented by the Kalman filter (Kalman 1960) and Rauch-Tung-Striebel smoother (Rauch, Striebel, and Tung 1965). Recursions are also available for some other conjugate models; see for example Vidoni (1999). Another analytic case occurs if the state space \mathcal{X} is finite, in which case any integrals become finite sums, and the forward-backward algorithm (Baum et al. 1970) yields the exact posteriors. However, if the state space becomes large (albeit finite), exact computation becomes infeasible.

If the model is Gaussian but non-linear, the posterior filtering distributions can be estimated using the *extended Kalman filter* (see for example Jazwinski (2007)), which applies a first-order approximation in order to make use of the Kalman filter. This method performs well on models that are “almost linear”. The resulting predictor is only *optimal* when the model is actually linear, in which case the extended Kalman filter coincides with the Kalman filter.

2 Background

For models that are high-dimensional or highly non-linear or for which gradients are not readily available, the exact Kalman filter updates can be replaced by sample approximations. The *ensemble Kalman filter* (Evensen 1994) uses a Monte Carlo sample from the current time, propagates these points through the transition dynamics, and uses the sample covariance as an estimator of the updated covariance matrix. The means (which are cheaper to evaluate and more stable than the covariances) are still updated using the Kalman filter recursion, based on the estimated covariance. The *unscented Kalman filter* (Wan and Merwe 2000) uses a deterministic sample chosen via the *unscented transformation*, which is then propagated through the non-linear transition to obtain a characterisation of the distribution at the next time step. The sample consists of $2d + 1$ points, where d is the dimension of the state space, and is a sufficient characterisation of a Gaussian distribution. The sample points define a Gaussian approximation to the updated distribution.

In complex or high-dimensional models, such techniques may not be feasible, in which case we must resort to Monte Carlo methods. Markov chain Monte Carlo performs woefully on state space models due to the high dimension of the parameter space and high correlation between dimensions. But we can exploit the sequential nature of the underlying dynamics to decompose the problem into a sequence of inferences of fixed dimension. This is the motivation behind sequential Monte Carlo (SMC).

2.1.4 Feynman-Kac models

Define a generic FK model. Show that this class includes all SSMs. Example of non-SSM that is FK?

2.1.5 Sequential Monte Carlo for Feynman-Kac models

Present generic algorithm. State the SMC estimators of the quantities of interest. Include the dependence diagram and note that the offspring counts are not independent at each time, but can be made so by conditioning on the separatrix \mathcal{H} .

```

Data:  $N, T, \mu, (K_t)_{t=1}^T, (g_t)_{t=0}^T$ 
for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  do Sample  $X_0^{(i)} \sim \mu(\cdot)$ 
for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  do  $w_0^{(i)} \leftarrow \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N g_0(X_0^{(j)}) \right\}^{-1} g_0(X_0^{(i)})$ 
for  $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$  do
    | Sample  $a_t^{(1:N)} \sim \text{RESAMPLE}(\{1, \dots, N\}, w_t^{(1:N)})$ 
    | for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  do Sample  $X_{t+1}^{(i)} \sim K_{t+1}(X_t^{(a_t^{(i)})}, \cdot)$ 
    | for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  do  $w_{t+1}^{(i)} \leftarrow \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N g_{t+1}(X_t^{(a_t^{(j)})}, X_{t+1}^{(j)}) \right\}^{-1} g_{t+1}(X_t^{(a_t^{(i)})}, X_{t+1}^{(i)})$ 
end
```

Algorithm 1: Sequential Monte Carlo

Figure 2.1 shows part of the conditional dependence graph implied by Algorithm 1. Our aim is to find a σ -algebra \mathcal{H}_t at each time t that separates the ancestral process (encoded by $a_t^{(1:N)}$) from the filtration \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . That is, $a_t^{(1:N)}$ is conditionally independent of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} given \mathcal{H}_t . By a D-separation argument (see Verma and Pearl 1988), the nodes highlighted in grey suffice as the generator of \mathcal{H}_t . That is, for each t , we take

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \sigma(X_{t-1}^{(1:N)}, X_t^{(1:N)}, w_{t-1}^{(1:N)}, w_t^{(1:N)}).$$

Notice that $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$ can be expressed as a function of $a_t^{(1:N)}$, and as such carries less information.



Figure 2.1: Part of the conditional dependence graph implied by Algorithm 1. The direction of time is from left to right. The reverse-time filtration is indicated by the dashed areas. The nodes highlighted in grey generate the separatrix \mathcal{H}_t between $a_t^{(1:N)}$ and \mathcal{F}_{t-1} . Use the same shades of grey here as elsewhere

2.1.6 Theoretical justification

How come SMC works? Convergence results (briefly!) e.g. Lp bounds, CLT, stability.

2.2 Coalescent theory ✓

Write a paragraph introducing the section.

2.2.1 Kingman's coalescent ✓

The Kingman coalescent (Kingman 1982b; Kingman 1982c; Kingman 1982a) is a continuous-time Markov process on the space of partitions of \mathbb{N} . For our purposes we need only consider its restriction to $\{1, \dots, n\}$, termed the n -coalescent (defined below), since we

Figure 2.2: A realisation of the n -coalescent with $n = 50$.

only ever consider finite samples from a population. However, an excellent probabilistic introduction to the Kingman coalescent from the point-of-view of exchangeable random partitions can be found in Berestycki (2009, Chapters 1–2). [or Wakeley \(2009\)](#) ? [or Durrett \(2008\)](#) ?

Definition 2.1. The n -coalescent is the homogeneous continuous-time Markov process on the set of partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with infinitesimal generator Q having entries

$$q_{\xi, \eta} = \begin{cases} 1 & \xi \prec \eta \\ -|\xi|(|\xi| - 1)/2 & \xi = \eta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where ξ and η are partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, $|\xi|$ denotes the number of blocks in ξ , and $\xi \prec \eta$ means that η is obtained from ξ by merging exactly one pair of blocks.

A particularly attractive feature of the n -coalescent is its tractability; its distribution and those of many statistics of interest are available in closed form (Section 2.2.2). It turns out also to be extremely useful as a limiting distribution in population genetics, including the genealogies of a wide range of population models in its domain of attraction (Section 2.2.3).

2.2.2 Properties of Kingman's coalescent ✓

The simplicity of Q allows various properties of the n -coalescent to be studied analytically. Refer to more exhaustive studies of the properties in the literature, e.g. Durrett (2008, Section 1.2). Starting with n blocks, exactly $n - 1$ coalescences are required to reach

2 Background

the absorbing state where all blocks have coalesced, known in the population genetics literature as the *most recent common ancestor* (MRCA).




Figure 2.3: Diagram illustrating the definitions of t_i , T_i in the n -coalescent.

Denote by $t_2, t_3 \dots, t_n$ the waiting times between coalescent events, where t_i is the amount of time for which the coalescent has exactly i distinct lineages (see Figure 2.3). A consequence of Definition 2.1 is that these waiting times are independent and have distributions

$$t_i \sim \text{Exp} \left(\binom{i}{2} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

The partial sum $T_k := \sum_{i=k+1}^n t_i$ gives the total time up to the $(n-k)^{th}$ coalescence event, i.e. the first time at which there are only k lineages remaining out of the initial n (see Figure 2.3). The partial sums, being sums of independent Exponential random variables, have HyperExponential distributions.

Refer back to the following three properties later on with reference to their relevance in SMC.

Time to MRCA

Of particular interest is the tree height or time to the most recent common ancestor, $T_{MRCA} := T_1$. With some algebra we find, for instance,

$$\mathbb{E}[T_{MRCA}] = \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbb{E}[t_i] = \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{2}{i(i-1)} = 2 \sum_{i=2}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{i-1} - \frac{1}{i} \right\} = 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) \quad (2.3)$$

and

$$\text{Var}[T_{MRCA}] = \sum_{i=2}^n \text{Var}[t_i] = \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\frac{2}{i(i-1)} \right)^2. \quad (2.4)$$

The expected tree height converges to 2 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the variance converges to $4(\pi^2 - 9)/3 \simeq 1.16$. The somewhat surprising fact that the tree height does not diverge with n is a result of the very high rate of coalescence close to the bottom of the tree. This rate is large enough that the full Kingman coalescent (on \mathbb{N}) *comes down from infinity*, that is, despite starting with infinitely many blocks, after any positive amount of time these have

2 Background

coalesced into finitely many blocks. Plot mean with sd-ribbon over n for an illustration? SD ribbon isn't the right thing; since we apparently know the actual distribution, plot a high density interval of that. (also for L)

Total branch length

Another quantity of interest is the total branch length, $L := \sum_{i=2}^n it_i$. For instance

$$\mathbb{E}[L] = \sum_{i=2}^n i\mathbb{E}[t_i] = \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{2}{i-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{2}{i} \simeq 2 \ln(n-1) \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\text{Var}[L] = \sum_{i=2}^n i^2 \text{Var}[t_i] = \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{4}{(i-1)^2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{4}{i^2}. \quad (2.6)$$

Note that although the mean total branch length diverges with n , the variance converges to a constant, $4\pi/6 \simeq 6.6$.

Probability that sample MRCA equals population MRCA

One other interesting quantity is the probability that the MRCA of k random lineages coincides with the population MRCA (e.g. Durrett 2008, Theorem 1.7). Denote by S_k the relevant event: that a random sample of k lineages has the same as the MRCA as the population. Consider the two subtrees produced by cutting the tree just below the population MRCA. The sample of k lineages coalesces before the population MRCA if and only if all k sampled leaves lie in just one of these two subtrees. A basic consequence of the exchangeability of the n -coalescent is that, in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the proportion of leaves in the left subtree is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Calling this proportion X , we have

$$\mathbb{P}[S_k^c \mid X = x] = x^k + (1-x)^k$$

Integrating against the distribution of X , the probability of interest is

$$\mathbb{P}[S_k] = 1 - \int_0^1 [x^k + (1-x)^k] dx = \frac{k-1}{k+1}$$

as required.

The above is based on properties of the full Kingman coalescent, but similar results are available for the n -coalescent. Consider now a subsample of size k among n lineages that follow the n -coalescent. Denote by $S_{k,n}$ the event that these k lineages have the same MRCA as all n lineages. This probability of this event is calculated in Saunders, Tavaré, and Watterson (1984, Example 1) and again in Spouge (2014, Equation (3)), in both cases arising as a special case of more general results. A direct proof is given below.

Let X be the number of leaves in the left subtree. So $X \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and, like before, a consequence of exchangeability is that X is uniformly distributed on that set. Now that

2 Background

the total number of branches is finite, we have to count more carefully. Conditional on X we have

$$\mathbb{P}[S_{k,n}^c \mid X = x] = \left[\binom{x}{k} + \binom{n-x}{k} \right] \binom{n}{k}^{-1}.$$

Integrating against the distribution of X gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[S_{k,n}] &= 1 - \frac{1}{n-1} \binom{n}{k}^{-1} \sum_{x=1}^{n-1} \left[\binom{x}{k} + \binom{n-x}{k} \right] \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{n-1} \binom{n}{k}^{-1} \left[\binom{n}{k+1} + \binom{n}{k+1} \right] \\ &= \frac{k-1}{k+1} \frac{n+1}{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

using binomial identities and some algebra. As $n \rightarrow \infty$ this agrees with the population-level result above.

2.2.3 Models in population genetics ✓

The Kingman coalescent is the limiting coalescent process (in the large population limit) for a surprisingly wide range of population models. Some important examples of models in Kingman's "domain of attraction" are introduced in this section. Common to all of these models are the following assumptions:

- The population has constant size N
- Reproduction happens in discrete generations
- The offspring distributions are identical at each generation, and independent between generations
- These models are all *neutral*, i.e. the offspring distribution is exchangeable.

As before [section/eq ref?](#), we define offspring counts in terms of parental indices as $\nu_j := |\{i : a_i = j\}|$. Under the assumption of neutrality, it is sufficient to consider only the offspring counts, rather than the parental indices (which generally carry more information). **Crucially, in the neutral case, offspring counts carry all the information about the distribution of the genealogy that is contained in the parental indices.** From a biological perspective, neutrality encodes the absence of natural selection, i.e. no individual in the population is "fitter" than another.

Wright-Fisher model

The neutral Wright-Fisher model (Fisher 1923; Fisher 1930; Wright 1931) is one of the most studied models in population genetics. At each time step the existing generation dies and is replaced by N offspring. The offspring descend from parents (a_1, \dots, a_N) which are

2 Background

selected according to

$$a_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Categorical}(\{1, \dots, N\}, (1/N, \dots, 1/N)).$$

The joint distribution of the offspring counts is therefore

$$(v_1, \dots, v_N) \sim \text{Multinomial}(N, (1/N, \dots, 1/N)).$$

Since the Multinomial distribution is exchangeable, this model is neutral. There are several non-neutral variants of the Wright-Fisher model [citations?](#), but they are typically much less tractable than the neutral one.

Kingman showed in his original papers introducing the Kingman coalescent (Kingman 1982b) that, when time is scaled by a factor of N , genealogies of the neutral Wright-Fisher model converge to the Kingman coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Cannings model

The neutral Cannings model (Cannings 1974; Cannings 1975) is a more general construction which encompasses the neutral Wright-Fisher model as a special case.

In the Cannings model, the particular offspring distribution is not specified; we only require that it is exchangeable, i.i.d. between generations, and preserves the population size. In particular, the probability of observing offspring counts (v_1, \dots, v_N) must be invariant under permutations of this vector.

Genealogies of the neutral Cannings model also converge to the Kingman coalescent, under some conditions and a suitable time-scaling [which is what?](#), as $N \rightarrow \infty$ (see for example Etheridge 2011, Section 2.2). [original reference for this? is not any Kingman 1982 papers, and certainly not Cannings 1974/5 which predates KC](#)

Moran model

The neutral Moran model (Moran 1958), while perhaps less biologically relevant, is mathematically appealing because its simple dynamics make it particularly tractable.

At each time step, an ordered pair of individuals is selected uniformly at random. The first individual in this pair dies (i.e. leaves no offspring in the next generation), while the other reproduces (leaving two offspring). All of the other individuals leave exactly one offspring. This is another special case of the neutral Cannings model, where the offspring distribution is now uniform over all permutations of $(0, 2, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Therefore we know that under a suitable time-scaling, its genealogies converge to the Kingman coalescent. The time scale in this case is N^2 , because reproduction happens at a rate N times [or is it technically N-1 times?](#) lower than in the Wright-Fisher model. [also cite a Moran-specific convergence result: not sure where \(it isn't in Kingman 1982* or in Moran 1958 which predates KC\)](#)

2.2.4 Particle populations ✓

Much of the population genetics framework transfers readily to the case of SMC. The population is now a population of particles, with each iteration of the SMC algorithm corresponding to a generation, and resampling playing the part of reproduction. In fact, SMC “populations” are in some ways more suited to these population models than actual populations of organisms. The assumptions that the population has constant size N and that reproduction occurs only at discrete generations are satisfied by construction. However, we cannot assume independence between generations: as seen in Figure 2.1, the offspring counts at subsequent generations are not independent without some conditioning. In fact, after marginalising out the information about the positions of the particles, the genealogical process is not even Markovian. Nor is our model neutral: the resampling distribution depends on the weight of each particle (the weight plays the role of fitness in a non-neutral population model).

2.3 Sequential Monte Carlo genealogies

2.3.1 From particles to genealogies

How does the SMC algorithm induce a genealogy? (resampling = parent-child relationship).

2.3.2 Performance

How do genealogies affect performance? Variance (and variance estimation?), storage cost. Ancestral degeneracy.




Figure 2.4: Illustration of ancestral degeneracy and the mitigating effect of low-variance and adaptive resampling. (a) with multinomial resampling, (b) the same system with adaptive systematic resampling.

2.3.3 Mitigating ancestral degeneracy

Low-variance resampling (save details for next section). Adaptive resampling: idea of balancing weight/ancestral degeneracy; rule of thumb for implementing it; when is it effective or not?; necessary changes to our generic SMC algorithm (calculation of weights in particular). Backward sampling: when is it possible to do this?

2.3.4 Asymptotics

Why are large population asymptotics useful? Existing results (path storage, KJJS).

2.4 Resampling \sim

As we have seen, resampling is necessary within SMC to “reset” the weights in order to prevent weight degeneracy. The basic role of a resampling scheme is to map the continuous weights to discrete offspring counts, in some “sensible” way (Definition 2.2). The choice of resampling scheme is explored in detail in this section.

2.4.1 Definition ✓

Also say that resampling is itself a Monte Carlo procedure.

Definition 2.2. For our purposes, a valid resampling scheme is a stochastic function mapping weights $w_t^{(1:N)} \in \mathcal{S}_{N-1}$ to offspring counts $\nu_t^{(1:N)} \in \{0, \dots, N\}^N$ that satisfies the following properties:

1. the population size is conserved: $\sum_{i=1}^N \nu_t^{(i)} = N$ for all N
2. the weights are uniform after resampling: $w_{t+}^{(i)} = 1/N$ for all i
3. the resampling is unbiased: $\mathbb{E}[\nu_t^{(i)} | w_t^{(i)}] = N w_t^{(i)}$ for all i .

It is possible to design resampling schemes that violate these properties. For example, a scheme of Liu and Chen (1998) uses the square roots of the weights for resampling, then corrects by setting non-uniform weights after resampling (violating conditions 2 and 3). Fearnhead and Clifford (2003, p.890, point (d)) also appears to resample such that the weights are not uniform after resampling. Resampling different numbers of particles in different iterations (violating condition 1) is of course possible, but we typically have a fixed limit on computational resources, in which case it makes sense to simulate the maximum feasible number of particles N at every iteration. Deterministic resampling schemes (which cannot generally be unbiased, violating condition 3) have been used by some authors. These include schemes based on optimal transport (Reich 2013; Myers et al. 2021; Corenflos et al. 2021) and the importance support points resampling of Huang, Joseph, and Mak (2020). However, the majority of resampling schemes in the literature fit within Definition 2.2, and it is not typically advantageous to violate the properties 1–3.

Within Definition 2.2 there is still a great deal of flexibility. Many different resampling schemes have been proposed in the literature, some of which perform better than others. Section 2.4.2 introduces some important resampling schemes, and their properties are discussed in Section 2.4.3. These are summarised in Table 2.3.

2.4.2 Examples ~

Argue in each case that the scheme is unbiased.

Abbreviation	Description
<code>multi</code>	multinomial resampling
<code>star</code>	star resampling
<code>strat</code>	stratified resampling
<code>syst</code>	systematic resampling
<code>res-multi</code>	residual resampling with multinomial residuals
<code>res-star</code>	residual resampling with star residuals
<code>res-strat</code>	residual resampling with stratified residuals
<code>res-syst</code>	residual resampling with systematic residuals
<code>ssp</code>	Srinivasan sampling procedure resampling
<code>branch</code>	minimal variance branching algorithm

Table 2.1: Abbreviations for resampling schemes

Multinomial resampling ✓

Multinomial resampling (Gordon, Salmond, and Smith 1993; Efron and Tibshirani 1994) is one of the simplest resampling schemes. The parental indices are chosen independently from $\{1, \dots, N\}$, each with probability given by the weight of the corresponding particle $w_t^{(i)}$. That is,

$$a_t^{(1:N)} \sim \text{Categorical}(\{1, \dots, N\}, w_t^{(1:N)}).$$

This implies the joint distribution of the offspring counts is

$$\nu_t^{(1:N)} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Multinomial}(N, w_t^{(1:N)}).$$

It follows from the mean of the Multinomial distribution that this resampling scheme is unbiased. **Although the parental indices are chosen independently, the resulting offspring counts are negatively correlated. — link to GCW19's negative association?**

A simple way to sample the parental indices is to use inversion sampling: partition the unit interval into N subintervals each of which will correspond to a certain index i and has length equal to the weight $w_t^{(i)}$; then draw N samples $U_i \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ and classify

2 Background

them according to which of these subintervals they fall in. Explicitly, the parental index assigned to child i is the index a_i satisfying

$$\sum_{j=1}^{a_i-1} w_t^{(j)} \leq U_i \leq \sum_{j=1}^{a_i} w_t^{(j)}. \quad (2.7)$$

This is illustrated in Figure 2.6a.

Fast implementations of multinomial resampling rely on U_1, \dots, U_N being pre-sorted, which speeds up the search step (2.7). Sorting N numbers is an $O(N \log N)$ operation, but in fact this is not necessary because we can directly sample the order statistics of a Uniform[0, 1] distribution [citations: Chopin and Papaspiliopoulos (2020), and a different (or possibly equivalent) method in Hol, Schön, and Gustafsson (2006)] —explore whether these methods are equivalent. This allows multinomial resampling to be implemented at $O(N)$ cost, with the side-effect that the sampled ancestral indices will be ordered. And therefore the sampled parental indices cannot be $\text{Cat}(N, w)$ distributed. But the counts are still Multinomial? And anyway for the purposes of resampling this isn't a problem; it might even improve performance?

Residual resampling ✓

Residual resampling is described in Liu and Chen (1998) and also in Whitley (1994) where it is called “remainder stochastic sampling”.

Each particle $X_t^{(i)}$ is deterministically assigned $\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor$ offspring and the remaining $R := \sum_{i=1}^N (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) = nN - \sum_{i=1}^N \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor$ offspring are assigned stochastically according to the residual weights

$$r^{(i)} := (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) / R.$$

Notice that each $r^{(i)}$ lies in the interval $(0, 1/R)$.

The stochastic part can be done using any of the other basic resampling schemes (e.g. multinomial, stratified, systematic). Most presentations focus on the case where multinomial resampling is used for the residuals, which is by no means the most sensible option. We will explore several different options in what follows.

Stratified resampling ✓

Stratified resampling is introduced in Kitagawa 1996.

As in multinomial resampling, stratified resampling uses inversion sampling to sample the parental indices. However, the samples used for inversion sampling are no longer i.i.d. Uniform[0, 1] samples. Instead, one number is sampled from each subinterval of length $1/N$; that is,

$$U_i \sim \text{Uniform}\left(\frac{i-1}{N}, \frac{i}{N}\right).$$




Figure 2.5: Inversion sampling to obtain Multinomial offspring counts, where the (marginally) Uniform variables for inversion are sampled in different ways. For this example $N = 4$ and the weights are $w_{(1:4)} = \frac{1}{N}(1, \frac{2}{3}, 2, \frac{1}{3})$. Also make the same diagram in Whitley's "roulette wheel" style, to illustrate the difference. Or maybe make it for the "degeneracy under equal weights" section just illustrating the difference it makes in stratified resampling.

2 Background

Alternatively, one may think of standard Uniform samples $u_1, \dots, u_N \sim^{iid} \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ with the transformation

$$U_i = \frac{u_i + i - 1}{N} \quad (2.8)$$

to give the stratified samples U_1, \dots, U_N .

The parents are then assigned as in (2.7). This is illustrated in Figure 2.6b. The offspring distribution is no longer Multinomial, since parental indices are not chosen independently. This scheme ensures that the samples are “well spread out”, which reduces the probability of randomly losing high-weight particles or duplicating low-weight particles.

It will be useful later on to have a better idea about the marginal distributions of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ that are induced by stratified resampling. There are complex dependencies between the offspring counts, but we can still find some constraints on the distribution of each count conditional on the corresponding weight. Write the i^{th} weight in the form $w_t^{(i)} = (k + \delta)/N$, where $\delta \in [0, 1)$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, N - 1\}$. Considering the illustration Figure 2.6b, the distribution of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ depends not only on $w_t^{(i)}$ but also on where the i^{th} weight interval falls with respect to the length-($1/N$) intervals. There are three cases to consider, which are illustrated in Figure 2.5. Note that Case 3 **replace with subfig reference** cannot happen if $k = 0$.

Notice that in any case, $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{k - 1, k, k + 1, k + 2\}$ almost surely. To define a probability distribution over these four values, we introduce the notation $p_j := \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + j \mid w_t^{(i)}]$, for $j = -1, 0, 1, 2$. Since the sample within each interval of length $1/N$ is uniform over that interval, we find the probabilities given in Table 2.2, in terms of δ and the other quantities $\delta_L, \delta_R, x_L, x_R$ defined in the Figure. The probabilities do not depend on k , but of course the corresponding values of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ do. (Note that $\delta_L + \delta_R = \delta$ and $x_L + x_R = 1 + \delta$.)

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
p_{-1}	0	0	$x_L x_R - \delta$
p_0	$1 - \delta$	$1 - \delta + \delta_L \delta_R$	$1 + \delta - 2x_L x_R$
p_1	δ	$\delta - 2\delta_L \delta_R$	$x_L x_R$
p_2	0	$\delta_L \delta_R$	0

Table 2.2: Marginal probability distribution of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ conditional on $w_t^{(i)}$, in terms of δ and the quantities defined in Figure 2.5. **Once Figure 2.5 is made properly and labelled with subfig, we can refer to the subfig labels for the Cases in this table.**

By considering the constraints on $\delta_L, \delta_R, x_L, x_R$, we also have the following properties which hold in every case (i.e. for any $w_t^{(i)}$):

- $p_{-1} \leq 1/4$
- $p_2 \leq 1/4$
- only one of p_{-1}, p_2 can be non-zero.






Figure 2.6: Cases for stratified resampling with a fixed weight. Case 3 is only valid for $k \geq 1$.

Systematic resampling ✓

Systematic resampling is described in Carpenter, Clifford, and Fearnhead (1999) and also in Whitley (1994) where it is called “stochastic universal sampling”.

Like stratified resampling, it uses the inversion sampler of multinomial resampling but starts with a more regular set of points in $[0, 1]$. In this scheme, only one standard Uniform sample is drawn, $u \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$, from which the N samples are generated by via the transformation

$$U_i = \frac{u + i - 1}{N}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. The parental indices are again selected according to (2.7). The method is illustrated in Figure 2.6c.

Whitley (1994) describes a slightly different picture, where the interval $[0, 1]$ is joined up into a circle, and the systematic samples are evenly spaced pointers on an outer ring, which is spun around like a roulette wheel to sample a random phase which, modulo 1, is equal to u . [figure please](#) For systematic resampling, Whitley’s “roulette wheel” representation is equivalent to that of Figure 2.6c.

Like stratified resampling, systematic resampling ensures the random numbers are “well spread out”; the resulting samples are even more constrained than with stratified resampling. Systematic resampling also has the advantage of being extremely easy to implement and also computationally efficient, requiring only one sample from a pseudo-random number generator (PRNG) followed by some elementary operations.

However, this scheme is known to exhibit pathological behaviour in some cases because its performance depends on the ordering of the weights. A simple example of this phenomenon is presented in Douc, Cappé, and Moulines (2005). Such behaviour can be avoided by randomly permuting the weights before resampling, and this is the recommended practice.

Star resampling ✓

For the sake of comparison, we also construct a resampling scheme which is the worst possible (in some sense). Sample

$$a_t \sim \text{Categorical}(\{1, \dots, N\}, w_t^{(1:N)})$$

and set $a_t^{(i)} = a_t$ for all i . The resulting offspring counts are all equal to zero except for $\nu_t^{(a_t)}$, which is equal to N . This resampling scheme is indeed unbiased, since each offspring count has marginal distribution

$$\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(1:N)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{w.p. } 1 - w_t^{(i)} \\ N & \text{w.p. } w_t^{(i)}. \end{cases}$$

We also see these offspring counts have the highest possible marginal variance, subject to $\mathbb{E}[\nu_t^{(i)} | w_t^{(i)}] = Nw_t^{(i)}$ and $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{0, \dots, N\}$.

I call this scheme *star resampling* because the parent-offspring relationships at each iteration form a star graph.

Minimum-variance resampling

The minimal variance branching algorithm of Crisan and Lyons (1999) provides a framework for minimal-variance resampling. The idea is to enforce minimal variance by resampling such that each offspring count $\nu_t^{(i)}$, conditionally on $w_t^{(i)}$, has marginal distribution

$$\nu_t^{(i)} | w_t^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + \text{Bernoulli}(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor). \quad (2.9)$$

We will see later on that this is exactly the framework of *stochastic rounding*. The set-up of Crisan and Lyons (1999) does not require the number of particles to remain constant from one generation to the next (Property 1 in Definition 2.2), so their minimal variance branching algorithm could be implemented for instance by sampling each $\nu_t^{(i)}$ independently from (2.9). The authors remark that enforcing strictly negative correlation between the offspring counts can improve the rate of convergence, but they do not specify how this might be achieved.

Also write about Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019), which in some sense extends/formalises the notions of Crisan and Lyons (1999).

2.4.3 Properties ~

Low-variance: variance of what? Different criteria/ definitions of optimality. Link back to adaptive resampling: interaction between adaptive and low-variance resampling. Comparison of properties of these, existing results comparing schemes. Implementation considerations. Theoretical justification (or lack of). Mention computational complexity. This section was dumped from elsewhere and most of its subsections need redrafting. Also add a paragraph here to introduce it, saying that everything is summarised in the table.

Support of offspring numbers ✓

Let us consider the support of the marginal offspring distributions in each scheme, conditional on the weights. Suppose that the i^{th} weight lies in the interval $w_t^{(i)} \in [k/N, (k+1)/N]$.

Under multinomial resampling, it is possible for $\nu_t^{(i)}$ to take any value from 0 to N (although some values are of course more likely than others). Thus it is possible for a high-weight particle to have zero offspring, or a low-weight particle to have many offspring, simply by chance. Recall that the weights give an indication of how “useful” each particle is for the approximation. Thus killing a high-weight particle is likely to increase

2 Background

the variance of the SMC estimates, while duplicating a low-weight particle wastes computational resources on propagating particles that will not contribute much to reducing that variance.

Residual resampling ensures that every particle with above-average (i.e. $> 1/N$) weight has at least one offspring, avoiding the loss of high-weight particles. If the residuals are sampled using multinomial resampling then the duplication of low-weight particles is not avoided, $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{k, \dots, k+R\} \subseteq \{k, \dots, N\}$, but this can be addressed by using a lower-variance scheme for the residual offspring. Various choices are included in Table 2.3.

Stratified resampling is more restrictive, $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{k-1, k, k+1, k+2\}$, but allows the possibility of a particle with above-average weight having no offspring. Systematic resampling has the smallest support, $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{k, k+1\}$, that is possible whilst maintaining unbiasedness.

Another way to quantify this property is by considering the maximum possible difference between the offspring count $\nu_t^{(i)}$ and its expected value $Nw_t^{(i)}$. This is also presented in Table 2.3.

Degeneracy under equal weights ✓

In the case where all of the weights are multiples of $1/N$, low-variance schemes such as residual and systematic resampling become fully deterministic. Since $\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor = Nw_t^{(i)}$ for each i , residual resampling will have $R = 0$ leaving no remainder to be assigned stochastically. In systematic resampling exactly $\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor = Nw_t^{(i)}$ samples will fall in the i^{th} interval. In particular, if $w_t^{(1:N)} = (1, \dots, 1)/N$ then each parent is assigned exactly one offspring deterministically, so there is effectively no resampling.

The same phenomenon occurs with stratified resampling, but not if one uses Whitley's roulette wheel description (Figure ??). The random phase shift introduced by "spinning the wheel" prevents the inversion sampling intervals from lining up exactly with the weight intervals, so the resampled offspring counts may vary from their means by one either side. Whitley (1994) does not describe stratified resampling, but we see that unlike with systematic resampling, the roulette wheel description is not equivalent to the standard inversion sampling description. For stratified resampling, the roulette wheel adds some extra randomness, so the straightforward inversion sampler is preferred.

If the state space is continuous, the event that all weights are multiples of $1/N$ typically has zero measure, but with non-zero probability we can get arbitrarily close to this regime in which resampling becomes deterministic.

Marginal variance of offspring counts ✓

Mention negative association? = teaser for later, which has to do with covariance between counts rather than marginal variance.

One indication of the performance could be the variance of the resampled offspring counts. For instance we might ask what is the marginal variance of $\nu_t^{(i)}$, conditional on

2 Background

the corresponding weight $w_t^{(i)}$.

In multinomial resampling, the marginal distributions are

$$\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)} \sim \text{Binomial}(N, w_t^{(i)}) \quad (2.10)$$

so the variance is

$$\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] = N w_t^{(i)} (1 - w_t^{(i)}). \quad (2.11)$$

Compare this to star resampling, where the marginal offspring counts

$$\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} N \text{Bernoulli}(w_t^{(i)}) \quad (2.12)$$

having variance

$$\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] = N^2 w_t^{(i)} (1 - w_t^{(i)}), \quad (2.13)$$

N times larger than in the multinomial case.

As pointed out in Crisan and Lyons (1999, p.557), their minimal variance branching process yields offspring variance

$$\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] = (N w_t^{(i)} - \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor) (1 - N w_t^{(i)} + \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \leq \frac{1}{4}, \quad (2.14)$$

since the stochastic part of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ is a $\text{Bernoulli}(N w_t^{(i)} - \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor)$ random variable (as seen in (2.9)). The same marginal variance appears from systematic, residual-systematic and SSP resampling, since these all share the same marginal offspring distributions. We will see in Section 2.4.4 that all of these schemes fall within the *stochastic rounding* class, and the marginal offspring variance is a property shared by all stochastic roundings.

The marginal variance is harder to calculate for other schemes such as residual-multinomial and stratified resampling because these were not defined in terms of marginal distributions, nor are the offspring counts independent conditional on the weights. However, it is possible in some cases to find upper bounds on the variance, and some such bounds are derived below.

Residual-multinomial: $\nu_t^{(i)}$ depends on all of the other weights, as well as $w_t^{(i)}$, but only through the statistic $R := \sum(N w_t^{(i)} - \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor)$. We have

$$\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R \stackrel{d}{=} \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor + \text{Binomial}\left(R, \frac{N w_t^{(i)} - \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor}{R}\right). \quad (2.15)$$

2 Background

Using the law of total variance,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R] \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] + \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R] \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \left(1 - \frac{Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor}{R} \right) \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&\quad + \text{Var} \left[Nw_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&= Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)^2 \mathbb{E}[R^{-1} \mid w_t^{(i)}] \\
&\leq Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for residual resampling with star residuals,

$$\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R \stackrel{d}{=} \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + R \text{Bernoulli} \left(\frac{Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor}{R} \right). \quad (2.16)$$

and we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R] \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] + \text{Var} \left[\mathbb{E}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}, R] \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[R(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \left(1 - \frac{Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor}{R} \right) \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&\quad + \text{Var} \left[Nw_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[R(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \left(1 - \frac{Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor}{R} \right) \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] \\
&= (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \mathbb{E} \left[R \mid w_t^{(i)} \right] - (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)^2 \\
&\leq N(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor).
\end{aligned}$$

For stratified resampling, we can use the constraints on the marginal offspring distribution that were derived in Section 2.4.2. Recall that, conditional on $w_t^{(i)}$, $\nu_t^{(i)} = \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + j$ with probability p_j for $j = -1, 0, 1, 2$. Using the values of p_{-1}, p_0, p_1, p_2 in the three cases of Figure 2.5, as summarised in Table 2.2, we find the overall bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] &= \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)^2 \mid w_t^{(i)}] - \mathbb{E}[\nu_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor \mid w_t^{(i)}]^2 \\
&= p_{-1} + p_1 + 4p_2 - (-p_{-1} + p_1 + 2p_2)^2 \leq 1/2.
\end{aligned}$$

Residual-stratified resampling has the further constraint that $p_{-1} = 0$ (i.e. Case 3 of Figure 2.5 doesn't occur) since the residual weights are between 0 and $1/R$. However this does not give an improvement on the stratified bound:

$$\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} \mid w_t^{(i)}] \leq 1/2.$$

Table 2.3 includes upper bounds on $\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)}]$ for various resampling schemes, indepen-

2 Background

dent of $w_t^{(i)}$. Those general bounds are derived from the results of this section, bounded above independently of the weights. Some of the bounds are certainly not tight.

Contribution to the Monte Carlo variance

Finish the proof. Remark that we can't do a formal variance comparison for syst (and others?).

While the variance of the offspring counts goes some way to providing a comparison between the various resampling schemes, a more relevant property is the contribution of the resampling step to the Monte Carlo variance. This quantifies directly the effect that a certain choice of resampling scheme has on the variance of the Monte Carlo estimators.

Let $(\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by the particle positions and weights up to and including time t . Let $\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}$ denote position of the i th resampled particle. We consider the one-step Monte Carlo variance induced by resampling, that is

$$\rho(\varphi) := \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right] \quad (2.17)$$

where φ is an arbitrary test function.

Some results comparing this variance across different resampling schemes are presented in Douc, Cappé, and Moulines (2005). Their results, plus some additional results, are presented in Proposition 2.1.

Proposition 2.1 (Variance of resampling schemes). *Let ρ_{multi} etc. denote the variance (2.17) under the various resampling schemes, as abbreviated in Table 2.1. For any square-integrable ? function φ ,*

- (a) $\rho_{multi}(\varphi) \geq \rho_{res-multi}(\varphi)$
- (b) $\rho_{multi}(\varphi) \geq \rho_{strat}(\varphi)$
- (c) $\rho_{star}(\varphi) = N\rho_{multi}(\varphi)$
- (d) $\rho_{res-star}(\varphi) \geq \rho_{res-multi}(\varphi) \geq \rho_{res-strat}(\varphi)$

Parts (a) and (b) were proved in Douc, Cappé, and Moulines (2005, Section 3). The second inequality in (d) is stated in Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019, p.9) and follows from (b), as shown below.

2 Background

Proof. **multinomial resampling:** the resampled indices are conditionally i.i.d., so

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\text{multi}}(\varphi) &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right] = \frac{1}{N} \text{Var} \left[\varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi^2(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right]^2 \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) \mathbb{P}[\tilde{X}_t^{(i)} = X_t^{(j)} \mid \mathcal{G}_t] - \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) \mathbb{P}[\tilde{X}_t^{(i)} = X_t^{(j)} \mid \mathcal{G}_t] \right\}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} \right\}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

star resampling: all of the resampled indices are equal, say $\tilde{X}_t^{(1)} = \dots = \tilde{X}_t^{(N)} = X_t^\star$, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\text{star}}(\varphi) &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) \mid \mathcal{G}_t \right] = \text{Var} [\varphi(X_t^\star) \mid \mathcal{G}_t] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [\varphi^2(X_t^\star) \mid \mathcal{G}_t] - \mathbb{E} [\varphi(X_t^\star) \mid \mathcal{G}_t]^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) \mathbb{P}[X_t^\star = X_t^{(j)} \mid \mathcal{G}_t] - \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) \mathbb{P}[X_t^\star = X_t^{(j)} \mid \mathcal{G}_t] \right\}^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} \right\}^2 \\
&= N \rho_{\text{multi}}(\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves part (c). Here we see the same factor of N as we had with the marginal variance of offspring counts, due to the variance reduction achieved by taking N independent copies (multinomial resampling) as opposed to N identical copies (star resampling).

residual-multinomial resampling: the Monte Carlo estimate in (2.17) can be decomposed into a sum of conditionally deterministic terms plus a sum of conditionally i.i.d. terms: conditional on \mathcal{G}_t ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi(\tilde{X}_t^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \lfloor N w_t^{(i)} \rfloor \varphi(X_t^{(i)}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^R \varphi(\hat{X}_t^{(i)})$$

where $\hat{X}_t^{(i)} \sim^{\text{iid}} \text{Multinomial}(R, r^{(1:N)})$. The first sum is conditionally deterministic and hence does not contribute to the Monte Carlo variance (2.17). By a similar calculation to

2 Background

that for multinomial resampling,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\text{res-multi}}(\varphi) &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^R \varphi(\hat{X}_t^{(i)}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \\
&= \frac{R}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) r^{(j)} - \frac{R}{N^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) r^{(j)} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) \lfloor N w_t^{(j)} \rfloor - \frac{R}{N^2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) r^{(j)} \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar argument, it can be shown that

$$\rho_{\text{res-star}}(\varphi) = R \rho_{\text{res-multi}}(\varphi) \geq \rho_{\text{res-multi}}(\varphi),$$

whenever $R \geq 1$, proving the first inequality in (d) (which holds trivially when $R = 0$ because both residual schemes then have zero variance). Maybe I should do res-star explicitly actually; if I'm including proofs that have already been published then I ought to include proofs that haven't. To prove (a), write

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\text{res-multi}}(\varphi) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) \lfloor N w_t^{(j)} \rfloor + \frac{R}{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) r^{(j)} \right)^2 \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) \lfloor N w_t^{(j)} \rfloor + \frac{R}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) r^{(j)} \right\}^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi^2(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} - \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \varphi(X_t^{(j)}) w_t^{(j)} \right\}^2 = \rho_{\text{multi}}(\varphi).
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality is an application of Jensen's inequality, since

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\lfloor N w_t^{(j)} \rfloor}{N} + \frac{R}{N} = 1.$$

...

■

Exchangeability ✓

We will call a resampling scheme exchangeable if the resulting distribution of parental indices is invariant under permutations of the children. To put it another way, each child chooses its parent from the same marginal distribution.

It is clear that multinomial resampling is exchangeable since in this case the parental indices are independent and identically distributed. However it is worth noting that efficient implementations of multinomial sampling may not preserve exchangeability in practice.

Stratified and systematic resampling are clearly not exchangeable since, for instance, child 1 is more likely to choose parent 1 than child N is. However, this is merely a feature of the arbitrary ordering of the sampling steps: exchangeability can easily be reintroduced (at $O(N)$ cost) by applying a random permutation to the vector of parental indices after sampling. The same goes for residual resampling. This property will not appear in Table 2.3 since it depends upon the particular implementation.

Permutation invariance ✓

A strange property of stratified and systematic resampling is that they are sensitive to the order in which the subintervals are placed. For example, in Figures 2.6b and 2.6c if the intervals w_2 and w_4 were swapped, the number of offspring assigned to particles 2 and 4 would be swapped in each case. Better to use an example where *distribution of offspring counts (conditional on the weights but not on the Uniform samples)* differs depending on order. Such an example is included in my YRM19 presentation on resampling. We can also see that because w_1 has weight $\geq 1/N$ and is placed first, it is guaranteed at least one offspring.

This property can lead to pathological behaviour, but is easily avoided by applying a random permutation to the order of the subintervals. The SSP resampling scheme of Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019) is intended to share the benefits of systematic resampling whilst avoiding this property.

Sorting

Results from Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019) about benefits of sorting. What about sorting instead by weights?

Computational complexity ✓

All of the resampling algorithms discussed in Section 2.4.2 can be implemented in $O(N)$ operations. Even star and SSP and branching? If it turns out to differ depending on resampling scheme then include it as a column in Table 2.3. — I think we can't say for branching because it depends on implementation, but Crisan and Lyons (1999, Corollary 18) seems to imply $O(N^2)$...? Considering the complexity of each operation, Hol (2004) and Hol, Schön, and Gustafsson (2006) suggest that systematic resampling is fastest because it only requires one pseudo-random number generation, and multinomial resampling is slower than stratified resampling because of the transformations required. Residual resampling is hard to compare directly because a random fraction of the operations are deterministic, so the number of pseudo-random numbers required is less than N . This analysis was backed up by simulation experiments. However, the analysis of per-particle cost is sensitive to the particular implementation of each resampling scheme, the system implementation of pseudo-random number generation and arithmetic operations, and the hardware used.

Negative association

Definition from Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019). Why is it a good criterion? Which resampling schemes do/don't satisfy it? Also, this could be added as a column in Table 2.3.

Following Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019), we use the definition of negative association from Joag-Dev and Proschan (1983).

Definition 2.3. Let (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) be a collection of random variables. $Z_{1:n}$ are said to be *negatively associated* if, for every partition of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ into subsets I and J , for all real-valued coordinatewise non-decreasing functions φ, ψ for which the covariance is well defined,

$$\text{Cov} [\varphi(Z_I), \psi(Z_J)] \leq 0. \quad (2.18)$$

Star discrepancy ✓

(See Hol, Schön, and Gustafsson (2006) for inspiration.) Include a diagram showing the quantity inside the D^* supremum, plotted over u , for mn/strat/syst? (sketched in sora — use same weights and samples as in Figure 2.6a.) Does not appear in Table 2.3 since it only makes sense for resampling schemes based on inversion sampling.

The *star discrepancy* [citation] is a measure of the regularity of a given set of points $u_{1:N}$ in the unit hypercube. For our purposes it is sufficient to define the star discrepancy in one dimension:

$$D^*(u_1, \dots, u_N) := \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{\{u_i \leq u\}} - u \right|. \quad (2.19)$$

The quantity inside the supremum is the difference between the empirical CDF of the observed points $u_{1:N}$ and the CDF of the Uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. The star discrepancy is used in quasi-Monte Carlo, where “low-discrepancy” points are used in place of uniform samples to decrease the variance of Monte Carlo estimates.

We have noted already we haven't actually, but we should that resampling can itself be viewed as a Monte Carlo procedure. From this point-of-view, stratified and systematic resampling are quasi-Monte Carlo versions of multinomial resampling, since they provide “more regular” points to be used in inversion sampling.

In one dimension, the lowest-discrepancy point set is the regular grid $(\frac{1}{2N}, \frac{3}{2N}, \dots, \frac{2N-1}{2N})$, which has star discrepancy $1/(2N)$ [citation]. However, to maintain unbiasedness of resampling, the points must have marginal Uniform[0, 1] distributions, which the regular grid points clearly do not. The point sets generated in stratified and systematic resampling both have star discrepancy between $1/(2N)$ and $1/N$ almost surely, where the exact value depends on the realisation. This certainly seems to improve on independent uniform points which can have star discrepancy arbitrarily close to 1, the maximum possible value, albeit with diminishing probability as N increases.

Optimal resampling

Crisan and Lyons (1999) introduce another resampling scheme based on a branching process, which they show to be optimal in some sense. However, their algorithm is not widely used in practice because it is much more complicated to implement than alternatives like systematic resampling which perform just as well empirically, and share some of its optimality properties (Bain and Crisan 2008). Possibly add an “optimality” column in Table 2.3 containing in what sense a scheme might be considered optimal.

	support of $\nu_t^{(i)}$ given $\frac{k}{N} \leq w_t^{(i)} < \frac{k+1}{N}$	$ \nu_t^{(i)} - Nw_t^{(i)} $	upper bound on $\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)}]$	stochastic rounding?	$w_t^{(1:N)} = \frac{1}{N}(1, \dots, 1)$?	degenerate if of weights?	sensitive to permutations of weights?	PRNG calls
multi	$\{0, \dots, N\}$	N	$N/4$	\times	\times	\times	\times	N
star	$\{0, N\}$	N	$N^2/4$	\times	\times	\times	\times	1
strat	$\{k-1, k, k+1, k+2\}$	2	$1/2$	\times	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	N
syst	$\{k, k+1\}$	1	$1/4$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	1
res-multi	$\{k, \dots, N\}$	N	1	\times	\checkmark	\times	\times	$\leq N$
res-star	$\{k, N\}$	N	N	\times	\checkmark	\times	\times	1
res-strat	$\{k, k+1, k+2\}$	2	$1/2$	\times	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\leq N$
res-syst	$\{k, k+1\}$	1	$1/4$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	1
ssp	$\{k, k+1\}?$	$1?$	$1/4?$	$\checkmark?$	$\checkmark?$	$\checkmark?$	$\checkmark?$	$?$
branch	$\{k, k+1\}$	1	$1/4?$	\checkmark	\checkmark			

Table 2.3: Summary of some of the properties of resampling schemes explored in Section 2.4.3. The abbreviated names for the resampling schemes are explained in Table 2.1. **I need to include an explanation of the column titles in the caption too.** Some properties are not specified for branching because they will depend on the particular implementation.

2.4.4 Stochastic rounding ✓

Definition 2.4. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_N)$ be a \mathbb{R}_+^N -valued random variable. Then $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N) \in \mathbb{N}^N$ is a *stochastic rounding* of X if each element Y_i takes values

$$Y_i | X_i = \begin{cases} \lfloor X_i \rfloor & \text{with probability } 1 - X_i + \lfloor X_i \rfloor \\ \lfloor X_i \rfloor + 1 & \text{with probability } X_i - \lfloor X_i \rfloor. \end{cases}$$

By construction, $\mathbb{E}(Y_i) = X_i$ for each i . Taking X to be N times the vector of particle weights, we can therefore use stochastic rounding to construct a valid resampling scheme, under the further constraint that $Y_1 + \dots + Y_N = N$. Several ways to enforce this constraint on the joint distribution have been proposed, including systematic resampling, residual resampling with systematic residuals, the minimal variance branching system of Crisan and Lyons (1997), and the Srinivasan sampling process resampling introduced in Gerber, Chopin, and Whiteley (2019).

Explicitly, the offspring counts are marginally distributed according to

$$\nu_t^{(i)} | w_t^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + \text{Bernoulli}(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor). \quad (2.20)$$

Some of the properties discussed earlier are common to every stochastic rounding scheme. Since all such schemes give offspring counts with the same marginal distributions, properties such as the marginal offspring variance are common to all stochastic roundings. Indeed it is easy to see that the marginal variance of the offspring counts, $\text{Var}[\nu_t^{(i)} | w_t^{(i)}]$ is as small as possible under the constraint of unbiasedness (refer to the property in Defintion 2.2?), and as such this is sometimes referred to as minimal-variance resampling. By definition the support of an offspring count $\nu_t^{(i)}$, if the associated weight lies in the interval $k/N \leq w_t^{(i)} < (k+1)/N$, is $\{k, k+1\}$. All stochastic roundings are also degenerate by definition when the weights are all equal, i.e. $w_t^{(1:N)} = (1, \dots, 1)/N$.

2.5 Conditional SMC ~

2.5.1 Particle MCMC ✓

Motivate particle MCMC methods.

The idea behind particle MCMC methods is to use SMC steps within the MCMC updates in a way that improves the mixing properties of the Markov chain. In certain models, generally those including some highly correlated sequential components, this strategy can be very effective.

One popular particle MCMC algorithm is particle marginal Metropolis-Hastings (Andrieu, Doucet, and Holenstein 2010)[Section 2.4.2], a pseudo-marginal MCMC algorithm in which SMC provides an unbiased likelihood estimate with which to compute the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance probability. The following exposition will focus on another particle

MCMC algorithm, namely the particle Gibbs sampler (Andrieu, Doucet, and Holenstein 2010)[Section 2.4.3], which is more interesting from the point-of-view of SMC genealogies.

The following scenario illustrates the power of particle MCMC, and is a good model to have in mind as we go on to discuss particle Gibbs and ancestor sampling. Emphasise that the inference itself is not sequential; we are targeting one static posterior distribution, on a fixed time horizon.

2.5.2 Particle Gibbs algorithm ~

Present particle Gibbs algorithm (for the specific model just introduced?, but note that of course the algorithm is more general). Explain why CSMC is required within particle Gibbs. The following was dumped from elsewhere and NEEDS REDRAFTING.

The scenario we present is a particle Gibbs algorithm for filtering with unknown parameters. The method applies more generally to particle Gibbs (for which the reader is directed to Lindsten and Schön (2013, Chapter 5)), but we find this particular scenario to be simple and instructive. To generalise to Del Moral's SMC framework basically requires just the change of notation $g \rightarrow G_t, f \rightarrow M_t$.

Consider the following hidden Markov model, parametrised by a constant parameter θ which may be multidimensional. Define the spaces in which θ, X, Y live?

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t | X_t &\sim g_\theta(\cdot | X_t) \\ X_t | X_{t-1} &\sim f_\theta(\cdot | X_{t-1}) \\ X_0 &\sim \mu_\theta(\cdot) \\ \theta &\sim p(\cdot) \end{aligned}$$

Add ranges for t in first two lines. Use q instead of f for better congruity with other sections? We work on a fixed time horizon $T \in \mathbb{N}$, which is necessary to implement the particle Gibbs algorithm. Can be artificially imposed by block sampling if doing online-ish inference? The measures corresponding to μ_θ, f_θ and g_θ are assumed to be known and to admit densities, and we are also given a fixed sequence of observations $y_{1:T}$. Either mention that f, g can depend on t , or make this explicit in the notation. Don't really need to include prior on θ ; it's not relevant to CSMC step.

Our aim is to generate Monte Carlo samples from the joint distribution of $X_{0:T}$ and θ conditional on $y_{1:T}$. Outside of models admitting closed-form solutions, this is typically the most practical way to draw samples from the marginal distributions of either θ or any subset of the states $X_{0:T}$, by marginalising the Monte Carlo samples.

The structure of the model invites Gibbs sampling: alternating between updating θ conditional on $X_{0:T}$, and updating $X_{0:T}$ conditional on θ . “These conditionals are typically much easier to sample from than the corresponding marginals.” (due to the

2 Background

dependence structure in the HMM). The θ update consists of sampling from

$$p(\theta | x_{0:T}, y_{1:T}) \propto p(\theta) p(x_{0:T}, y_{1:T} | \theta),$$

which can be achieved quite easily with a Metropolis–Hastings step. The X update is the ‘difficult’ part, requiring a sample from

$$p(x_{0:T} | \theta, y_{1:T}) =: \gamma_T^\theta(x_{0:T}).$$

Define gamma for general s too:

$$\gamma_s^\theta(x_{0:s}) \propto \mu_\theta(x_0) g_\theta(y_0 | x_0) \prod_{r=1}^s f_\theta(x_r | x_{r-1}) g_\theta(y_r | x_r).$$

This target distribution is suited to sequential Monte Carlo, and this is where the ‘particle’ part of particle Gibbs comes in. We update all of the hidden states $X_{0:T}$ in one Gibbs step, which consists of drawing one sample from a particle filter. To target the correct distribution, we use conditional SMC for these updates, conditional on the sample of $X_{0:T}$ from the previous sweep.

Refer back to the CSMC algorithm which I’ve already written down somewhere, explaining how the inputs to the algorithm correspond to functions/quantities introduced in this setting.

2.5.3 Ancestor sampling ~

Algorithm (or required changes to generic algorithm). Relation to backward sampling. When can it be implemented? Effect on performance (when is it effective?). Maybe illustrate/motivate with some plots as in the ancestor sampling note. The following was dumped from elsewhere and NEEDS REDRAFTING.

Ancestor sampling was first suggested by Nick Whiteley in the discussion on Andrieu, Doucet, and Holenstein (2010). Its contribution is to reduce autocorrelation between samples obtained using the particle Gibbs algorithm (Andrieu, Doucet, and Holenstein 2010). Proper way to cite discussion of paper?

Ancestral degeneracy leads to poor mixing

Particle Gibbs runs into problems when the time horizon T is large compared to the number of particles N . T is determined by the application at hand, and N is limited by computational resources, so we may not be able to control their relative size. The source of the problem is ancestral degeneracy. We know that in standard SMC algorithms this problem exists and its effect is to increase the variance of our Monte Carlo estimates. In particle Gibbs, the N simulated trajectories are not used to estimate anything; only one trajectory is sampled at each step, and becomes one state a Markov chain Monte Carlo




Fig. 5.3 Particle system generated by CSMC at iterations r (top) and $r + 1$ (bottom) of the PG sampler. The dots show the particle positions, the thin black lines show the ancestral dependence of the particles and the thick black lines show the sampled trajectories $x_{1:T}[r]$ and $x_{1:T}[r + 1]$, respectively. In the bottom pane, the thick gray line illustrates the conditioned path at iteration $r + 1$, which by construction equals $x_{1:T}[r]$. Note that, due to path degeneracy, the particles shown as gray dots are not reachable by tracing any of the ancestral lineages from time T and back.

Figure 2.7: PLACEHOLDER. Copied from Lindsten and Schön (2013).

estimate. Ancestral degeneracy now has a less direct effect: it causes the Markov chain to mix slowly.

To see why, take a look at Figure 2.7. In Figure 2.7a we have just completed the r^{th} Gibbs sweep, sampling $\theta[r]$ and $x_{0:T}[r]$. For the $(r + 1)^{th}$ sweep, we take as immortal trajectory $x_{0:T}^* = x_{0:T}[r]$, and run conditional SMC. Due to ancestral degeneracy, many of the resulting trajectories coalesce, and since the immortal trajectory must survive across the whole time window, they tend to coalesce onto the immortal trajectory (Figure 2.7b). Now we obtain the next sample $x_{0:T}[r + 1]$ by sampling a trajectory among the N we have just simulated. Whichever one we choose, it has a high amount of overlap with the immortal trajectory, i.e. the previous sample $x_{0:T}[r]$. This behaviour tends to repeat at every iteration, meaning the early X coordinates are getting ‘stuck’ (rarely being updated). This is clearly a problem for the mixing of the Markov chain. **Another way to explain this is that the variables defining the immortal trajectory (indices and states) are never refreshed during the Gibbs sweep - this is the explanation given in Lindsten Ch5.** It renders the particle Gibbs algorithm impractical for any such model where the time horizon T is too large: either we must run the Markov chain for longer, or increase the number of particles N in the conditional SMC step, neither of which is feasible on a limited computational




Figure 2.8: PLACEHOLDER. Interpretation of a resampling weight for the immortal offspring.

budget.

The solution: ancestor sampling

An effective solution (where it is possible to implement it) was proposed by Nick Whiteley and is known as ancestor sampling. It consists of a simple modification to the resampling step within the conditional SMC algorithm. In the basic CSMC algorithm, at each time step the particles are resampled by multinomial resampling according to their weights. That is, at each time t , each non-immortal offspring is assigned a parent as so:

$$\mathbb{P}[a_t^{(j)} = i] \propto w_t^{(i)},$$

while the immortal offspring is deterministically assigned to the immortal parent.

In ancestor sampling we do the same thing, except that the immortal particle is also resampled, rather than being deterministically assigned:

$$\mathbb{P}[a_t^{(j)} = i] \propto \begin{cases} w_t^{(i)} & \text{non-immortal particles} \\ w_t^{(i)} \frac{\gamma_T^\theta((x_{0:t-1}^{(i)}, x_{t:T}^{*}))}{\gamma_{t-1}^\theta(x_{0:t-1}^{(i)})} & \text{immortal particle.} \end{cases}$$

The ratio of γ s can be interpreted as the conditional probability of the trajectory continuing with $x_{t:T}^{*}$ given it starts with $x_{0:t-1}^{(i)}$ (see Figure 2.8). Using the structure of the hidden Markov model defined earlier, we can rewrite the ratio

$$\frac{\gamma_T^\theta((x_{0:t-1}^{(i)}, x_{t:T}^{*}))}{\gamma_{t-1}^\theta(x_{0:t-1}^{(i)})} \propto f_\theta(x_t^* | x_{t-1}^{(i)}) g_\theta(y_t | x_t^*) \prod_{s=t}^T f_\theta(x_s^* | x_{s-1}^*) g_\theta(y_s | x_s^*) \propto f_\theta(x_t^* | x_{t-1}^{(i)}).$$

Should the first prompt actually be equality? So it looks like it should also be pretty easy to implement ancestor sampling for our model. **Write down the pseudocode to prove it?** The only catch is that we need to be able to evaluate f_θ pointwise, whereas in the basic algorithm we only need to draw samples from f_θ . This will rule out ancestor sampling in some applications.




Figure 2.9: PLACEHOLDER. Illustration of how ancestor sampling prevents coalescence onto the immortal trajectory.

Why ancestor sampling works

Ancestor sampling is backward sampling, but only for the immortal trajectory. (It isn't possible to do backward sampling during the forward sweep for any except the immortal trajectory - see that we can't evaluate the required γ s without knowing the future states, which are known only for the immortal trajectory.) We know that backward sampling (on all trajectories, in a separate backward sweep) eradicates ancestral degeneracy. But we've only backward-sampled one trajectory, leaving the other $N - 1$ trajectories to do their coalescing thing.

The important point is that ancestor sampling does not prevent ancestral degeneracy (it mitigates it a tiny bit like $1/N$). Ancestral degeneracy is pretty much as severe as ever; the difference is that the trajectories no longer coalesce preferentially onto the immortal trajectory. There is no longer an immortal trajectory to coalesce onto. An illustration of this can be seen in Figure 2.9.

Remember, the problem with ancestral degeneracy in particle Gibbs was that it induced strong autocorrelation among consecutive samples of $X_{0:T}$. It isn't a problem that the trajectories coalesce, as long as the thing they coalesce to is able to move, readily exploring the state space. This is achieved with ancestor sampling.

2 Background

Why is ancestor sampling even a valid thing to do (i.e. still targetting the right thing)? Extended state space argument?(I think there is one in Lindsten Ch5). No need to go into it here unless there is a simple intuitive explanation to put the reader's mind at rest.

3 Limits

3.1 Encoding genealogies ~

3.1.1 The genealogical process ✓

Before we can analyse genealogies, we need a way to encode them. The encoding will only include the information relevant to the sample genealogy, namely which lineages coalesce at which times. Information about particle positions and “killed” particles is ignored.

Let \mathcal{P}_n be the space of partitions on $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For convenience, we now label time in reverse, so the terminal particles are at time 0, their parents are at time 1, and so on. Consider a sample of n terminal particles among a total of N particles, and label the sampled particles $1, \dots, n$. The genealogical process $(G_t^{(n,N)})_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ for this sample is the \mathcal{P}_n -valued stochastic process such that labels i and j are in the same block of the partition $G_t^{(n,N)}$ if and only if terminal particles i and j have a common ancestor at time t (i.e. t generations back).

A formulation where $G_t^{(n,N)}$ takes values in the space of equivalence relations from $[n]$ to $[n]$ is sometimes used; interpreting partition blocks as equivalence classes, this formulation is equivalent to ours.

The initial (time 0) value of the process is the partition of singletons $G_0^{(n,N)} = \{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$, since all of the terminal particles are separate. The only possible non-identity transitions are those that merge some blocks of the partition; this encodes the coalescence of the corresponding lineages. The trivial partition $\{\{1, \dots, n\}\}$ is therefore an absorbing state, corresponding to all lineages in the sample having coalesced (i.e. the MRCA has been reached). The construction of the genealogical process from the resampling indices is illustrated in Figure 3.1.

3.1.2 Time scale ✓

In order to get a continuous limit, we scale time by a function $\tau_N(\cdot)$. In the population genetics literature, a deterministic time scale can be used [citations] and/or this will have been mentioned already in pop gen example models (Section 2.2.3), whereas in our case τ_N depends on the offspring counts and is therefore random. To define the time scale we first define the pair merger rate

$$c_N(t) := \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2. \quad (3.1)$$




Figure 3.1: Illustration of how the sample genealogy is encoded. (a) Relationships induced by resampling with six particles over four iterations. (b) The genealogy of the terminal particles, labelled with the value of the genealogical process G_t at each time.

This is the probability, conditional on $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$, that a randomly chosen pair of lineages in generation t merges exactly one generation back. To achieve the limiting pair merger rate of 1, as in the n -coalescent, we rescale time by the generalised inverse

$$\tau_N(t) := \inf \left\{ s \geq 1 : \sum_{r=1}^s c_N(r) \geq t \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

The function τ_N maps continuous to discrete time, providing the link between the discrete-time SMC dynamics and the continuous-time Kingman limit. We will also need the following quantity, which is an upper bound on the rate of multiple mergers (three or more lineages merging, or two or more simultaneous pairwise mergers):

$$D_N(t) := \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_t^{(j)})^2 \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Some basic properties are given in Proposition 3.1.

Proposition 3.1 (Properties of c_N). *For all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $t' > s' > 0$,*

- (a) $c_N(t), D_N(t) \in [0, 1]$
- (b) $D_N(t) \leq c_N(t)$
- (c) $c_N(t)^2 \leq c_N(t)$
- (d) $t' \leq \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t')} c_N(r) \leq t' + 1.$
- (e) $t' - s' - 1 \leq \sum_{r=\tau_N(s')+1}^{\tau_N(t')} c_N(r) \leq t' - s' + 1.$

Proof. (a) $c_N(t)$ and $D_N(t)$ are clearly non-negative. Both are maximised when one of the offspring counts is equal to N and the rest are zero, in which case $c_N(t) = D_N(t) = 1$.
(b) As outlined in Koskela et al. (2018, p.9),

$$\begin{aligned} D_N(t) &:= \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N N \nu_t^{(j)} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_t^{(j)} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 = c_N(t). \end{aligned}$$

(c) is immediate given (a).

(d) follows directly from the definition of τ_N in (3.2).

(e) Writing

$$\sum_{r=\tau_N(s')+1}^{\tau_N(t')} c_N(r) = \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t')} c_N(r) - \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(s')} c_N(r),$$

the result follows by applying (d) to both sums. ■

3.1.3 Transition probabilities \sim

Introduce $p_{\xi\eta}$. Present expression for that (or at least for $p_{\xi\xi}$), and hence the bounds on it that will be used later (keeping big-O terms explicit where possible).

Let \mathcal{P}_n be the space of partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and denote by Δ the partition of singletons $\{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$. For any $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $p_{\xi\eta}(t)$ denote the conditional transition probabilities of the genealogical process given $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$ ($t \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{P}_n$). The transition probability $p_{\xi\eta}(t)$ can only be non-zero when η can be obtained from ξ by merging some blocks of ξ . Ordering the blocks by their least element, denote by b_i the number

3 Limits

of blocks of ξ that merge to form block i in η ($i \in \{1, \dots, |\eta|\}$). Hence $b_1 + \dots + b_{|\eta|} = |\xi|$. Then the transition probability is given by

$$p_{\xi\eta}(t) := \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_{|\eta|} \\ = 1}}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_{b_1} \cdots (\nu_t^{(i_{|\eta|})})_{b_{|\eta|}}. \quad (3.4)$$

We will only need to work directly with the *identity* transition probabilities $p_{\xi\xi}(t)$. Upper and lower bounds on these probabilities are presented in Propositions 3.2 and 3.3.

Proposition 3.2 (Lower bound on identity transition probabilities). *Let $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $N > 2$. Then*

$$p_{\xi\xi}(t) \geq 1 - \binom{|\xi|}{2} \frac{N^{n-2}}{(N-2)_{n-2}} [c_N(t) + B_{|\xi|} D_N(t)]$$

where $B_{|\xi|} = K(|\xi| - 1)!(|\xi| - 2) \exp(2\sqrt{2(|\xi| - 2)})$ for some $K > 0$ that does not depend on $|\xi|$.

For weak convergence proof, refer to this proposition but rewrite the inequality using $\xi = \Delta$ and α_n , to provide a local target for cross-referencing. Similarly for UB.

Proof. We have the following expression for $p_{\xi\xi}(t)$, by subtracting all possible non-identity transitions (the omitted $k = |\xi|$ term would count identity transitions):

$$p_{\xi\xi}(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\xi|-1} \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_k = 1 \\ b_1 + \dots + b_k = |\xi|}}^{\|\xi\|} \frac{|\xi|!}{\prod_{j=1}^{|\xi|} (j!)^{\kappa_j} \kappa_j!} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_k = 1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_{b_1} \cdots (\nu_t^{(i_k)})_{b_k},$$

where $\kappa_i = |\{j : b_j = i\}|$ is the multiplicity of mergers of size i (κ_1 counts non-merger events, and we have the identity $\kappa_1 + 2\kappa_2 + \dots + |\xi|\kappa_{|\xi|} = |\xi|$). The combinatorial factor is the number of partitions of a sequence of length $|\xi|$ having κ_j subsequences of length j for each j (Fu 2006, Equation (11)).

We separate the $k = |\xi| - 1$ term (which counts single pair mergers), for which $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{|\xi|-1}) = (2, 1, \dots, 1)$ and

$$\frac{|\xi|!}{\prod_{j=1}^{|\xi|} (j!)^{\kappa_j} \kappa_j!} = \binom{|\xi|}{2}.$$

For the remaining terms we use

$$\frac{|\xi|!}{\prod_{j=1}^{|\xi|} (j!)^{\kappa_j} \kappa_j!} \leq |\xi|!.$$

3 Limits

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\xi\xi}(t) &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \binom{|\xi|}{2} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_{|\xi|-1} = 1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_2 \nu_t^{(i_2)} \dots \nu_t^{(i_{|\xi|-1})} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \sum_{k=1}^{|\xi|-1} \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_k = 1 \\ b_1 + \dots + b_k = |\xi|}}^{|\xi|} |\xi|! \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_k = 1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_{b_1} \dots (\nu_t^{(i_k)})_{b_k} \end{aligned}$$

Now, for the $k = |\xi| - 1$ term we use the bound

$$\sum_{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_{|\xi|-1} = 1}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_2 \nu_t^{(i_2)} \dots \nu_t^{(i_{|\xi|-1})} \leq N^{|\xi|-2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2$$

while for the other terms we have (similarly to Koskela et al. 2018, Lemma 1 Case 3)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_k = 1 \\ \text{all distinct}}}^N (\nu_t^{(i_1)})_{b_1} \dots (\nu_t^{(i_k)})_{b_k} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left(N^{|\xi|-2} - \sum_{\substack{j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_{|\xi|-2} = 1 \\ \text{all distinct and } \neq i}}^N \nu_t^{(j_1)} \dots \nu_t^{(j_{|\xi|-2})} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ N^{|\xi|-2} - (N - \nu_t^{(i)})^{|\xi|-2} + \binom{|\xi|-2}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \left(\sum_{k \neq i} \nu_t^{(k)} \right)^{|\xi|-4} \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ (|\xi| - 2) \nu_t^{(i)} N^{|\xi|-3} + \binom{|\xi|-2}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_t^{(j)})_2^2 N^{|\xi|-4} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses $(N - x)^b \geq N^b - bxN^{b-1}$ for $x \leq N$, $b \geq 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\xi\xi}(t) &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{(N)_{|\xi|}} \binom{|\xi|}{2} N^{|\xi|-2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \\ &\quad - \frac{N^{|\xi|-3}}{(N)_{|\xi|}} |\xi|! \sum_{k=1}^{|\xi|-1} \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq \dots \geq b_k = 1 \\ b_1 + \dots + b_k = |\xi|}}^{|\xi|} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ (|\xi| - 2) \nu_t^{(i)} + \binom{|\xi|-2}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_t^{(j)})_2^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The summands in the last line are independent of k, b_i , and the number of terms in the sums over k and b_1, \dots, b_k is bounded by $\gamma_{|\xi|-2}(|\xi| - 2)$, where γ_n is the number of integer partitions of n . By Hardy and Ramanujan (1918, Section 2), $\gamma_n < K e^{2\sqrt{2n}}/n$ for a constant

$K > 0$ independent of n . Thus, for $|\xi| > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{\xi\xi}(t) &\geq 1 - \frac{N^{|\xi|-2}}{(N-2)_{|\xi|-2}} \binom{|\xi|}{2} c_N(t) \\
&\quad - \frac{N^{|\xi|-2}}{(N-2)_{|\xi|-2}} K \exp(2\sqrt{2(|\xi|-2)}) |\xi|! \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \\
&\quad \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ (|\xi|-2)\nu_t^{(i)} + \binom{|\xi|-2}{2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_t^{(j)})^2 \right\} \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{N^{|\xi|-2}}{(N-2)_{|\xi|-2}} \binom{|\xi|}{2} c_N(t) \\
&\quad - \frac{N^{|\xi|-2}}{(N-2)_{|\xi|-2}} K \exp(2\sqrt{2(|\xi|-2)}) |\xi|! \binom{|\xi|-1}{2} D_N(t) \\
&\geq 1 - \frac{N^{|\xi|-2}}{(N-2)_{|\xi|-2}} \binom{|\xi|}{2} [c_N(t) + B_{|\xi|} D_N(t)]
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{|\xi|} &= \binom{|\xi|}{2}^{-1} K \exp(2\sqrt{2(|\xi|-2)}) |\xi|! \binom{|\xi|-1}{2} \\
&= K(|\xi|-1)!(|\xi|-2) \exp(2\sqrt{2(|\xi|-2)}).
\end{aligned}$$

When $|\xi| \leq 2$, there are no terms with $k \leq |\xi| - 2$, and the result is immediate. ■

Proposition 3.3 (Upper bound on identity transition probabilities). *Let $\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $N > \dots$ some threshold. Then*

$$p_{\xi\xi}(t) \leq 1 - \binom{|\xi|}{2} \frac{N^{n-2}}{(N-2)_{n-2}} [c_N(t) - B'_{|\xi|} D_N(t)]$$

where $B'_{|\xi|} = \binom{|\xi|-1}{2}$.

Proof. The proof follows Koskela et al. (2018, Proof of Lemma 1 Case 1) but with the terms in N kept explicit. (where possible/only some of them?) ■

...

3.2 An existing limit theorem \sim

State KJJS theorem. Discuss the conditions in detail. Give outline of proof. Say somewhere that we can only get pair-merger-only limits because we take a sparse sample; obviously SMC resampling can induce >pair mergers. State the standing assumption somewhere.

Theorem 3.1 (Koskela et al. 2018). *Fix $n \leq N$ as the observed number of particles from the output of an interacting particle system with N particles, and suppose that the standing assumption holds. Suppose also that for any $0 \leq s < t < \infty$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tau_N(s)+1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(r) \right] = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[c_N(t)] = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tau_N(s)+1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(r)^2 \right] = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\tau_N(t) - \tau_N(s)] \leq C_{t,s} N, \quad (3.8)$$

for some constant $C_{t,s} > 0$ that is independent of N . Then $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to the Kingman n -coalescent in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

As we saw in Section ??, the n -coalescent is *exchangeable*, so for instance the pair of lineages merging at each event is chosen uniformly. The standing assumption is a weaker condition than exchangeability of the particles within a generation, which is sufficient to admit an exchangeable process in the limit. Exchangeability of the particles would imply neutrality, an unreasonable assumption in the setting of SMC. In contrast, the standing assumption can easily be enforced upon any SMC algorithm by permuting the offspring immediately after resampling.

To ensure samples of size n have Kingman genealogies in the limit, with pair mergers only, we require that multiple mergers (that is, where more than two lineages merge into one, or where two or more mergers happen simultaneously) occur on a slower time scale than pair mergers. This is the role of condition (3.5).

Conditions (3.6) and (3.7) ensure that the limiting process is continuous and has the required unit pair merger rate. For (3.6) to fail to hold, the expected number of mergers at some generation would have to be $O(N)$. This can only happen if the resampling scheme is very bad (e.g. star resampling) or the weights are particularly badly-behaved. The latter is ruled out in the corollaries of Chapter 4?? by imposing bounds on the potential functions; this is discussed more in Section ??.

Condition 3.8 specifies that the time scale must be $O(N)$. As we saw in Section ??, this is the correct scale for the Wright-Fisher model, but for instance the Moran model has time scale $O(N^2)$ and hence violates this condition. Since we know that the Moran model also has Kingman genealogies in the limit, condition 3.8 clearly is not necessary. The simplified statement of the theorem (Theorem 3.2) does not impose any such condition on the time scale.

3.3 A new limit theorem ✓

Theorem 3.2. Let $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$ denote the offspring numbers in an interacting particle system satisfying the standing assumption and such that, for any N sufficiently large, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t . Suppose that there exists a deterministic sequence $(b_N)_{N \geq 1}$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_N = 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \leq b_N \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2] \quad (3.9)$$

for all N , uniformly in $t \geq 1$. Then the rescaled genealogical process $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

On the RHS of (3.9) is the filtered expectation of $c_N(t)$, i.e. the expected pair merger rate, and the LHS is the corresponding rate of triple mergers. Intuitively, (3.9) says that pair mergers dominate triple mergers, the expected rate of which vanishes as $N \rightarrow \infty$. As we will see, this implies that pair mergers also dominate all other larger mergers, such as simultaneous pair mergers.

Our result improves on Theorem 3.1 by eliminating the restrictive condition (3.8), which is shown in Lemma ?? ?! to be unnecessary. This allows our result to apply to some models not previously included; for example the neutral Moran model of population genetics violates (3.8) but is included in Theorem 3.2. In neutral models the straightforward analogue of (3.9) is necessary and sufficient (Möhle and Sagitov 2003, Theorem 5.4), suggesting that in general this condition is not significantly stronger than (3.5)–(3.7) combined.

Our conditions are also significantly easier to verify than those of Theorem 3.1. Not only are four conditions replaced with one, but the condition (3.9) only involves marginal moments of the offspring counts, whereas (3.5) and (3.7) involve mixed moments. As we will see in Chapter 4, once we move beyond conditionally independent resampling schemes like multinomial resampling, joint distributions of offspring counts become complicated and it may only be feasible to calculate their marginal moments. As such, we are able to verify the conditions of Theorem 3.2 in several cases, whereas Koskela et al. (2018) only apply their theorem to multinomial resampling.

3.3.1 Proof of theorem ~

Explain relationship between this and KJJS theorem, e.g. which conditions are implied by each other (with a diagram?!). Proof that KJJS conditions are implied by ours. Modification of KJJS proof (or even write out a complete proof?) using weaker bound on $p_{\xi\xi}$ (that bound should have been stated and proved already in transition probabilities section). Still need to add the proof of KJJS theorem with changed assumption (sec3.1 in BJK).

3 Limits

The series of Lemmata 3.1–3.3 below show that the assumptions (??)–(??) follow from (3.9). Lemma ?? allows us to remove condition (??) by improving upon some arguments from the proof of Koskela et al. (2018, Theorem 1); this argument is presented in detail in Section ??.

Lemma 3.1. (3.5) \Rightarrow (3.7).

Proof. It is sufficient to show that $c_N(t)^2 \leq D_N(t)N/(N - 1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} c_N(t)^2 &= \frac{1}{N(N-1)(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)}(\nu_t^{(i)} - 1) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \frac{\nu_t^{(i)}(\nu_t^{(i)} - 1)}{N-1} + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{N/(N-1)}{N} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})_2^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{N/(N-1)}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \left\{ \nu_t^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^N (\nu_t^{(j)})_2^2 \right\} = \frac{N}{N-1} D_N(t) \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 3.2. (3.9) \Rightarrow (3.6).

Proof. Following the proof of Möhle and Sagitov (2003, Lemma 5.5), we fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and define the event $A_i = \{\nu_t^{(i)} \leq N\varepsilon\}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)] &= \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2] = \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c}] \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[\nu_t^{(i)} \mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbb{1}_{A_i^c}] \\ &\leq (1 + O(N^{-1}))\varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} > N\varepsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

3 Limits

For $N \geq 3/\varepsilon$, Markov's inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} > N\varepsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &\leq \frac{1}{(N\varepsilon)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] = \frac{(1 + O(N^{-1}))}{\varepsilon^3(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \\ &\leq (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Substituting (3.11) into (3.10) and using $c_N(t) \leq 1$ results in

$$\mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)] \leq (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \varepsilon$$

since $b_N \rightarrow 0$. As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[c_N(t)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]] \rightarrow 0$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Lemma 3.3. $(3.9) \Rightarrow (3.5)$.

Proof. We decompose $D_N(t)$ as the sum of two terms and consider their filtered expectations. The first is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \nu_t^{(i)}] &= \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[2(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 + (\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \\ &\leq \frac{2}{N} \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)] + \frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2}{N} + b_N \right) \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

The second is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})^2] &= \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 + (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \nu_t^{(j)}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2] + \frac{\mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

3 Limits

Now, with A_i defined as in Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t \{ (\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \} &= \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_t [(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + \mathbb{E}_t [(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c}] \right\} \\
&\leq N\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t [\nu_t^{(i)} (\nu_t^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i}] + N^3 \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t [\nu_t^{(j)} \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c}] \\
&\leq N^2(N)_2 \varepsilon \mathbb{E}_t [c_N(t)] + N^4 \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} > N\varepsilon \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]. \quad (3.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.11) into (3.14) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t [(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2] \leq N^4 (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) \mathbb{E}_t [c_N(t)], \quad (3.15)$$

and substituting (3.15) into (3.13) gives

$$\frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_t [(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 (\nu_t^{(j)})_2^2] \leq \left[(1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) + \frac{1}{N} \right] \mathbb{E}_t [c_N(t)]. \quad (3.16)$$

Combining (3.12) and (3.16), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_t [D_N(t)] = \left[(1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) + \frac{3}{N} + b_N \right] \mathbb{E}_t [c_N(t)].$$

Finally, invoking Koskela et al. (2018, Lemma 2) twice gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tau_N(s)+1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(r) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tau_N(s)+1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}_r [D_N(r)] \right] \\
&\leq \left\{ (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) + \frac{3}{N} + b_N \right\} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=\tau_N(s)+1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(r) \right] \\
&\leq \left\{ (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left(\varepsilon + \frac{b_N}{\varepsilon^3} \right) + \frac{3}{N} + b_N \right\} (t - s + 1) \\
&\xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \varepsilon(t - s + 1),
\end{aligned}$$

and recalling that $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary concludes the proof. ■

4 Applications

Earth's crammed with heaven,
 And every common bush afire with God,
 But only he who sees takes off his shoes;
 The rest sit round and pluck blackberries.

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING

4.1 Multinomial resampling

This is the easy-to-analyse scheme, because conditionally i.i.d., and was presented in KJJS already. Now (with our simpler conditions) it is easier to show.

4.2 Stratified resampling \sim

Corollary 4.1. *Consider an SMC algorithm using stratified resampling, such that the standing assumption is satisfied. Assume that there exists a constant $a \in [1, \infty)$ such that for all x, x', t ,*

$$\frac{1}{a} \leq g_t(x, x') \leq a. \quad (4.1)$$

Assume that $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t . Let $(G_t^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ denote the genealogy of a random sample of n terminal particles from the output of the algorithm when the total number of particles used is N . Then, for any fixed n , the time-scaled genealogy $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions.

Proof. Recall that the sequence of σ -algebras

$$\mathcal{H}_t := \sigma(X_{t-1}^{(1:N)}, X_t^{(1:N)}, w_{t-1}^{(1:N)}, w_t^{(1:N)}) \quad (4.2)$$

are such that $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$ is conditionally independent of the filtration \mathcal{F}_{t-1} given \mathcal{H}_t . With stratified resampling, conditional on the weights each offspring count almost surely takes

4 Applications

one of four values: $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 1, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 2\}$. Denote $p_j^{(i)} := \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + j \mid \mathcal{H}_t]$ for $j = -1, 0, 1, 2$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &= p_{-1}^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 1)_2 + p_0^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)_2 + p_1^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1)_2 \\ &\quad + p_2^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 2)_2\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &= p_{-1}^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 1)_3 + p_0^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)_3 + p_1^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1)_3 \\ &\quad + p_2^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 2)_3 \\ &= p_{-1}^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 3)(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 1)_2 + p_0^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 2)(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)_2 \\ &\quad + p_1^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor - 1)(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1)_2 + p_2^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 2)_2 \\ &\leq \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor \{p_0^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor)_2 + p_1^{(i)}(\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1)_2\} \\ &= \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \\ &\leq a^2 \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t]\end{aligned}$$

The last line uses the almost sure bound $w_t^{(i)} \leq a^2/N$ which follows from (4.1) along with the form of the weights in Algorithm 1. Note that some terms in the above expressions may be equal to zero when $w_t^{(i)}$ is small enough, but the bound always holds nonetheless. Since the above holds for all i , applying the tower rule we have

$$\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \leq \frac{a^2}{N-2} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2]$$

satisfying (3.9) with $b_N := a^2/(N-2) \rightarrow 0$. The result then follows by applying Theorem 3.2. ■

Lemma 4.1. Consider an SMC algorithm using stratified resampling. Suppose that

$$\varepsilon \leq q_t(x, x') \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$$

uniformly in x, x' for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and that there exist $\zeta > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \zeta$$

for infinitely many t . Then, for all $N > 1$, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t .

Finish constructing the proof.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove, under the conditions, that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[c_N(r) > 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] = \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

By the filtered Borel-Cantelli lemma (see for example Durrett 2019, Theorem 4.3.4), this implies that, almost surely, $c_N(r) > 2/N^2$ for infinitely many r . Thus, for any $t < \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) < \infty] = \mathbb{P}\left[\exists s < \infty : \sum_{r=1}^s c_N(r) \geq t\right] = 1 \quad (4.4)$$

which is the desired result.

Now we have to prove (4.3). Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[c_N(t) \leq 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &= \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = 1 \mid i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i^*)} = 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_t], \end{aligned}$$

where $i^* := \operatorname{argmax}_i \{w_t^{(i)}\}$ (but note that the inequality holds when i^* is taken to be any particular index).

...

■

4.3 Stochastic rounding ✓

Corollary 4.2. Consider an SMC algorithm using any stochastic rounding as its resampling scheme, such that the standing assumption is satisfied. Assume that there exists a constant $a \in [1, \infty)$ such that for all x, x', t ,

$$\frac{1}{a} \leq g_t(x, x') \leq a. \quad (4.5)$$

Assume that $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t . Let $(G_t^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ denote the genealogy of a random sample of n terminal particles from the output of the algorithm when the total number of particles used is N . Then, for any fixed n , the time-scaled genealogy $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions.

By the way, does the lack of conditions of q_t here imply that we do not even need the transition kernels to admit densities?

Proof version 2. We can apply exactly the proof of Corollary 4.1, except that stochastic rounding is more restrictive than stratified resampling, so that the only possible offspring counts (almost surely, conditional on weights) are $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1\}$. We

4 Applications

simply set $p_{-1}^{(i)} = p_2^{(i)} = 0$ in the proof of Corollary 4.1 to see that

$$\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \leq \frac{a^2}{N-2} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2]$$

as required. The result then follows by applying Theorem 3.2. \blacksquare

We can also show, under additional conditions, that the assumption $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t holds.

Lemma 4.2. *Consider an SMC algorithm using any stochastic rounding as its resampling scheme. Suppose that*

$$\varepsilon \leq q_t(x, x') \leq \varepsilon^{-1}$$

uniformly in x, x' for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, and that there exist $\zeta > 0$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \zeta$$

for infinitely many t . Then, for all $N > 1$, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t .

The extra condition that the transition densities are bounded above and away from zero ... say something intelligent. The second condition is required to ensure that, at least infinitely often, the weights are not equal to $(1, \dots, 1)/N$, since stochastic rounding is degenerate under equal weights and this will cause the time scale to explode. It is hardly conceivable that any real SMC algorithm would fail to satisfy this condition, which effectively ensures that the weights cannot be “too well-behaved”.

If I find a more elegant proof for e.g. stratified, I can use the techniques to simplify this one a bit too.

Proof. Let \mathcal{H}_t be defined as in (4.2). The first step is to show that whenever $\max_i w_t^{(i)} \geq (1 + \delta)/N$, $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] = \mathbb{P}[c_N(t) \neq 0 \mid \mathcal{H}_t]$ is bounded below uniformly in t . For this purpose we need consider only weight vectors such that $w_t^{(i)} \in (0, 2/N)$ for all i ; otherwise $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) \neq 0 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] = 1$ by the definition of stochastic rounding.

Denote $\mathcal{S}_{N-1}^\delta = \{w^{(1:N)} \in \mathcal{S}_{N-1} : \forall i, 0 < w^{(i)} < 2/N; \max_i w^{(i)} \geq (1 + \delta)/N\}$ for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, where \mathcal{S}_k denotes the k -dimensional probability simplex. Fix arbitrary $w_t^{(1:N)} \in \mathcal{S}_{N-1}^\delta$. Set $i^* = \arg \max_i w_t^{(i)}$ and denote $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in \{1, \dots, N\} : w^{(i)} > 1/N\}$. Since all weights are in $(0, 2/N)$, for $i \in \mathcal{I}, \nu_t^{(i)} \in \{1, 2\}$ and for $i \notin \mathcal{I}, \nu_t^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}$; and

4 Applications

since the offspring counts must sum to N , we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) \leq 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &= \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = 1 \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = 1 \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \\
&= \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = 1 \mid \nu_t^{(j)} = 1 \forall j \in \mathcal{I} : j < i; \mathcal{H}_t] \\
&= \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i^*)} = 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \prod_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I} \\ i \neq i^*}} \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = 1 \mid \nu_t^{(i^*)} = 1; \nu_t^{(j)} = 1 \forall j \in \mathcal{I} : j < i; \mathcal{H}_t] \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i^*)} = 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_t].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

The final inequality holds with equality when $|\mathcal{I}| = 1$, i.e. the only weight larger than $1/N$ is $w_t^{(i^*)}$. Thus $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t]$ is minimised on \mathcal{S}_{N-1}^δ when only one weight is larger than $1/N$, in which case the values of the other weights do not affect this probability.

Define $w_{\delta'} = \{(1, \dots, 1) + \delta' e_{i^*} - \delta' e_{j^*}\}/N$ for fixed $i^* \neq j^*$ and $\delta' \in (0, 1)$, where e_i denotes the i th canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^N . As in the proof of Corollary 4.2, define $p_0^{(i)} = \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor \mid \mathcal{H}_t]$ and $p_1^{(i)} = \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i)} = \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_t]$. Then from (4.6) we have

$$\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t, w_t^{(1:N)} = w_{\delta'}] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[\nu_t^{(i^*)} = 1 \mid \mathcal{H}_t, w_t^{(1:N)} = w_{\delta'}] = p_1^{(i^*)},$$

evaluated on $w_{\delta'}$. We will need a lower bound on $p_1^{(i^*)}$ when $w_t^{(1:N)} = w_{\delta'}$. We first derive expressions for $p_0^{(i)}$ and $p_1^{(i)}$ up to a constant, then use $p_0^{(i)} + p_1^{(i)} = 1$ to get a normalised bound. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_0^{(i)} &= C(1 - Nw_t^{(i)} + \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \\
&\quad \times \sum_{\substack{a_{1:N} \in \{1, \dots, N\}^N: \\ |\{j: a_j=i\}|=\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor}} \mathbb{P}\left[a_t^{(1:N)} = a_{1:N} \mid \nu_t^{(i)}, w_t^{(1:N)}\right] \prod_{k=1}^N q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_k)}, X_{t-1}^{(k)}), \\
p_1^{(i)} &= C(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \\
&\quad \times \sum_{\substack{a_{1:N} \in \{1, \dots, N\}^N: \\ |\{j: a_j=i\}|=\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor+1}} \mathbb{P}\left[a_t^{(1:N)} = a_{1:N} \mid \nu_t^{(i)}, w_t^{(1:N)}\right] \prod_{k=1}^N q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_k)}, X_{t-1}^{(k)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the bounds on q_t , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C(1 - Nw_t^{(i)} + \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^N &\leq p_0^{(i)} \leq C(1 - Nw_t^{(i)} + \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^{-N}, \\
C(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^N &\leq p_1^{(i)} \leq C(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^{-N}
\end{aligned}$$

4 Applications

from which we construct the normalised bound

$$p_1^{(i)} \geq \frac{(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^N}{(Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^{-N} + (1 - Nw_t^{(i)} + \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^{-N}} = (Nw_t^{(i)} - \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor) \varepsilon^{2N}.$$

When $w_t^{(1:N)} = w_{\delta'}$, we have $w_t^{(i^*)} = (1 + \delta')/N$, so $p_1^{(i^*)} \geq \delta' \varepsilon^{2N}$, which is increasing in δ' . We conclude that $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t, \max_i w_t^{(i)} \geq (1 + \delta)/N] \geq \min_{\delta' \geq \delta} \delta' \varepsilon^{2N} = \delta \varepsilon^{2N}$.

A slight modification of this argument yields $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t, \min_i w_t^{(i)} \leq (1 - \delta)/N] \geq \delta \varepsilon^{2N}$. Whenever $\max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N$, either $\max_i w_t^{(i)} \geq (1 + \delta)/N$ or $\min_i w_t^{(i)} \leq (1 - \delta)/N$, so we have $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t, \max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N] \geq \delta \varepsilon^{2N}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t] \geq \delta \varepsilon^{2N} \mathbb{1}_{\max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N}.$$

Using the D-separation established in Appendix ?? combined with the tower property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}_t [\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t, \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]] = \mathbb{E}_t [\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{H}_t]] \\ &\geq \delta \varepsilon^{2N} \mathbb{P}[\max_i w_t^{(i)} - \min_i w_t^{(i)} \geq 2\delta/N | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}], \end{aligned}$$

which is bounded below by $\zeta \delta \varepsilon^{2N}$ for infinitely many t . Hence,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \infty.$$

By a filtered version of the second Borel–Cantelli lemma (see for example Durrett 2019, Theorem 4.3.4), this implies that $c_N(t) > 2/N^2$ for infinitely many t , almost surely. This ensures, for all $t < \infty$, that $\mathbb{P}[\exists s < \infty : \sum_{r=1}^s c_N(r) \geq t] = 1$, which by definition of $\tau_N(t)$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$. \blacksquare

4.4 Residual resampling with stratified residuals \sim

Corollary 4.3. *Consider an SMC algorithm using residual resampling with stratified residuals, such that the standing assumption is satisfied. Assume that there exists a constant $a \in [1, \infty)$ such that for all x, x', t ,*

$$\frac{1}{a} \leq g_t(x, x') \leq a. \tag{4.7}$$

Assume that $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t . Let $(G_t^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ denote the genealogy of a random sample of n terminal particles from the output of the algorithm when the total number of particles used is N . Then, for any fixed n , the time-scaled genealogy $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions.

Proof. We can apply exactly the proof of Corollary 4.1, except that residual-stratified resampling is more restrictive than stratified resampling, so that the only possible offspring counts (almost surely, conditional on weights) are $\nu_t^{(i)} \in \{\lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 1, \lfloor Nw_t^{(i)} \rfloor + 2\}$. We simply set $p_{-1}^{(i)} = 0$ in the proof of Corollary 4.1 to see that

$$\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3] \leq \frac{a^2}{N-2} \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2]$$

as required. The result then follows by applying Theorem 3.2. ■

State and prove finite time-scale lemma.

4.5 Residual resampling with multinomial residuals

If I manage to prove this corollary, it would make this chapter satisfactorily complete :-)

4.6 Star resampling

Remark that this one doesn't converge to KC, but rather to a star-shaped coalescent.

4.7 Conditional SMC ~

Why CSMC is qualitatively different to, say, standard SMC with multinomial resampling (immortal particle etc.). Reasons for restriction to multinomial resampling, conjecture that limit theorem holds for other schemes in CSMC.

Corollary 4.4. Consider a conditional SMC algorithm using multinomial resampling, such that the standing assumption is satisfied. Assume there exist constants $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, $a \in [1, \infty)$ and probability density h such that for all x, x', t ,

$$\frac{1}{a} \leq g_t(x, x') \leq a, \quad \varepsilon h(x') \leq q_t(x, x') \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} h(x'). \quad (4.8)$$

Let $(G_t^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ denote the genealogy of a random sample of n terminal particles from the output of the algorithm when the total number of particles used is N . Then, for any fixed n , the time-scaled genealogy $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense of finite-dimensional distributions.

Proof. Define the conditioning σ -algebra \mathcal{H}_t as in (4.2). We assume without loss of generality that the immortal particle takes index 1 in each generation. This significantly simplifies the notation, but the same argument holds if the immortal indices are taken to be $a_{(0:T)}^\star$ rather than $(1, \dots, 1)$.

4 Applications

The parental indices are conditionally independent, as in standard SMC with multinomial resampling, but we have to treat $i = 1$ as a special case. We have the following conditional law on parental indices

$$\mathbb{P} \left[a_t^{(i)} = a_i \mid \mathcal{H}_t \right] \propto \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{a_i=1} & i = 1 \\ w_t^{(a_i)} q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_i)}, X_{t-1}^{(i)}) & i = 2, \dots, N. \end{cases}$$

The joint conditional law is therefore

$$\mathbb{P} \left[a_t^{(1:N)} = a_{1:N} \mid \mathcal{H}_t \right] \propto \mathbb{1}_{a_1=1} \prod_{i=2}^N w_t^{(a_i)} q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_i)}, X_{t-1}^{(i)}).$$

First we make the following observation, which follows from a balls-in-bins coupling. Assume (4.8). Then for any function $f : \{1, \dots, N\}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that (for a fixed i) $f(a_t'^{(1:N)}) \geq f(a_t^{(1:N)})$ whenever $|\{j : a_t'^{(j)} = i\}| \geq |\{j : a_t^{(j)} = i\}|$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(A_{1,i}^{(1:N)})] \leq \mathbb{E}[f(a_t^{(1:N)}) \mid \mathcal{H}_t] \leq \mathbb{E}[f(A_{2,i}^{(1:N)})] \quad (4.9)$$

where the elements of $A_{1,i}^{(1:N)}, A_{2,i}^{(1:N)}$ are all mutually independent and independent of \mathcal{F}_∞ , and distributed according to

$$A_{1,i}^{(j)} \sim \begin{cases} \delta_1 & j = 1 \\ \text{Categorical}((\varepsilon/a)^{\mathbb{1}_{i=1}-\mathbb{1}_{i\neq 1}}, \dots, (\varepsilon/a)^{\mathbb{1}_{i=N}-\mathbb{1}_{i\neq N}}) & j \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

$$A_{2,i}^{(j)} \sim \begin{cases} \delta_1 & j = 1 \\ \text{Categorical}((a/\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{1}_{i=1}-\mathbb{1}_{i\neq 1}}, \dots, (a/\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{1}_{i=N}-\mathbb{1}_{i\neq N}}) & j \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

where the vector of probabilities is given up to a constant in the argument of Categorical distributions. We use these random vectors to construct bounds that are independent of \mathcal{F}_∞ . Also define the corresponding offspring counts $V_1^{(i)} = |\{j : A_{1,i}^{(j)} = i\}|$, $V_2^{(i)} = |\{j : A_{2,i}^{(j)} = i\}|$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, which have marginal distributions

$$V_1^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{1}_{i=1} + \text{Binomial}\left(N-1, \frac{\varepsilon/a}{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)}\right),$$

$$V_2^{(i)} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{1}_{i=1} + \text{Binomial}\left(N-1, \frac{a/\varepsilon}{(a/\varepsilon) + (N-1)(\varepsilon/a)}\right).$$

Now consider the function $f_i(a_t^{(1:N)}) := (\nu_t^{(i)})_2$. We can apply (4.9) to obtain the lower

4 Applications

bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &\geq \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(V_1^{(i)})_2] = \frac{1}{(N)_2} \left[\mathbb{E}[(V_1^{(1)})_2] + \sum_{i=2}^N \mathbb{E}[(V_1^{(i)})_2] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(N)_2} \left[\frac{(N-1)_2(\varepsilon/a)^2}{\{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)\}^2} + \frac{2(N-1)(\varepsilon/a)}{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=2}^N \frac{(N-1)_2(\varepsilon/a)^2}{\{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)\}^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(N)_2} \left[\frac{2(N-1)(\varepsilon/a)}{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(N-1)_2(\varepsilon/a)^2}{\{(\varepsilon/a) + (N-1)(a/\varepsilon)\}^2} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

using the moments of the Binomial distribution (see Mosimann 1962 for example) along with the identity $(X+1)_2 \equiv 2(X)_1 + (X)_2$. This is further bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &\geq \frac{1}{(N)_2} \left\{ \frac{2(N-1)(\varepsilon/a)}{N(a/\varepsilon)} + \frac{(N)_3(\varepsilon/a)^2}{N^2(a/\varepsilon)^2} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^2} \left\{ \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{a^2} + \frac{(N-2)\varepsilon^4}{a^4} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Similarly, we derive an upper bound on $f_i(a_t^{(1:N)}) := (\nu_t^{(i)})_3$, this time using the identity $(X+1)_3 \equiv 3(X)_2 + (X)_3$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3 \mid \mathcal{H}_t] &\leq \frac{1}{(N)_3} \left[\mathbb{E}[(V_2^{(1)})_3] + \sum_{i=2}^N \mathbb{E}[(V_2^{(i)})_3] \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(N)_3} \left[\frac{3(N-1)_2(a/\varepsilon)^2}{\{(a/\varepsilon) + (N-1)(\varepsilon/a)\}^2} + \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(N-1)_3(a/\varepsilon)^3}{\{(a/\varepsilon) + (N-1)(\varepsilon/a)\}^3} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(N)_3} \left\{ \frac{3(N-1)_2(a/\varepsilon)^2}{N^2(\varepsilon/a)^2} + \frac{(N)_4(a/\varepsilon)^3}{N^3(\varepsilon/a)^3} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{(N)_3} \left\{ \frac{3(N-1)_2}{N^2} \frac{a^4}{\varepsilon^4} + \frac{(N)_4}{N^3} \frac{a^6}{\varepsilon^6} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{N^3} \left\{ \frac{3a^4}{\varepsilon^4} + \frac{(N-3)a^6}{\varepsilon^6} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We apply the tower property and conditional independence as in Corollary 4.2, upper bounding the ratio by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_3]}{\frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t[(\nu_t^{(i)})_2]} &\leq \frac{N^2 \frac{3a^4}{\varepsilon^4} + \frac{(N-3)a^6}{\varepsilon^6}}{N^3 \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{a^2} + \frac{(N-2)\varepsilon^4}{a^4}} \leq \frac{1}{N} \frac{a^6}{\varepsilon^6} \frac{3 + (N-3)a^2/\varepsilon^2}{2 + (N-2)\varepsilon^2/a^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \frac{a^6}{\varepsilon^6} \left\{ \frac{3}{2} + \frac{N-3}{N-2} \frac{a^4}{\varepsilon^4} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{N} \left\{ \frac{3a^6}{2\varepsilon^6} + \frac{a^{10}}{\varepsilon^{10}} \right\} =: b_N \xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (3.9) is satisfied. It remains to show that, for N sufficiently large, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$

for all finite t , a technicality which is proved in Lemma 4.3. Applying Theorem 3.2 gives the result. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.3. *Consider a conditional SMC algorithm using multinomial resampling, satisfying the standing assumption and (4.8). Then, for all $N > 2$, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all finite t .*

Proof. Since $c_N(t) \in [0, 1]$ almost surely and has strictly positive expectation, for any fixed N the distribution of $c_N(t)$ with given expectation that maximises $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) = 0 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ is two atoms, at 0 and 1 respectively. To ensure the correct expectation, the atom at 1 should have mass $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) = 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]$, which is bounded below by (4.10). If $c_N(t) > 0$ then $c_N(t) \geq 2/(N)_2 > 2/N^2$. Hence, in general $\mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)]$. Applying (4.10), we have for any finite N ,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[c_N(t) > 2/N^2 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_t[c_N(t)] \geq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \left\{ \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{a^2} + \frac{(N-2)\varepsilon^4}{a^4} \right\} = \infty$$

By an argument analogous to the conclusion of Lemma 4.2, $\mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) = \infty] = 0$ for all $t < \infty$. \blacksquare

4.7.1 Effect of ancestor sampling \sim

Argue that ancestor sampling removes bias towards assigning offspring to immortal line, and leaves exactly the same genealogy as standard SMC with multinomial resampling. The following was dumped from elsewhere and NEEDS REDRAFTING.

Ancestor sampling interrupts the immortal trajectory, splitting it into disjoint pieces (see Figure 2.9b). So perhaps it doesn't make sense to talk about genealogies, now that we don't have a strictly coalescing process evolving backwards in time.

Probably need some conditioning e.g. on \mathcal{H}_t in the following equations. But let's look at this resampling scheme backwards in time anyway. With the time indices now reversed, and the notation made consistent with our work on genealogies, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[a_t^{(j)} = a_i] \propto \begin{cases} w_t^{(a_i)} q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_i)}, X_{t-1}^{(j)}) & \text{non-immortal particles} \\ w_t^{(a_i)} q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_i)}, X_{t-1}^*) & \text{immortal particle.} \end{cases}$$

Might be neater to avoid bringing in j at all, and write $a_t^{(i)} = a_i$ etc. But when j is the index of the immortal particle, $X_{t-1}^{(j)} = X_{t-1}^*$, so the reverse-time view makes no distinction between the immortal particle and others in terms of how their parents are chosen. We have

$$\mathbb{P}[a_t^{(j)} = a_i] \propto w_t^{(a_i)} q_{t-1}(X_t^{(a_i)}, X_{t-1}^{(j)})$$

4 Applications

for all particles. This is the same probability we get with multinomial resampling in standard SMC.

This viewpoint gives us another intuition about the effect of ancestor sampling: the immortal particle is no longer specially favoured when it comes to producing offspring. In the basic algorithm, the immortal parent produces on average one more offspring at each generation than any other parent (and must produce at least one offspring). It follows that the immortal line cannot die out (is immortal), and also that it is a more likely site for coalescence events (i.e. producing at least two offspring) than any other parent. With ancestor sampling, the immortal parent loses this advantage; it is treated just like the other parents. It is no longer a particularly favourable site for coalescing, so the trajectory onto which everyone coalesces might just as well be any of the other $N - 1$ trajectories. This prevents the Markov chain getting stuck as in Figure 2.7.

5 Weak Convergence ✓

At the age of twenty-one he wrote a treatise upon the Binomial Theorem, which has had a European vogue. On the strength of it he won the Mathematical Chair at one of our smaller universities, and had, to all appearances, a most brilliant career before him.

SHERLOCK HOLMES

Some motivation/discussion about weak convergence: why it is more useful than FDDs, that the following theorem has the same conditions as the FDDs one...

We start by defining a suitable metric space. Let \mathcal{P}_n be the space of partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Denote by \mathcal{X} the set of all functions mapping $[0, \infty)$ to \mathcal{P}_n that are right-continuous with left limits. (Our rescaled genealogical process $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ and our encoding of the n -coalescent are piecewise-constant functions mapping time $t \in [0, \infty)$ to partitions, and thus live in the space \mathcal{X} .) Finally, equip the space \mathcal{P}_n with the zero-one metric,

$$\rho(\xi, \eta) = 1 - \delta_{\xi\eta} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \xi = \eta \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

for any $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\nu_t^{(1:N)}$ denote the offspring numbers in an interacting particle system satisfying the standing assumption and such that, for any N sufficiently large, for all finite t , $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_N(t) = \infty\} = 0$. Suppose that there exists a deterministic sequence $(b_N)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} b_N = 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{(N)_3} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t\{(\nu_t^{(i)})_3\} \leq b_N \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_t\{(\nu_t^{(i)})_2\} \quad (5.2)$$

for all N , uniformly in $t \geq 1$. Then the rescaled genealogical process $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ converges weakly in (\mathcal{X}, ρ) to Kingman's n -coalescent as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. The structure of the proof follows Möhle (1999), albeit with considerable technical complication due to the dependence between generations (**non-neutrality**) in our model. **Is this the main/only source of complication?** Since we already have convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions (Theorem ?? refers to a previous chapter not yet written), strengthening this to weak convergence requires relative compactness of the sequence of processes $\{(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Ethier and Kurtz (2009, Chapter 3, Corollary 7.4) provides a necessary and sufficient condition for relative compactness: \mathcal{P}_n is finite and therefore complete and separable, and the sample paths of $(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}$ live in \mathcal{X} , so the conditions of the corollary are satisfied. The corollary states that the sequence of processes $\{(G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)})_{t \geq 0}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact if and only if the following two conditions hold:

1. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $t \geq 0$ there exists a compact set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n$ such that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[G_{\tau_N(t)}^{(n,N)} \in \Gamma] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (5.3)$$

2. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, $t > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\omega(G_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{(n,N)}, \delta, t) < \varepsilon] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (5.4)$$

where ω is the modulus of continuity:

$$\omega(G_{\tau_N(\cdot)}^{(n,N)}, \delta, t) := \inf \max_{i \in [K]} \sup_{u, v \in [T_{i-1}, T_i]} \rho(G_{\tau_N(u)}^{(n,N)}, G_{\tau_N(v)}^{(n,N)}) \quad (5.5)$$

with the infimum taken over all partitions of the form $0 = T_0 < T_1 < \dots < T_{K-1} < t \leq T_K$ such that $\min_{i \in [K]} (T_i - T_{i-1}) > \delta$. **Clarify that such a partition with any K is valid, i.e. K is not fixed.**

In our case, Condition 1 is satisfied automatically with $\Gamma = \mathcal{P}_n$, since \mathcal{P}_n is finite and hence compact. Intuitively, Condition 2 ensures that the jumps of the process are well-separated. In our case where ρ is the zero-one metric, we see that $\rho(G_{\tau_N(u)}^{(n,N)}, G_{\tau_N(v)}^{(n,N)})$ is equal to 1 if there is a jump between times u and v , and 0 otherwise. Taking the supremum and maximum then indicates whether there is a jump inside any of the intervals of the given partition; this can only be equal to zero if all of the jumps up to time t occur exactly at the times T_0, \dots, T_K . The infimum over all allowed partitions, then, can only be equal to zero if no two jumps occur less than δ (unscaled) time apart, because of the restriction we placed on these partitions.

The proof is concentrated on proving Condition 2. To do this, we use a coupling with another process that contains all of the jumps of the genealogical process, with the addition of some extra jumps. This process is constructed in such a way that it can be shown to satisfy Condition 2, and hence so does the genealogical process.

Define $p_t := \max_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \{1 - p_{\xi\xi}(t)\} = 1 - p_{\Delta\Delta}(t)$, where Δ denotes the trivial partition of singletons $\{\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}\}$. For a proof that the maximum is attained at $\xi = \Delta$, see Lemma

5 Weak Convergence ✓

5.1. Following Möhle (1999), we now construct the two-dimensional conditionally on \mathcal{F} ? Markov process $(Z_t, S_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ on $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathcal{P}_n$ with transition probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_t = j, S_t = \eta \mid Z_{t-1} = i, S_{t-1} = \xi] = \begin{cases} 1 - p_t & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } \xi = \eta \\ p_{\xi\xi}(t) + p_t - 1 & \text{if } j = i + 1 \text{ and } \xi = \eta \\ p_{\xi\eta}(t) & \text{if } j = i + 1 \text{ and } \xi \neq \eta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

and initial state $Z_0 = 0, S_0 = \Delta$. The construction is such that the marginal (S_t) has the same distribution as the genealogical process of interest, and (Z_t) has jumps at all the times (S_t) does plus some extra jumps. (The definition of p_t ensures that the probability in the second case is non-negative, attaining the value zero when $\xi = \Delta$.) And the transition probabilities (jump times) of Z do not depend on the current state.

Denote by $0 = T_0^{(N)} < T_1^{(N)} < \dots$ the jump times of the rescaled process $(Z_{\tau_N(t)})_{t \geq 0}$, and by $\varpi_i^{(N)} := T_i^{(N)} - T_{i-1}^{(N)}$ the corresponding holding times.

Suppose that for some $t > 0$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $T_m^{(N)} \geq t$. Then $K_N := \min\{i : T_i^{(N)} \geq t\}$ is well-defined with $1 \leq K_N \leq m$, and $T_1^{(N)}, \dots, T_{K_N}^{(N)}$ form a partition of the form required for Condition 2. Indeed $(Z_{\tau_N(\cdot)})$ is constant on every interval $[T_{i-1}^{(N)}, T_i^{(N)}]$ by construction, so $\omega((Z_{\tau_N(\cdot)}), \delta, t) = 0$. We therefore have that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\omega((Z_{\tau_N(\cdot)}), \delta, t) < \varepsilon] \geq \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t, \varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}]. \quad (5.7)$$

Thus a sufficient condition for Condition 2 is: for any $\varepsilon > 0, t > 0$, there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}, \delta > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t, \varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (5.8)$$

Since $T_m^{(N)} = \varpi_1^{(N)} + \dots + \varpi_m^{(N)}$, there is a positive correlation between $T_m^{(N)}$ and each of the $\varpi_i^{(N)}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t, \varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] &= \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t \mid \varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] \mathbb{P}[\varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t] \mathbb{P}[\varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Due to Lemma 5.2, the limiting distributions of $\varpi_i^{(N)}$ are i.i.d. $\text{Exp}(\alpha_n)$, so

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] = (e^{-\alpha_n \delta})^m \quad (5.10)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

and

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t] = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\varpi_1^{(N)} + \cdots + \varpi_m^{(N)} \geq t] = e^{-\alpha_n \delta} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\alpha_n t)^i}{i!}. \quad (5.11)$$

using the series expansion for the Erlang cumulative distribution function. citation?
Hence

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[T_m^{(N)} \geq t, \varpi_i^{(N)} > \delta \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}] \geq (e^{-\alpha_n \delta})^{m+1} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{(\alpha_n t)^i}{i!}, \quad (5.12)$$

which can be made $\geq 1 - \varepsilon$ by taking m sufficiently large and δ sufficiently small. Since this argument applies for any ε and t , (5.8) and hence Condition 2 is satisfied, and the proof is complete. ■

Lemma 5.1. $\max_{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_n} (1 - p_{\xi\xi}(t)) = 1 - p_{\Delta\Delta}(t)$.

Proof. Consider any $\xi \in E$ consisting of k blocks ($1 \leq k \leq n - 1$), and any $\xi' \in E$ consisting of $k + 1$ blocks. From the definition of $p_{\xi\eta}(t)$ (Koskela et al. 2018, Equation (1)),

$$p_{\xi\xi}(t) = \frac{1}{(N)_k} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{all distinct}}} \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)}. \quad (5.13)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\xi'\xi'}(t) &= \frac{1}{(N)_{k+1}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k, i_{k+1} \\ \text{all distinct}}} \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} \\ &= \frac{1}{(N)_k (N - k)} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{all distinct}}} \left\{ \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} \sum_{\substack{i_{k+1}=1 \\ \text{also distinct}}}^N \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

Discarding the zero summands,

$$p_{\xi'\xi'}(t) = \frac{1}{(N)_k (N - k)} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{all distinct:} \\ \nu_t^{(i_1)}, \dots, \nu_t^{(i_k)} > 0}} \left\{ \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} \sum_{\substack{i_{k+1}=1 \\ \text{also distinct}}}^N \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} \right\}. \quad (5.15)$$

The inner sum is

$$\sum_{\substack{i_{k+1}=1 \\ \text{also distinct}}}^N \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_t^{(i)} - \sum_{i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}} \nu_t^{(i)} \right\} \leq N - k \quad (5.16)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

since $\nu_t^{(i_1)}, \dots, \nu_t^{(i_k)}$ are all at least 1. Hence

$$p_{\xi'\xi'}(t) \leq \frac{N-k}{(N)_k(N-k)} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{all distinct:} \\ \nu_t^{(i_1)}, \dots, \nu_t^{(i_k)} > 0}} \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} = p_{\xi\xi}(t). \quad (5.17)$$

Thus $p_{\xi\xi}(t)$ is decreasing in the number of blocks of ξ , and is therefore minimised by taking $\xi = \Delta$, which achieves the maximum n blocks. This choice in turn maximises $1 - p_{\xi\xi}(t)$, as required. ■

Lemma 5.2. *The finite-dimensional distributions of $\varpi_1^{(N)}, \varpi_2^{(N)}, \dots$ converge as $N \rightarrow \infty$ to those of $\varpi_1, \varpi_2, \dots$, where the ϖ_i are independent $\text{Exp}(\alpha_n)$ distributed random variables.*

Proof. There is a continuous bijection between the jump times $T_1^{(N)}, T_2^{(N)}, \dots$ and the holding times $\varpi_1^{(N)}, \varpi_2^{(N)}, \dots$, so convergence of the holding times to $\varpi_1, \varpi_2, \dots$ is equivalent to convergence of the jump times to T_1, T_2, \dots , where $T_i := \varpi_1 + \cdots + \varpi_i$. We will work with the jump times, following the structure of Möhle (1999, Lemma 3.2).

The idea is to prove by induction that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t_1, \dots, t_k > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_k^{(N)} \leq t_k] = \mathbb{P}[T_1 \leq t_1, \dots, T_k \leq t_k]. \quad (5.18)$$

Take the basis case $k = 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}[T_1 \leq t] = \mathbb{P}[\varpi_1 \leq t] = 1 - e^{-\alpha_n t} \quad (5.19)$$

and $T_1^{(N)} > t$ if and only if Z has no jumps up to time t : Expectation appears by tower property to remove (implicit) conditioning in transition probabilities?

$$\mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} > t] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right]. \quad (5.20)$$

Lemma 5.6 shows that this probability converges to $e^{-\alpha_n t}$ as required.

For the induction step, assume that (5.18) holds for some k . We have the following decomposition:

$$\mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_{k+1}^{(N)} \leq t_{k+1}] = \mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_k^{(N)} \leq t_k] - \mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_k^{(N)} \leq t_k, T_{k+1}^{(N)} > t_{k+1}] \quad (5.21)$$

The first term on the RHS converges to $\mathbb{P}[T_1 \leq t_1, \dots, T_k \leq t_k]$ by the induction hypothesis, and it remains to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_k^{(N)} \leq t_k, T_{k+1}^{(N)} > t_{k+1}] = \mathbb{P}[T_1 \leq t_1, \dots, T_k \leq t_k, T_{k+1} > t_{k+1}]. \quad (5.22)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

As shown in Möhle (1999), the RHS

$$\mathbb{P}[T_1 \leq t_1, \dots, T_k \leq t_k, T_{k+1} > t_{k+1}] = \alpha_n^k e^{-\alpha_n t} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}. \quad (5.23)$$

The event on the LHS can be written (Möhle 1999)

$$\mathbb{P}[T_1^{(N)} \leq t_1, \dots, T_k^{(N)} \leq t_k, T_{k+1}^{(N)} > t_{k+1}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \begin{matrix} (1-p_r) \\ \forall r \neq r_1, \dots, r_k \end{matrix} \right) \right], \quad (5.24)$$

that is, there are jumps at some times r_1, \dots, r_k and identity transitions at all other times. Due to Lemmata 5.7 and 5.8, this probability converges to the correct limit. This completes the induction. ■

5.1 Bounds on sum-products ✓

Lemma 5.3. Fix $t > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

$$(a) \quad \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \leq (t+1)^l$$

$$(b) \quad t^l - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \binom{l}{2} (t+1)^{l-2} \leq \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \leq t^l + c_N(\tau_N(t))(t+1)^l$$

Proof. (a) It is a true fact that

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \leq \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s) \right)^l, \quad (5.25)$$

as can be seen by considering the multinomial expansion of the RHS. By definition of τ_N ,

$$t \leq \sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s) \leq t+1, \quad (5.26)$$

hence

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \leq (t+1)^l. \quad (5.27)$$

(b) As pointed out in Koskela et al. (2018, Equation (8)),

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \geq \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s) \right)^l - \binom{l}{2} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s) \right)^{l-2}. \quad (5.28)$$

Substituting (5.26) into the RHS of (5.28) yields the lower bound.

For the upper bound we have

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \leq \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s) \right)^l \leq \left(\sum_{s=0}^{\tau_N(t)-1} c_N(s) + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \right)^l \leq [t + c_N(\tau_N(t))]^l, \quad (5.29)$$

again using the definition of τ_N . A binomial expansion yields

$$[t + c_N(\tau_N(t))]^l = t^l + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{i} t^i c_N(\tau_N(t))^{l-i} = t^l + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{i} t^i c_N(\tau_N(t))^{l-1-i}, \quad (5.30)$$

then since $c_N(s) \leq 1$ for all s ,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{i} t^i c_N(\tau_N(t))^{l-1-i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{i} t^i \leq (t+1)^l. \quad (5.31)$$

Putting this together yields the upper bound. ■

Lemma 5.4. Fix $t > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let B be a positive constant which may depend on n .

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) + BD_N(s_j)] \leq \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1+B)^l. \quad (5.32)$$

Proof. We start with a binomial expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) + BD_N(s_j)] &= \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [l]} B^{l-|\mathcal{I}|} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} D_N(s_j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [l]} B^{l-|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} D_N(s_j) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where $[l] := \{1, \dots, l\}$. Since the sum is over all permutations of s_1, \dots, s_l , we may arbitrarily choose an ordering for $\{1, \dots, l\}$ such that $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{I}|\}$:

$$\sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [l]} B^{l-|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} D_N(s_j) \right) = \sum_{I=0}^l \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \quad (5.34)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Separating the term $I = l$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{I=0}^l \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \\ &= \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) + \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.35)$$

In the second term on the RHS, there is always at least one D_N term, and $c_N(s) \geq D_N(s)$ for all s (Koskela et al. 2018, p.9), so we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \leq \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} c_N(s_i) \right) D_N(s_l) \\ & \leq \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \left(\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_{l-1}}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{i=1}^{l-1} c_N(s_i) \right) \sum_{s_l=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s_l) \\ & \leq \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} (t+1)^{l-1} \sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \end{aligned} \quad (5.36)$$

using (5.25) and (5.26). Finally, by the Binomial Theorem,

$$\sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} (t+1)^{l-1} \sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \leq \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1+B)^l, \quad (5.37)$$

which, together with (5.35), concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 5.5. Fix $t > 0$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let B be a positive constant which may depend on n .

$$\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - BD_N(s_j)] \geq \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1+B)^l. \quad (5.38)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Proof. A binomial expansion and subsequent manipulation as in (5.33)–(5.35) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - BD_N(s_j)] &= \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [l]} (-B)^{l-|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} D_N(s_j) \right) \\
&= \sum_{I=0}^l \binom{l}{I} (-B)^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \\
&= \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) + \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} (-B)^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \\
&\geq \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) - \sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

where the last inequality just multiplies some positive terms by -1 . Then (5.36)–(5.37) can be applied directly (noting that an upper bound on negative terms gives a lower bound overall):

$$-\sum_{I=0}^{l-1} \binom{l}{I} B^{l-I} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^I c_N(s_i) \right) \left(\prod_{j=I+1}^l D_N(s_j) \right) \geq - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1+B)^l
\tag{5.40}$$

which concludes the proof. ■

5.2 Main components of weak convergence ✓

Lemma 5.6 (Basis step). *For any $0 < t < \infty$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right] = e^{-\alpha_n t} \tag{5.41}$$

where $\alpha_n := n(n-1)/2$.

Proof. We start by showing that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right] \leq e^{-\alpha_n t}$.

From Koskela et al. (2018, Lemma 1 Case 1), taking $\xi = \Delta$, we have for each r

$$1 - p_r = p_{\Delta\Delta}(r) \leq 1 - \alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1})) [c_N(r) - B'_n D_N(r)] \tag{5.42}$$

where the $O(N^{-1})$ term does not depend on r . When $N \geq 3$, a sufficient condition to ensure the bound in (5.42) is non-negative is that the event

$$E_N^1(r) := \left\{ c_N(r) \leq \frac{(N-2)_{n-2}}{\alpha_n N^{n-2}} \right\} \tag{5.43}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

occurs. We will also need to control the sign of $c_N(r) - B'_n D_N(r)$, for which we define the event

$$E_N^2(r) := \{c_N(r) \geq B'_n D_N(r)\}, \quad (5.44)$$

and we define $E_N^1 := \bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} E_N^1(r)$ and $E_N^2 := \bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} E_N^2(r)$. Then

$$1 - p_r = p_{\Delta\Delta}(r) \leq 1 - \alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1})) [c_N(r) - B'_n D_N(r)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2}. \quad (5.45)$$

Applying a multinomial expansion and then separating the positive and negative terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

This is further bounded by applying Lemma 5.5 and then both bounds of Lemma 5.3(b):

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\leq 1 + \left\{ \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left[\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B'_n)^l \right] \right\} \\ &\leq 1 + \left\{ \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left\{ t^l + c_N(\tau_N(t))(t+1)^l \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left[t^l - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \binom{l}{2} (t+1)^{l-2} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B'_n)^l \right\} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Collecting some terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} (t+1)^l \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \binom{l}{2} (t+1)^{l-2} \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B'_n)^l \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\}} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)]. \tag{5.48}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the expectation and limit, then applying Brown et al. (2021, Equations (3.3)–(3.5)), and Lemmata 5.11, 5.12 and 5.14 to deal with the indicators,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right] &\leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\} \cap E_N^1 \cap E_N^2] + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [c_N(\tau_N(t))] \exp \\
&\quad + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right] \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)] \\
&\quad + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right] \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \\
&= 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l = e^{-\alpha_n t}. \tag{5.49}
\end{aligned}$$

Passing the limit and expectation inside the infinite sum is justified by dominated convergence and Fubini.

It remains to show the corresponding lower bound $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right] \geq e^{-\alpha_n t}$. From Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.14)), taking $\xi = \Delta$, we have

$$1 - p_t = p_{\Delta\Delta}(t) \geq 1 - \alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1})) [c_N(t) + B_n D_N(t)] \tag{5.50}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

where $B_n > 0$ and the $O(N^{-1})$ term does not depend on t . In particular,

$$1 - p_t = p_{\Delta\Delta}(t) \geq 1 - \frac{N^{n-2}}{(N-2)_{n-2}} \alpha_n [c_N(t) + B_n D_N(t)]. \quad (5.51)$$

Since $D_N(s) \leq c_N(s)$ for all s (Koskela et al. 2018, p.9), a sufficient condition for this bound to be non-negative is

$$E_N^3(r) := \left\{ c_N(r) \leq \frac{(N-2)_{n-2}}{N^{n-2}} \alpha_n^{-1} (1 + B_n)^{-1} \right\}, \quad (5.52)$$

and we again define $E_N^3 := \bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} E_N^3(r)$. We now apply a multinomial expansion to the product, and split into positive and negative terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\geq \left\{ 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) + B_n D_N(s_j)] \right\} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} \\ &= \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) + B_n D_N(s_j)] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) + B_n D_N(s_j)] \right\} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

This is further bounded by applying Lemma 5.4 and both bounds in Lemma 5.3(b):

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\geq \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left[\sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B_n)^l \right] \right\} \\ &\geq \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left[t^l - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \binom{l}{2} (t+1)^{l-2} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \left[t^l + c_N(\tau_N(t)) (t+1)^l + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B_n)^l \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Collecting terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\geq \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \sum_{\substack{l=2 \\ \text{even}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \binom{l}{2} (t+1)^l \\
&\quad - c_N(\tau_N(t)) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} (t+1)^l \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ \text{odd}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} (t+1)^{l-1} (1 + B_n)^l \\
&\geq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\}} - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))](t+1) \\
&\quad - c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))](t+1) \\
&\quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))](t+1)(1 + B_n). \tag{5.55}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, taking the expectation and limit, and applying Brown et al. (2021, Equations (3.3)–(3.5)) to show that all but the first sum vanish, and Lemmata 5.12 and 5.11 to show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\} \cap E_N^3] = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right] &\geq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\} \cap E_N^3] \\
&\quad - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right] \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)] \\
&\quad - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [c_N(\tau_N(t))] \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)] \\
&\quad - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right] \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)(1 + B_n)] \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l = e^{-\alpha_n t}. \tag{5.56}
\end{aligned}$$

Again, passing the limit and expectation inside the infinite sum is justified by dominated convergence and Fubini. Combining the upper and lower bounds in (5.49) and (5.56) respectively concludes the proof. ■

Lemma 5.7 (Induction step upper bound). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $i_0 := 0$, $i_k := k$. For any sequence of times $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_k \leq t$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] \leq \alpha_n^k e^{-\alpha_n t} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1}: \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}. \quad (5.57)$$

Proof. We use the bound on $(1 - p_r)$ from (5.42) and apply a multinomial expansion, defining as in (5.43) and (5.44) respectively the sequences of events E_N^1 and E_N^2 which ensure the bounds are non-negative:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\leq \prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \left\{ 1 - \alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) [c_N(r) - B'_n D_N(r)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \right\} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\ &\quad - \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l \\ \exists i, i': s_i = r_{i'}}}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.58)$$

The penultimate line above is exactly the expansion we had in the basis step (5.46), except for the limit on l , and as such following the same arguments gives a bound analogous to that in (5.48):

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{j=1}^l [c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\ \leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.59)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

For the last line of (5.58),

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l \\ \exists i, i': s_i = r_{i'}}} \prod_{j=1}^l \{c_N(s_j) - B'_n D_N(s_j)\} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \\
& \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l \\ \exists i, i': s_i = r_{i'}}} \prod_{j=1}^l \{c_N(s_j) + B'_n D_N(s_j)\} \\
& \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_l \\ \exists i, i': s_i = r_{i'}}} (1 + B'_n)^l \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \\
& \leq \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{(l-1)!} \sum_{s_1 \in \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}} \sum_{s_2 \neq \dots \neq s_l} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 + B'_n)^l \prod_{j=1}^l c_N(s_j) \\
& = \sum_{s \in \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}} c_N(s) \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{(l-1)!} (1 + B'_n)^l \sum_{s_1 \neq \dots \neq s_{l-1}} \dots \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{(l-1)!} (1 + B'_n)^l (t+1)^{l-1} \\
& \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \right) \alpha_n (1 + B'_n) \exp[\alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B'_n) (t+1)],
\end{aligned} \tag{5.60}$$

where the penultimate inequality uses Lemma 5.3(a). Putting these together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) & \leq 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) (t+1)] \\
& + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) (t+1)] \\
& + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) (t+1) (1 + B'_n)] \\
& + \left(\sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \right) \alpha_n (1 + B'_n) \exp[\alpha_n (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B'_n) (t+1)].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.61}$$

Meanwhile, using the bound on p_r from (5.50) then applying a modification of Lemma 5.4

5 Weak Convergence ✓

where the sum is over ordered indices rather than distinct indices,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k [c_N(r_i) + B_n D_N(r_i)] \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (t+1)^{k-1} (1 + O(N^{-1}))^k
\end{aligned} \tag{5.62}$$

A more liberal (but simpler) bound can be arrived at thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \prod_{i=1}^k [c_N(r_i) + B_n D_N(r_i)] \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) (1 + B_n) \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B_n)^k \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.63}$$

which, using Lemma 5.3(a), also leads to the deterministic bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B_n)^k \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B_n)^k \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{r_1 \neq \dots \neq r_k}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B_n)^k \frac{1}{k!} (t+1)^k.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.64}$$

Combining (5.61) with the other product, the expression inside the expectation in (5.57)

is bounded above by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \\
& \leq \left\{ 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \right\} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \\
& + \left\{ c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \right\} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \\
& + \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(1 + B'_n)(t+1)] \alpha_n(1 + B'_n) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i}. \tag{5.65}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the various bounds (5.62)–(5.64), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left\{ 1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t)-k} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \right\} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \\
& + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (t+1)^{k-1} (1 + B_n)^k \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \\
& + \left\{ c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \right\} \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B'_n)^k \\
& + \exp[\alpha_n(1 + B'_n)(t+1)] \alpha_n(1 + B'_n) \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) (1 + B_n)^k \\
& \times \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i). \tag{5.66}
\end{aligned}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Upon taking the expectation and limit, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] \\
& \leq \alpha_n^k \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{\tau_N(t) - k} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \right) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \\
& + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right] \alpha_n^k (t+1)^{k-1} (1+B_n)^k \exp[\alpha_n t] \\
& + \left\{ \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [c_N(\tau_N(t))] \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)] + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right] \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)] \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right] \exp[\alpha_n(t+1)(1+B'_n)] \right\} \alpha_n^k (1+B_n)^k \frac{1}{k!} (t+1)^k \\
& + \exp[\alpha_n(1+B'_n)(t+1)] \alpha_n^{k+1} (1+B'_n) (1+B_n)^k \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{5.67}$$

The middle terms vanish due to Brown et al. (2021, Equations (3.3)–(3.5)) and the expression becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] \leq \alpha_n^k \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \\
& + \alpha_n^k \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_N(t) \geq k+l\}} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \\
& + \exp[\alpha_n(1+B'_n)(t+1)] \alpha_n^{k+1} (1+B'_n) (1+B_n)^k \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{5.68}$$

where passing the limit and expectation inside the infinite sum is justified by dominated

5 Weak Convergence ✓

convergence and Fubini; see Lemma 5.16. To simplify the last line,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) &\leq \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{r_1 \neq \dots \neq r_k}^{\tau_N(t)} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \\
&= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{r_1 \neq \dots \neq r_k}^{\tau_N(t)} \sum_{j=1}^k c_N(r_j)^2 \prod_{i \neq j} c_N(r_i) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \sum_{r_1 \neq \dots \neq r_{k-1}}^{\tau_N(t)} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c_N(r_i) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 (t+1)^{k-1}, \tag{5.69}
\end{aligned}$$

using Lemma 5.3(a) for the final inequality. Hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \sum_{s \in \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}} c_N(s) \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} (t+1)^{k-1} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right] = 0 \tag{5.70}$$

by Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.5)). By Lemmata 5.12, 5.11 and 5.14, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\{\tau_N(t) \geq k+l\} \cap E_N^1 \cap E_N^2] = 1$, so we can apply Lemma 5.9 to the remaining expectations in (5.68), yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1-p_r) \right) \right] &\leq \alpha_n^k \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \\
&= \alpha_n^k e^{-\alpha_n t} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \tag{5.71}
\end{aligned}$$

as required. ■

Lemma 5.8 (Induction step lower bound). Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $i_0 := 0$, $i_k := k$. For any sequence of times $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_k \leq t$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] \geq \alpha_n^k e^{-\alpha_n t} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1}: \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}. \quad (5.72)$$

Proof. Firstly,

$$\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \geq \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right). \quad (5.73)$$

Now the second product does not depend on r_1, \dots, r_k , and we can use the lower bound from (5.55):

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\geq \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ &\quad - c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (5.74)$$

where E_N^3 is defined as in (5.52). We will also need an upper bound on this product, which is formed from (5.48) with a further deterministic bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\}} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^1 \cap E_N^2} + c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \\ &\leq \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))t] + \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 (t+1) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] + (t+1) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \\ &\leq \left(2 + \frac{\alpha_n^2 (t+1)}{2} \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] + (t+1) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (5.75)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Now let us consider the remaining sum-product on the RHS of (5.73). We use the same bound on p_r as in (5.42):

$$p_r = 1 - p_{\Delta\Delta}(r) \geq \alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1})) [c_N(r) - B'_n D_N(r)] \quad (5.76)$$

where the $O(N^{-1})$ term does not depend on r . When N is large enough for the factor of $(1 + O(N^{-1}))$ to be non-negative, the condition that the bound in (5.76) is non-negative holds on the event E_N^2 that was defined in (5.44). Then

$$\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \geq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \prod_{i=1}^k [c_N(r_i) - B'_n D_N(r_i)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2}. \quad (5.77)$$

Applying a modification of Lemma 5.5 where the sum is over ordered indices rather than distinct indices,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) &\geq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k [c_N(r_i) - B'_n D_N(r_i)] \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2} \\ &\geq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \left\{ \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2} - \frac{1}{k!} \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) (t+1)^{k-1} (1 + O(N^{-1})) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.78)$$

The above expression is already split into positive and negative terms; a lower bound on (5.73) can be formed by multiplying the positive terms by the lower bound (5.74) and the

negative terms by the upper bound (5.75). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \\
& \geq \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} \right. \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \frac{1}{2} \alpha_n^2 \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\
& \quad - c_N(\tau_N(t)) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B_n)] \Big\} \\
& \quad - \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(s) \right) \alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{k!} (t+1)^{k-1} (1 + B'_n)^k \left\{ \right. \\
& \quad \left(2 + \frac{\alpha_n^2(t+1)}{2} \right) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)] \\
& \quad \left. + (t+1) \exp[\alpha_n(1 + O(N^{-1}))(t+1)(1 + B'_n)] \right\}. \tag{5.79}
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Brown et al. (2021, Equations (3.3)–(3.5)), all but the first line on the RHS of the above have vanishing expectation, leaving

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] \\
& \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\alpha_n^k (1 + O(N^{-1})) \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2} \sum_{l=0}^{\tau_N(t)} (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \mathbb{1}_{E_N^3} \right] \\
& = \alpha_n^k \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\}} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^2 \cap E_N^3} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right]. \tag{5.80}
\end{aligned}$$

Passing the limit and expectation inside the infinite sum is justified by dominated convergence and Fubini; see Lemma 5.16. Lemmata 5.11 and 5.14 establish that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N^2 \cap E_N^3] = 1$ and Lemma 5.12 deals with the other indicator. We can therefore apply

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Lemma 5.9 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k p_{r_i} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{r=1 \\ \notin \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}}}^{\tau_N(t)} (1 - p_r) \right) \right] &\geq \alpha_n^k \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (-\alpha_n)^l \frac{1}{l!} t^l \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \\
&= \alpha_n^k e^{-\alpha_n t} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.81}$$

as required. ■

Lemma 5.9. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $i_0 := 0$, $i_k := k$. Let E_N be a sequence of events such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N] = 1$. Then for any sequence of times $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_k \leq t$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}. \tag{5.82}$$

Proof. As pointed out by Möhle (1999, p. 460), the sum-product on the left hand side can be expanded as

$$\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \sum_{\substack{\tau_N(t_j) \\ r_{i_{j-1}+1} \neq \dots \neq r_{i_j} \\ = \tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}} \prod_{i=i_{j-1}+1}^{i_j} c_N(r_i). \tag{5.83}$$

By a modification of the upper bound in Lemma 5.3(b) where the lower limit of the sum is a general time rather than 1,

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau_N(t_j) \\ r_{i_{j-1}+1} \neq \dots \neq r_{i_j} \\ = \tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}} \prod_{i=i_{j-1}+1}^{i_j} c_N(r_i) \leq (t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}} + c_N(\tau_N(t_j))(t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \tag{5.84}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Now, taking the product on the outside,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \sum_{\substack{r_{i_{j-1}+1} \neq \dots \neq r_{i_j} \\ = \tau_N(t_{j-1}) + 1}}^{\tau_N(t_j)} \prod_{i=i_{j-1}+1}^{i_j} c_N(r_i) \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \left\{ \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} + c_N(\tau_N(t_j)) \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right\} \\
& \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \left\{ \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} + c_N(\tau_N(t_j))(t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right\} \\
& = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [k]} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} c_N(\tau_N(t_j))(t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \\
& = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \\
& \quad + \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} c_N(\tau_N(t_j))(t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \\
& \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \\
& \quad + \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} t^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} c_N(\tau_N(t_j))(t + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \\
& \leq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} + \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} c_N(\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})})) \prod_{j=1}^k (t + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \\
& = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} + \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} c_N(\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})}))(t + 1)^k
\end{aligned} \tag{5.85}$$

where, say, $j^*(\mathcal{I}) := \min\{j \notin \mathcal{I}\}$. Now we are in a position to evaluate the limit in (5.82):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}}^k \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \leq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}}^k \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \\
& \leq \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}}^k \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} + \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [c_N(\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})}))] (t + 1)^k \\
& = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}}^k \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.86}$$

using Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.3)).

5 Weak Convergence ✓

For the corresponding lower bound, by a modification of the lower bound in Lemma 5.3(b) where the lower limit of the sum is a general time rather than 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{r_{i_{j-1}+1} \neq \dots \neq r_{i_j} \\ = \tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}}^{\tau_N(t_j)} \prod_{i=i_{j-1}+1}^{i_j} c_N(r_i) \geq (t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}} - \binom{i_j - i_{j-1}}{2} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \\
& \geq (t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}} - (i_j - i_{j-1})! \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.87}$$

Define the events

$$E_N^4(j) = \left\{ \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \left(\frac{t_j - t_{j-1}}{t_j - t_{j-1} + 1} \right)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right\}, \tag{5.88}$$

which is sufficient to ensure the j^{th} term in the following product is non-negative, and define $E_N^4 := \bigcap_{j=1}^k E_N^4(j)$. (If $t_j = t_{j-1}$ then $E_N^4(j)$ has probability one automatically; otherwise the constant on the right is strictly positive and so satisfies the conditions of

Lemma 5.13.) Now, taking a product over j ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \sum_{\substack{r_{i_{j-1}+1} \neq \dots \neq r_{i_j} \\ = \tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}}^{\tau_N(t_j)} \prod_{i=i_{j-1}+1}^{i_j} c_N(r_i) \\
& \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \left\{ \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} - \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 2} \right\} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& = \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [k]} (-1)^{k-|\mathcal{I}|} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 2} \right) \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& \quad + \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} (-1)^{k-|\mathcal{I}|} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 2} \right) \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& \quad - \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t_j - t_{j-1} + 1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 2} \right) \\
& \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& \quad - \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} t^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t+1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 2} \right) \\
& \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} \\
& \quad - \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right) \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}} t^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \right) \left(\prod_{j \notin \mathcal{I}} (t+1)^{i_j - i_{j-1} - 1} \right) \\
& \geq \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} - \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right) \prod_{j=1}^k (t+1)^{i_j - i_{j-1}} \\
& = \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^4} - \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^\star(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t+1)^k, \tag{5.89}
\end{aligned}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

where again we have arbitrarily set $j^*(\mathcal{I}) := \min\{j \notin \mathcal{I}\}$. We can now evaluate the limit:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N} \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right] \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N \cap E_N^4} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \right] \\
& \quad - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t+1)^k \right] \\
& \geq \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{E_N \cap E_N^4}] \\
& \quad - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \left(\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right) (t+1)^k \right] \\
& = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N \cap E_N^4] \\
& \quad - \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subset [k]} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_{j^*(\mathcal{I})})} c_N(s)^2 \right] (t+1)^k \\
& = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{k-1} \\ \in \{0, \dots, k\}: \\ i_j \geq j \forall j}} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{i_j - i_{j-1}}}{(i_j - i_{j-1})!} \tag{5.90}
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we use Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.5)) to show that the second sum vanishes and Lemma 5.13 to show that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N \cap E_N^4] = 1$. We have shown that the upper and lower bounds coincide, so the result follows. ■

5.3 Indicators ✓

Lemma 5.10. Let $(A_N), (B_N)$ be sequences of events. If $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N] = 1$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[B_N] = 1$ then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N \cap B_N] = 1$.

The above might be so obvious as to go unstated, but it is very important because it

5 Weak Convergence ✓

means we don't have to deal with intersections of dependent events! Here is a little proof just to be sure:

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N] = 1 \text{ and } \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[B_N] = 1 \\
\Leftrightarrow & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N^c] = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[B_N^c] = 0 \\
\Rightarrow & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{P}[A_N^c] + \mathbb{P}[B_N^c]\} = 0 \\
\Rightarrow & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N^c \cup B_N^c] = 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[A_N \cap B_N] = 1. \tag{5.91}
\end{aligned}$$

The only part of this argument that I find potentially controversial is going from the third to the fourth line, which is an application of the sandwich theorem (since $0 \leq \mathbb{P}[A_N^c \cup B_N^c] \leq \mathbb{P}[A_N^c] + \mathbb{P}[B_N^c]$). ■

Lemma 5.11. Let $K > 0$ be a constant which may depend on n, N but not on r , such that $K^{-2} = O(1)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Define the events $E_N(r) := \{c_N(r) < K\}$ and denote $E_N := \bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} E_N(r)$. Then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N] = 1$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[E_N] &= 1 - \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] = 1 - \mathbb{P}\left[\bigcup_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} E_N^c(r)\right] = 1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\bigcup E_N^c(r)}\right] \geq 1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{1}_{E_N^c(r)}\right] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{E_N^c(r)} \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}\right]\right] = 1 - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{P}[E_N^c(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}]\right] \tag{5.92}
\end{aligned}$$

where for the second line we apply Lemma 5.15 with $f(r) = \mathbb{1}_{E_N^c(r)}$. By the generalised Markov inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N^c(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] = \mathbb{P}[c_N(r) \geq K \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \leq K^{-2} \mathbb{E}[c_N(r)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}]. \tag{5.93}$$

Substituting this into (5.92) and applying Lemma 5.15 again, this time with $f(r) = c_N(r)^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N] \geq 1 - K^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}[c_N(r)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}]\right] = 1 - K^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} c_N(r)^2\right]. \tag{5.94}$$

Applying Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.5)), the limit is

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N] = 1 - O(1) \times 0 = 1 \tag{5.95}$$

as required. ■

Lemma 5.12. Fix $t > 0$. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) \geq l] = 1$.

Proof. We can replace the event $\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\}$ with an event of the form of E_N in Lemma 5.11:

$$\{\tau_N(t) \geq l\} = \left\{ \min \left\{ s \geq 1 : \sum_{r=1}^s c_N(r) \geq t \right\} \geq l \right\} = \left\{ \sum_{r=1}^{l-1} c_N(r) < t \right\} \supseteq \bigcap_{r=1}^{l-1} \left\{ c_N(r) < \frac{t}{l} \right\} \supseteq \bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \left\{ c_N(r) < \frac{t}{l} \right\} \quad (5.96)$$

Hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\tau_N(t) \geq l] \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \left\{ c_N(r) < \frac{t}{l} \right\} \right] = 1 \quad (5.97)$$

by applying Lemma 5.11 with $K = t/l$. ■

Lemma 5.13. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a sequence of times $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_k \leq t$, and let K_1, \dots, K_k be strictly positive constants. Define the events

$$E_N := \bigcap_{j=1}^k \left\{ \sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \leq K_j \right\}. \quad (5.98)$$

Then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[E_N] = 1$.

Proof.

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[E_N^c] = 1 - \mathbb{P} \left[\bigcup_{j=1}^k \left\{ \sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 > K_j \right\} \right] \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \geq K_j \right]. \quad (5.99)$$

Applying Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}[E_N] \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k K_j^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{s=\tau_N(t_{j-1})+1}^{\tau_N(t_j)} c_N(s)^2 \right] \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k O(1) \times 0 = 1 \quad (5.100)$$

by Brown et al. (2021, Equation (3.5)). ■

Lemma 5.14. Fix $t > 0$. Let K be a constant not depending on N, r , but which may depend on n .

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \{c_N(r) \geq KD_N(r)\} \right] = 1. \quad (5.101)$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \{c_N(r) \geq KD_N(r)\} \right] &\geq \mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \{c_N(r) > KD_N(r)\} \right] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P} \left[\bigcup_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \{c_N(r) \leq KD_N(r)\} \right] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}_{\bigcup \{c_N(r) \leq KD_N(r)\}}] \\
&\geq 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{1}_{\{c_N(r) \leq KD_N(r)\}} \right] \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{P}[c_N(r) \leq KD_N(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] \quad (5.102)
\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality is an application of Lemma 5.15 with $f(r) = \mathbb{1}_{\{c_N(r) \leq KD_N(r)\}}$.

Fix $0 < \varepsilon < K^{-1}/2$ and assume $N > \max\{\varepsilon^{-1}, (K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon)^{-1}\}$. For each r, i define the event $A_i(r) := \{\nu_r^{(i)} \leq N\varepsilon\}$. Conditional on \mathcal{F}_{r-1} , we have

$$D_N(r) = \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \left[\nu_r^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_r^{(j)})^2 \right] \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)} + \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \left[\nu_r^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_r^{(j)})^2 \right] \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} \quad (5.103)$$

For the first term,

$$\frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \left[\nu_r^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_r^{(j)})^2 \right] \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)}. \quad (5.104)$$

For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \left[\nu_r^{(i)} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i} (\nu_r^{(j)})^2 \right] \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} &\leq \frac{1}{N(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \nu_r^{(i)} \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} + \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \sum_{j=1}^N (\nu_r^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} c_N(r) N\varepsilon + \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \sum_{j=1}^N (\nu_r^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^2(N)_2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \sum_{j=1}^N (\nu_r^{(j)})_2 \mathbb{1}_{A_i(r)} \\
&\leq \varepsilon c_N(r) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \nu_r^{(i)} N\varepsilon c_N(r) + \frac{1}{N^2} c_N(r) N \\
&= c_N(r) \left(2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{N} \right). \quad (5.105)
\end{aligned}$$

5 Weak Convergence ✓

Altogether we have

$$D_N(r) \leq c_N(r) \left(2\varepsilon + \frac{1}{N} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)}. \quad (5.106)$$

Hence, still conditional on \mathcal{F}_{r-1} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \{c_N(r) \leq K D_N(r)\} &\subseteq \left\{ c_N(r) \leq K c_N(r)(2\varepsilon + N^{-1}) + K \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)} \right\} \\ &= \left\{ K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)}}{c_N(r)} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.107)$$

where the ratio $\mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)}/c_N(r)$ is well-defined because

$$A_i^c(r) \Rightarrow c_N(r) := \frac{1}{(N)_2} \sum_{j=1}^N (\nu_r^{(j)})_2 \geq \frac{1}{(N)_2} (\nu_r^{(i)})_2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon(N\varepsilon - 1)}{N-1} \geq \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right) > 0. \quad (5.108)$$

Hence by Markov's inequality (the conditions on ε, N ensuring the constant is always strictly positive),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[c_N(r) \leq K D_N(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)} \geq \left(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{r-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{A_i^c(r)} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{r-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right)} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(\nu_r^{(i)})_3}{(N\varepsilon)_3} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{r-1} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right)} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{N(N)_2}{(N\varepsilon)_3} D_N(r) \middle| \mathcal{F}_{r-1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.109)$$

Applying Lemma 5.15 once more, with $f(r) = D_N(r)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{P}[c_N(r) \leq K D_N(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] &\leq \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right)} \frac{N(N)_2}{(N\varepsilon)_3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}[D_N(r) \mid \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N}) \varepsilon \left(\varepsilon - \frac{1}{N} \right)} \frac{N(N)_2}{(N\varepsilon)_3} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} D_N(r) \right] \\ &\xrightarrow[N \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{1}{(K^{-1} - 2\varepsilon) \varepsilon^5} \times 0 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.110)$$

Substituting this back into (5.102) concludes the proof. ■

5.4 Other useful results ✓

The following Lemma is taken from Koskela et al. (2018, Lemma 2), where the function is set to $f(r) = c_N(r)$, but the authors remark that the result holds for other choices of function.

Lemma 5.15. Fix $t > 0$. Let (\mathcal{F}_r) be the backwards-in-time filtration generated by the offspring counts $\nu_r^{(1:N)}$ at each generation r , and let $f(r)$ be any deterministic function of $\nu_r^{(1:N)}$ that is non-negative and bounded. In particular, for all r there exists $B < \infty$ such that $0 \leq f(r) \leq B$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} f(r) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right]. \quad (5.111)$$

Proof. Define

$$M_s := \sum_{r=1}^s \{f(r) - \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}]\}. \quad (5.112)$$

It is easy to establish that (M_s) is a martingale with respect to (\mathcal{F}_s) , and $M_0 = 0$. Now fix $K \geq 1$ and note that $\tau_N(t) \wedge K$ is a bounded \mathcal{F}_t -stopping time. Hence we can apply the optional stopping theorem:

$$\mathbb{E}[M_{\tau_N(t) \wedge K}] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} \{f(r) - \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}]\} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} f(r) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] = \dots \quad (5.113)$$

Since this holds for all $K \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} f(r) \right] = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right]. \quad (5.114)$$

The monotone convergence theorem allows the limit to pass inside the expectation on each side (since increasing K can only increase each sum, by possibly adding non-negative terms). Hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} f(r) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} f(r) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t) \wedge K} \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{r=1}^{\tau_N(t)} \mathbb{E}[f(r) | \mathcal{F}_{r-1}] \right] \quad (5.115)$$

which concludes the proof. ■

There are a few instances where Fubini's Theorem and the Dominated Convergence Theorem are needed in order to pass a limit and expectation through an infinite sum. Now we verify that the conditions of these theorems indeed hold. This result, analogous

to that in Koskela et al. (2018, Appendix), is used once in Lemma 5.7 at (5.67) and once in Lemma 5.8 at (5.80).

Lemma 5.16. *For any fixed $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left| (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right| \right] < \infty. \quad (5.116)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \left| (-\alpha_n)^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l \sum_{\substack{r_1 < \dots < r_k: \\ r_i \leq \tau_N(t_i) \forall i}} \prod_{i=1}^k c_N(r_i) \right| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n^l (1 + O(N^{-1})) \frac{1}{l!} t^l (t+1)^k \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\alpha_n t(1 + O(N^{-1}))\}(t+1)^k] = \exp\{\alpha_n t(1 + O(N^{-1}))\}(t+1)^k \end{aligned} \quad (5.117)$$

■

5.5 Dependency graph ✓

Missing links since this graph was updated:

- Lemma 5.3(a) is used three times in Lemma 5.7, but not anywhere else.
- Lemma 5.3 in the current dependency graph is really referring to Lemma 5.3(b)
- Lemma 5.16 is used in Lemmata 5.8 and 5.7.
- Lemma 5.10 is used in Lemmata 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9




Figure 5.1: Graph showing dependencies between the lemmata used to prove weak convergence. Dotted arrows indicate dependence via a slight modification of the preceding lemma.

6 Discussion

Bibliography

- [1] Christophe Andrieu, Arnaud Doucet, and Roman Holenstein. “Particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 72.3 (2010), pp. 269–342.
- [2] Alan Bain and Dan Crisan. *Fundamentals of Stochastic Filtering*. Springer, 2008.
- [3] Leonard E. Baum et al. “A Maximization Technique Occurring in the Statistical Analysis of Probabilistic Functions of Markov Chains”. In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 41 (1970), pp. 164–171.
- [4] Nathanaël Berestycki. *Recent Progress in Coalescent Theory*. 0909.3985. ArXiv, 2009.
- [5] Suzie Brown et al. “Simple Conditions for Convergence of Sequential Monte Carlo Genealogies with Applications”. In: *Electronic Journal of Probability* 26.1 (2021), pp. 1–22. ISSN: 1083-6489. DOI: 10.1214/20-EJP561.
- [6] C. Cannings. “The Latent Roots of Certain Markov Chains Arising in Genetics: A New Approach, I. Haploid Models”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 6.2 (1974), pp. 260–290.
- [7] C. Cannings. “The Latent Roots of Certain Markov Chains Arising in Genetics: A New Approach, II. Further Haploid Models”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 7.2 (1975), pp. 264–282.
- [8] James Carpenter, Peter Clifford, and Paul Fearnhead. “Improved Particle Filter for Nonlinear Problems”. In: *IEE Proceedings — Radar, Sonar and Navigation* 146.1 (1999), pp. 2–7.
- [9] Nicolas Chopin and Omiros Papaspiliopoulos. *An Introduction to Sequential Monte Carlo*. Springer, 2020.
- [10] Adrien Corenflos et al. *Differentiable Particle Filtering via Entropy-Regularized Optimal Transport*. Tech. rep. 2102.07850. ArXiv, 2021.
- [11] Dan Crisan and Terry Lyons. “Nonlinear Filtering and Measure-Valued Processes”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 109.2 (1997), pp. 217–244.
- [12] Dan Crisan and Terry Lyons. “A Particle Approximation of the Solution of the Kushner–Stratonovitch Equation”. In: *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 115.4 (1999), pp. 549–578.

Bibliography

- [13] Randal Douc, Olivier Cappé, and Eric Moulines. “Comparison of Resampling Schemes for Particle Filtering”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Image and Signal Processing and Analysis*. IEEE. 2005, pp. 64–69.
- [14] Richard Durrett. *Probability Models for DNA Sequence Evolution*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [15] Richard Durrett. *Probability: Theory and Examples*. 5th ed. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2019. DOI: [10.1017/9781108591034](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108591034).
- [16] Bradley Efron and Robert J. Tibshirani. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. CRC press, 1994.
- [17] Alison Etheridge. *Some Mathematical Models from Population Genetics: École D’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXIX-2009*. Springer, 2011.
- [18] Stewart N. Ethier and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Markov Processes: Characterization and Convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- [19] Geir Evensen. “Sequential Data Assimilation with a Nonlinear Quasi-Geostrophic Model Using Monte Carlo Methods to Forecast Error Statistics”. In: *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* 99.C5 (1994), pp. 10143–10162.
- [20] Paul Fearnhead and Peter Clifford. “On-line Inference for Hidden Markov Models via Particle Filters”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 65.4 (2003), pp. 887–899.
- [21] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. “On the Dominance Ratio”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 42 (1923), pp. 321–341.
- [22] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. “The Distribution of Gene Ratios for Rare Mutations”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 50 (1930), pp. 205–220.
- [23] Y.-X. Fu. “Exact Coalescent for the Wright–Fisher Model”. In: *Theoretical Population Biology* 69 (4 2006), pp. 385–394.
- [24] Mathieu Gerber, Nicolas Chopin, and Nick Whiteley. “Negative Association, Ordering and Convergence of Resampling Methods”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* 47.4 (2019), pp. 2236–2260.
- [25] Neil J. Gordon, David J. Salmond, and Adrian F. M. Smith. “Novel Approach to Nonlinear/Non-Gaussian Bayesian State Estimation”. In: *IEE Proceedings F (Radar and Signal Processing)*. Vol. 140. 2. IET. 1993, pp. 107–113.
- [26] Godfrey Harold Hardy and Srinivasa Aaiyangar Ramanujan. “Asymptotic Formulae in Combinatory Analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* s2-17.1 (1918), pp. 75–115.
- [27] Jeroen D. Hol. “Resampling in Particle Filters”. LiTH-ISY-EX-ET-0283-2004. Internship report. Linköping University, 2004.

Bibliography

- [28] Jeroen D. Hol, Thomas B. Schön, and Fredrik Gustafsson. “On Resampling Algorithms for Particle Filters”. In: *Nonlinear Statistical Signal Processing Workshop*. IEEE. 2006, pp. 79–82.
- [29] Chaofan Huang, V. Roshan Joseph, and Simon Mak. *Population Quasi-Monte Carlo*. Tech. rep. 2012.13769. ArXiv, 2020.
- [30] Andrew H. Jazwinski. *Stochastic Processes and Filtering Theory*. Courier Corporation, 2007.
- [31] Kumar Joag-Dev and Frank Proschan. “Negative Association of Random Variables with Applications”. In: *The Annals of Statistics* (1983), pp. 286–295.
- [32] Rudolph Emil Kalman. “A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction Problems”. In: *Journal of Basic Engineering* 82.1 (1960), pp. 35–45.
- [33] John F. C. Kingman. “Exchangeability and the Evolution of Large Populations”. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Exchangeability in Probability and Statistics, Rome, 6th-9th April, 1981, in Honour of Professor Bruno de Finetti*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [34] John F. C. Kingman. “On the Genealogy of Large Populations”. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 19.A (1982), pp. 27–43.
- [35] John F. C. Kingman. “The Coalescent”. In: *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications* 13.3 (1982), pp. 235–248.
- [36] Genshiro Kitagawa. “Monte Carlo Filter and Smoother for Non-Gaussian Nonlinear State Space Models”. In: *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 5.1 (1996), pp. 1–25.
- [37] Jere Koskela et al. *Asymptotic genealogies of interacting particle systems with an application to sequential Monte Carlo*. Mathematics e-print 1804.01811. ArXiv, 2018.
- [38] Fredrik Lindsten and Thomas B Schön. “Backward Simulation Methods for Monte Carlo Statistical Inference”. In: *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* 6.1 (2013), pp. 1–143.
- [39] Jun S Liu and Rong Chen. “Sequential Monte Carlo Methods for Dynamic Systems”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 93.443 (1998), pp. 1032–1044.
- [40] Martin Möhle. “Weak Convergence to the Coalescent in Neutral Population Models”. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 36.2 (1999), pp. 446–460.
- [41] Martin Möhle and Serik Sagitov. “Coalescent Patterns in Exchangeable Diploid Population Models”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 47 (2003), pp. 337–352.
- [42] Patrick Alfred Pierce Moran. “Random Processes in Genetics”. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Vol. 54. 1. Cambridge University Press, 1958, pp. 60–71.

Bibliography

- [43] James E. Mosimann. “On the Compound Multinomial Distribution, the Multivariate β -Distribution, and Correlations among Proportions”. In: *Biometrika* 49.1/2 (1962), pp. 65–82.
- [44] Aaron Myers et al. “Sequential Ensemble Transform for Bayesian Inverse Problems”. In: *Journal of Computational Physics* 427 (2021), p. 110055.
- [45] Herbert E. Rauch, C. T. Striebel, and F. Tung. “Maximum Likelihood Estimates of Linear Dynamic Systems”. In: *AIAA Journal* 3.8 (1965), pp. 1445–1450.
- [46] Sebastian Reich. “A Nonparametric Ensemble Transform Method for Bayesian Inference”. In: *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 35.4 (2013), A2013–A2024.
- [47] Ian W. Saunders, Simon Tavaré, and G. A. Watterson. “On the Genealogy of Nested Subsamples from a Haploid Population”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* (1984), pp. 471–491.
- [48] John L. Spouge. “Within a Sample from a Population, the Distribution of the Number of Descendants of a Subsample’s Most Recent Common Ancestor”. In: *Theoretical Population Biology* 92 (2014), pp. 51–54.
- [49] Thomas Verma and Judea Pearl. “Causal Networks: Semantics and Expressiveness”. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*. Minneapolis, MN, Mountain View, CA, 1988, pp. 352–359.
- [50] Paolo Vidoni. “Exponential Family State Space Models Based on a Conjugate Latent Process”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 61.1 (1999), pp. 213–221.
- [51] John Wakeley. *Coalescent Theory: An Introduction*. Roberts & Co. Publishers, 2009.
- [52] Eric A. Wan and Rudolph van der Merwe. “The Unscented Kalman Filter for Non-linear Estimation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE 2000 Adaptive Systems for Signal Processing, Communications, and Control Symposium*. IEEE. 2000, pp. 153–158.
- [53] Darrell Whitley. “A Genetic Algorithm Tutorial”. In: *Statistics and Computing* 4.2 (1994), pp. 65–85.
- [54] Sewall Wright. “Evolution in Mendelian Populations”. In: *Genetics* 16.2 (1931), pp. 97–159.