Weak convergence proof (in progress)

Suzie Brown

September 7, 2020

Theorem 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, $\mathbb{P}\{\tau_N(t)=\infty\}=0$ for all finite t. Suppose that there exists a deterministic sequence $(b_N)_{N>1}$ such that $\lim_{N\to\infty}b_N=0$ and

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

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

Proof. Define $p_t := \max_{\xi \in E} \{1 - p_{\xi\xi}(t)\} = 1 - p_{\Delta\Delta}(t)$, where Δ denotes the trivial partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ into singletons. For a proof that the maximum is attained at $\xi = \Delta$, see Lemma 1. Following Möhle (1999), we now construct the two-dimensional Markov process $(Z_t, S_t)_{t \in \mathbb{N}}$ with transition probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_{t} = j, S_{t} = \eta \mid Z_{t-1} = i, S_{t-1} = \xi) = \begin{cases}
1 - p_{t} & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } \xi = \eta \\
p_{\xi\xi}(t) + p_{t} - 1 & \text{if } j = i + 1 \text{ and } \xi = \eta \\
p_{\xi\eta}(t) & \text{if } j = i + 1 \text{ and } \xi \neq \eta \\
0 & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases} \tag{2}$$

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 $\xi = \Delta$.)

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 $\omega_i^{(N)} := T_i^{(N)} - T_{i-1}^{(N)}$ the corresponding holding times $(i \in \mathbb{N})$.

Lemma 1. $\max_{\xi \in E} (1 - p_{\xi\xi}(t)) = 1 - p_{\Delta\Delta}(t)$.

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

$$p_{\xi\xi}(t) = \frac{1}{(N)_k} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\dots,i_k \text{all distinct}}} \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)}. \tag{3}$$

Similarly,

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

Suzie Brown 1

Discarding some zero summands,

$$p_{\xi'\xi'}(t) = \frac{1}{(N)_k(N-k)} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\dots,i_k \\ \text{all distinct:} \\ \nu^{(i_1)},\dots,\nu^{(i_k)} > 0}} \left\{ \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} \sum_{\substack{i_{k+1}=1 \\ \text{also distinct}}}^N \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} \right\}. \tag{4}$$

The inner sum is

$$\sum_{\substack{i_{k+1}=1\\\text{also distinct}}}^{N} \nu_t^{(i_{k+1})} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nu_t^{(i)} - \sum_{i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}} \nu_t^{(i)} \right\} \le N - k$$
 (5)

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

$$p_{\xi'\xi'}(t) \le \frac{N-k}{(N)_k(N-k)} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\dots,i_k \\ \text{all distinct:} \\ \nu_t^{(i_1)},\dots,\nu_t^{(i_k)} > 0}} \nu_t^{(i_1)} \cdots \nu_t^{(i_k)} = p_{\xi\xi}(t).$$
 (6)

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.

References

Koskela, J., Jenkins, P. A., Johansen, A. M. and Spanò, D. (2018), 'Asymptotic genealogies of interacting particle systems with an application to sequential Monte Carlo', arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01811.

Möhle, M. (1999), 'Weak convergence to the coalescent in neutral population models', *Journal of Applied Probability* **36**(2), 446–460.

Suzie Brown 2