BEHAVIOUR OF ABC FOR BIG DATA

By Wentao Li and Paul Fearnhead

Lancaster University

Many statistical applications involve models that it is difficult to evaluate the likelihood, but relatively easy to sample from, which is called intractable likelihood. Approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) is a useful Monte Carlo method for inference of the unknown parameter in the intractable likelihood problem under Bayesian framework. Without evaluating the likelihood function, ABC approximately samples from the posterior by jointly simulating the parameter and the data and accepting/rejecting the parameter according to the distance between the simulated and observed data. Many successful applications have been seen in population genetics, systematic biology, ecology etc. In this work, we analyse the asymptotic properties of ABC as the number of data points goes to infinity, under the assumption that the data is summarised by a fixed-dimensional statistic, and this statistic obeys a central limit theorem. We show that the ABC posterior mean for estimating a function of the parameter can be asymptotically normal, centred on the true value of the function, and with a mean square error that is equal to that of the maximum likelihood estimator based on the summary statistic. We further analyse the efficiency of importance sampling ABC for fixed Monte Carlo sample size. For a wide-range of proposal distributions importance sampling ABC can be efficient, in the sense that the Monte Carlo error of ABC increases the mean square error of our estimate by a factor that is just $1 + O(1/N)$, where N is the Monte Carlo sample size.

1. Introduction. There are many statistical applications which involve inference about models that are easy to simulate from, but for which it is difficult, or impossible, to calculate likelihoods for. In such situations it is possible to use the fact we can simulate from the model to enable us to perform inference. There is a wide class of such *likelihood-free* methods of inference including indirect inference [22, 23], the bootstrap filter [21] and simulated methods of moment [16].

We consider a Bayesian version of these methods, termed Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC). This approach involves defining an approximation to the posterior distribution in such a way that it is possible to sample from this approximate posterior using only the ability to sample from the model for any given parameter value.

Let $K(\boldsymbol{x})$ be a density kernel, where $\max_{\boldsymbol{x}} K(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be a bandwith. Denote the data as $\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs} = (y_{obs,1}, \cdots, y_{obs,n})$. Assume we have chosen a finite dimensional summary statistic $\boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y})$, and denote $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} = \boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs})$. If we model the data as a draw from a

Algorithm 1: Importance and Rejection Sampling ABC

1. Simulate $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_N \sim q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$;
2. For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, simulate $\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)} = (y_1^{(i)}, \cdots, y_n^{(i)}) \sim f_n(y|\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$;
3. For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, accept $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ with probability $K_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$, where $\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y}^{(i)})$; and define the associated weight as $w_i = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)/q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i)$.

parametric density $f_n(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and assume prior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, then define the ABC posterior as

$$\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon) \propto \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}, \tag{1}$$

where $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the density for the summary statistic implied by $f_n(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Let $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon) = \int f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}$. The idea is that $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)$ is an approximation of the likelihood, and the ABC posterior, proportional to the prior multiplying this likelihood approximation, is an approximation of the true posterior. The likelihood approximation can be interpreted as a measure of, on average, how close the summary, $\boldsymbol{s}_n$, simulated from the model are to the summary for the observed data, $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. The choices of kernel and bandwidth affect the definition of "closeness".

By defining the approximate posterior in this way, we can simulate samples from it using standard Monte Carlo methods. One approach, that we will focus on later, uses importance sampling (IS). Let $K_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{x}) = K(\boldsymbol{x}/\varepsilon)$. Given a proposal density, $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, a bandwidth, ε, and a Monte Carlo sample size, N, the importance sampling ABC (IS-ABC) would proceed as in Algorithm 1. The set of accepted parameters and their associated weights provides a Monte Carlo approximation to π_{ABC}. Note that if we set $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ then this is just a rejection sampler with the ABC posterior as its target, which is called rejection ABC in this paper. In practice sequential importance sampling methods are often used to learn a good proposal distribution [3].

There are three choices in implementing ABC: the choice of summary statistic, the choice of bandwidth, and the specifics of the Monte Carlo algorithm. For importance sampling, the last of these involves specifying the Monte Carlo sample size, N, and the proposal density, $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. These, roughly, relate to three sources of approximation in ABC. To see this note that as $\varepsilon \to 0$ we would expect ABC posterior to converge to the posterior given $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ [17]. Thus the choice of summary statistic governs the approximation, or loss of information, between using the full posterior distribution and using the posterior given the summary. The value ε then affects how close the ABC posterior is to the posterior given the summary. Finally there is then Monte Carlo error from approximating the true ABC posterior with a Monte Carlo sample. The Monte Carlo error is not only affected by the specifics of the Monte Carlo algorithm, but also by the choices of summary statistic and bandwidth, which together affect, say, the probability of acceptance in step 3 of the above importance sampling algorithm. Having higher dimensional summary statistic, or

smaller values of ε, will tend to reduce this acceptance probability and hence increase the Monte Carlo error. These three sources of approximation, together with the variation of the observations, determine the variation of the ABC estimator.

Arguably the first ABC method was that of [36], and these methods have been popular within population genetics [4, 11, 43], ecology [2] and systematic biology [42, 38]. More recently, there have been applications of ABC to other areas including stereology [9], stochastic differential equations [34] and finance [33]. The basic rejection scheme is limited due to the low acceptance probability when the posterior is far away from the prior [31] or the dimension of summary statistic is high [4]. Importance sampling can improve upon rejection sampling by proposing parameter values in areas of high posterior density, in order to increase the acceptance probability. Alternatives to the importance sampling include MCMC [31, 43, 41] and sequential Monte Carlo which attempts to move the sample towards the high posterior density area [3, 15]. The choice of the proposal distribution is key to the performance of the importance sampling. [17] used a pilot stage to find the high posterior density region for constructing the proposal distribution, and [7] used iterative procedure to learn good proposal distributions. However, as it is closer to the posterior distribution, one concern is the increased Monte Carlo variance due to the more and more skewed importance weight, the effect of which is unclear.

Whilst ABC methods have been widely used, its theoretical understanding is still limited, and theory to date has often focussed on specific aspects of ABC. By ignoring the Monte Carlo error, the asymptotic properties of some ABC estimators of the parameter are analysed. For example, [39, 26] show the consistency of the maximum a posteriori estimator of the ABC posterior density; [14] and [13] devise an ABC procedure for the hidden Markov model based on the full observations, instead of a summary statistic, and give the consistency and the asymptotic normality of the ABC posterior and the estimator maximising the approximate likelihood. There are also results for choosing the optimal summary statistic for parameter estimation or model choice [17, 35], and conditions on the summary statistic that are required if we wish to be able to distinguish between competing models [30]. For the choice of ε of the rejection ABC, [6], [5] and [1] investigate how it should scale with the Monte Carlo sample size, N, by obtaining the asymptotic MSE to the posterior mean based on $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. There have been separate results around the implementation of different Monte Carlo algorithms for ABC. For example [27] looks at the conditions under which MCMC algorithms in ABC are geometrically ergodic. [17] gives the optimal proposal density for the importance sampling implementation in the sense of it minimising the effective sample size (ESS) of [28] of the sample weights.

1.1. *Contributions and Main Results.* Assume the true parameter is $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, and some function of the parameter, $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, is of interest. In Algorithm 1, the ABC estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is obtained using a weighted average of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for the accepted $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. In this paper, we study the asymptotic behaviour of the approximation accuracy of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$, considering all sources of error, for fixed but large Monte Carlo size as the number of observations increase. Our

key assumption behind the results is that as size of the data set increases, the summary statistic obeys a central limit theorem.

Our goal is to find out for increasing n and fixed N, whether the efficiency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ can increase at the same rate as that of the maximum likelihood estimator for $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ given the summary statistic. We will use the terminology *MLES* of $\boldsymbol{h}(\theta)$ to denote this maximum likelihood estimator given the summary. To help understand the results we will consider ABC applied to a simple Gaussian example, for which we can analytically calculate the ABC posterior and properties of IS-ABC. Informally, our assumption that the summary statistics obey a central limit theorem means that the asymptotic behaviour of ABC will be qualitatively similar to its behaviour on this example.

Assume a sample of even size n, $y_1, \ldots, y_n$, with y_i independently drawn from a $N(\theta, 1)$ distribution. Assume that we have a two-dimension summary statistic

$$\mathbf{s}_n(\boldsymbol{y}) = \left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n/2} y_i, \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=n/2+1}^{n} y_i \right),$$

the average of the first $n/2$ and last $n/2$ data points respectively. The ABC posterior will depend on this 2-dimension summary through the average of its two components, and we let $\tilde{s}(\boldsymbol{y})$ denote this average. For details of the derivation of the analytical expressions shown below, see Appendix D.

We will assume a prior for θ which is standard normal. Our first set of results relates to the ABC posterior. We choose a kernel and bandwidth which is equivalent to independent marginal Gaussian density with variance ε^2, for which the bandwidth is proportional to ε. The ABC posterior for this simple model is

$$\mathrm{N}\left(\frac{\tilde{s}_{obs}}{1/n + \varepsilon^2 + 1}, \frac{1 + n\varepsilon^2}{n + 1 + n\varepsilon^2} \right).$$

The ABC posterior differs from the true posterior due to terms which are $O(\varepsilon^2)$ in both the mean and variance. If we consider the ABC estimate of $h(\theta)$, for some function h that has bounded derivatives, and assume $\varepsilon = o(n^{-1/4})$, its mean will be

$$h\left(\frac{\tilde{s}_{obs}}{1 + 1/n + \varepsilon^2} \right) = h\left(\tilde{s}_{obs} \right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Now $\tilde{s}_{obs}$ is just the MLES for θ. So the mean of the ABC estimate is just MLES for $h(\theta)$ plus terms which are negligible as $n \to \infty$. The asymptotic distribution of the MLES is Gaussian, and thus the ABC posterior mean will also have the same asymptotic distribution. Our Theorem 3.1, a Bernstein-von Mises type result, shows that such behaviour holds in general.

Furthermore, we can get an ABC estimate with asymptotically equivalent mean if we just use a one-dimensional summary statistic, $\tilde{s}(\boldsymbol{y})$. We show in Proposition 3.1 that for any

d dimensional summary statistic, with d greater than the dimension, p, of the parameter, there is an equivalent p dimensional summary statistic achieving the same asymptotic distribution for the ABC posterior mean.

Note that whilst for $\varepsilon = o(n^{-1/4})$ we have that the ABC posterior mean is asymptotically equivalent to the MLES, the ABC posterior is not necessarily a good approximation to the posterior distribution given the summaries. In particular the ABC posterior has a larger variance than the true posterior. If $\varepsilon = O(n^{-1/2})$ then it will over-estimate the posterior variance by a constant factor as $n \to \infty$, and this corresponds to an equivalent overestimate of the uncertainty in ABC estimates of the parameters. If ε decreases to 0 more slowly than $O(n^{-1/2})$, then the ABC posterior variance will be $O(\varepsilon^2)$ rather than $O(1/n)$. To obtain an accurate estimate of the true posterior given the summary statistics as $n \to \infty$ we would need $1/(n\varepsilon^2) = o(1)$, but as we shall see, this will lead to the deteriorative Monte Carlo performance of the IS-ABC algorithm.

Our second set of results focuses on how the Monte Carlo error of IS-ABC affects the accuracy of the final ABC estimator. Firstly note that we can bound the performance of IS-ABC by an algorithm which generates N i.i.d. draws from the ABC posterior. The Monte Carlo variance of such an algorithm will be equal to the ABC posterior variance divided by the Monte Carlo sample size, N. So if ε decreases to 0 more slowly than $O(n^{-1/2})$ the Monte Carlo variance will dominate the variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$.

For IS-ABC we will consider a class of proposal distributions that are tempered versions of the ABC posterior, defined for $\alpha \geq 0$, as

$$\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}(\theta) \propto \pi(\theta) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\theta, \varepsilon)^{\alpha}.$$

For the above model with summary statistic $\tilde{s}(\boldsymbol{y})$ this corresponds to the following proposal distribution for θ

$$\mathrm{N}\left(\frac{\alpha \tilde{s}_{obs}}{1/n + \varepsilon^2 + \alpha}, \frac{1 + n\varepsilon^2}{n\alpha + 1 + n\varepsilon^2}\right).$$

Denote the mean and variance of this distribution as μ_α and σ_α^2 respectively. It is straightforward to see that the marginal distribution of summary statistics simulated in IS-ABC will also be normal, with mean μ_α and variance $\sigma_\alpha^2 + 1/n$. Informally, to have non-negligible acceptance probability we need simulated summary statistics to be within $O(\varepsilon^2)$ of $\tilde{s}_{obs}$. This means that both $\sigma_\alpha^2 + 1/n$ and $(\tilde{s}_{obs} - \mu_\alpha)^2$ must be $O(\varepsilon^2)$, and thus occurs if and only if $\alpha > 0$ and $\varepsilon^2 \geq c/n$ for some $c > 0$. Analytic expressions for the acceptance probability for our model, which confirm this intuition, are given in Appendix D. In Theorem 5.1 we demonstrate that this behaviour holds for ABC in general.

For the Monte Carlo variance of IS-ABC to be well-behaved we also need that the variance of the normalised weights assigned to the accepted θ values does not blow-up as n increases. Note that controlling this variance is non-trivial as the expected value of the original, un-normalised, weights goes to 0 as n increases. Thus standard methods [e.g. 25] which bound the original weights do not work. For our Gaussian example, the above

discussion for the acceptance probability suggests that to control the Monte Carlo variance we want $\varepsilon^2 = c/n$ for some positive constant c. Under this condition we can show that the variance of the normalised IS weights depends on the ratio of the ABC posterior variance to the variance of the distribution of θ values that are accepted in IS-ABC. Similar to the standard result for importance sampling with a Gaussian proposal and Gaussian target, we need the latter variance to be greater than half the former. For our example, as $n \to \infty$ this occurs if and only if $\alpha < 1$ (see Appendix D). In Theorem 5.2 we show IS-ABC using a tempered proposal with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ leads to a Monte Carlo variance that is well-behaved as $n \to \infty$, and that the resulting asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is $1 + O(1/N)$ times the variance of the MLES.

1.2. *Outline of Paper.* The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 sets up some notations and presents the key assumptions for the main theorems. Section 3 gives the asymptotic normality of the ABC posterior mean of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for $n \to \infty$. Section 4 gives the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ when $N \to \infty$. In Section 5, the relative asymptotic efficiency between MLES and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is studied for various proposal densities. An iterative importance sampling algorithm is proposed and the comparison between ABC and the indirect inference (II) is given. In Section 6 we demonstrate our results empirically on a stochastic volatility model. Section 7 concludes with some discussions.

2. Notation and Set-up. As mentioned above, we denote the data by $\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs} = (y_{obs,1}, \cdots, y_{obs,n})$, where n is the sample size, and each observation, $y_{obs,i}$, can be of arbitrary dimension. We will be considering asymptotics as $n \to \infty$, and thus denote the density of $\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs}$ by $f_n(\boldsymbol{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. This density depends on an unknown parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. We will let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ denote the true parameter value, and $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ the prior distribution for the parameter. Let p be the dimension of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be the parameter space. For a set A, let A^c be its complement with respect to the whole space. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is in the interior of the parameter space, as implied by the following condition:

(C1) There exists some $\delta_0 > 0$, such that $\mathcal{P}_0 \equiv \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : |\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0| < \delta_0\} \subset \mathcal{P}$.

To implement ABC we will use a summary statistic of the data, $\boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$; for example a vector of sample means of appropriately chosen functions of the data. This summary statistic will be of fixed dimension, d, as we vary n. The density for $\boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y})$, implied by the density for the data, will depend on n, and we denote this by $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. We will use the shorthand $\boldsymbol{S}_n$ to denote the random variable with density $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In ABC we use a kernel, $K(\boldsymbol{x})$, with $\max_{\boldsymbol{x}} K(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1$, and a bandwidth $\varepsilon > 0$. As we vary n we will often wish to vary ε, and in these situations denote the bandwidth by ε_n. For the importance sampling algorithm we require a proposal distribution, $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and allow for this to depend on n. We assume the following conditions on the kernel:

(C2) (i) $\int \boldsymbol{v} K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} = 0$ and $\int v_i v_j v_k K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} = 0$ for any different coordinates (v_i, v_j, v_k) of $\boldsymbol{v}$.

(ii) $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ is spherically symmetric, i.e. $K(\boldsymbol{v}) = K(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|)$, and $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ is a decreasing function of $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|$.

(iii) $K(\boldsymbol{v}) = O(e^{-c_1\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^{\alpha_1}})$ for some $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$ as $\|\boldsymbol{v}\| \to \infty$.

In (C2), (i) is satisfied by all commonly used kernels in ABC; (ii) can be assumed without loss of generality, since π_{ABC} with a elliptically symmetric kernel is equivalent to π_{ABC} with a spherically symmetric kernel and the linearly transformed $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$; (iii) is satisfied by kernels with bounded support or exponentially decreasing tails, like Gaussian kernel.

For a real function $g(\boldsymbol{x})$ with vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, at $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_0$, denote its k_{th} partial derivative by $D_{x_k} g(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$, the gradient function by $D_{\boldsymbol{x}} g(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$ and the Hessian matrix by $H_{\boldsymbol{x}} g(\boldsymbol{x}_0)$. To simplify the notations, D_{θ_k}, $D_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and $H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ are written as D_k, D and H respectively. For a series x_n, besides the limit notations $O(\cdot)$ and $o(\cdot)$, we use the notations that for large enough n, $x_n = \Theta(a_n)$ if there exists constants m and M such that $0 < m < |x_n/a_n| < M < \infty$, and $x_n = \Omega(a_n)$ if $|x_n/a_n| \to \infty$.

The asymptotic results are based around assuming a central limit theorem for the summary statistic.

(C3) There exists a sequence a_n, with $a_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, a d-dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and a $d \times d$ matrix $A(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, such that for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$a_n(\boldsymbol{S}_n - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, A(\boldsymbol{\theta})); \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, that

(i) $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $A(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in C^1(\mathcal{P}_0)$, and $A(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is positive definite for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$;

(ii) $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$; and

(iii) $I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \triangleq D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T A^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ has full rank at $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$.

Under condition (C3) we have that a_n is the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem. If the data are independent and identically distributed, and the summaries consist of sample means of functions of the data, then $a_n = n^{1/2}$. Part (ii) of this condition is required for the true parameter to be identifiable given only the summary of data. Furthermore, $I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/a_n^2$ is the asymptotic variance of MLES for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and therefore is required to be valid at the true parameter.

We next require a condition that controls the difference between $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and its limiting distribution for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{s}$ close to $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. This condition is similar to that assumed by [12] when they looked at the asymptotics of the MLES for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Let $N(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ be the normal density at $\boldsymbol{x}$ with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and variance Σ. Define $\widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = N(\boldsymbol{s}; \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), A(\boldsymbol{\theta})/a_n^2)$, $LR_n(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log(f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})/\widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ and $LR_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = LR_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then the condition is:

(C4) $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0} \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\| \le M} |LR_n(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{\theta})| = o(1)$ for any positive constant M, $a_n^{-1} D_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} LR_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = o_p(1)$ and $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0} a_n^{-2} |H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} LR_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = o_p(1)$.

We also need a condition that ensures the tails of $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are exponentially decreasing.

(C5) $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0^c}\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s}-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|\le M_1} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = O(e^{-c_2 a_n^{\alpha_2}})$ for some positive constants M_1, c_2 and α_2.

The following condition requires an appropriate choice of $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ such that the approximate likelihood f_{ABC}, as an integral in $\mathbb{R}^d$, mainly depends on the integration in a compact set around $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$.

(C6) $\exists M_2 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0}\left[\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\ge M_2\varepsilon_n^{-1}} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta})K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}/f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta},\varepsilon_n)\right] = o_p(1).$$

When the support of $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ is bounded, (C6) obviously holds. For $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ with unbounded support, a sufficient condition for (C6) to hold is that the tails of $K(\boldsymbol{v})$ decrease fast enough, as stated below.

(C6′) $\exists M_2 > 0$ such that $\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\ge M_2}\varepsilon_n^{-d}K(\varepsilon_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}) \le \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0,\|\boldsymbol{s}-\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}\|\le M_2} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Some continuity and moment conditions of the prior distribution are required.

(C7) $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is continuous in $\mathcal{P}_0$ and $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) > 0$.
(C8) $\int\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$ and $\int\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$.

Finally, the function of interest $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ needs to satisfy some differentiable and moment conditions in order that the remainders of its posterior moment expansion are small. Consider the k_{th} coordinate $h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

(C9) $h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in C^1(\mathcal{P}_0)$ and $D_k h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \ne 0$.
(C10) $\int|h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$ and $\int h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$.

3. Asymptotics of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$. We first ignore the Monte Carlo error of ABC, and focus on the ideal ABC estimator, $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$, where $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = \mathrm{E}_{\pi_{ABC}}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n]$. As an approximation to the true posterior mean, $\mathrm{E}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs}]$, $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ contains the errors from the choice of the bandwidth, ε_n, and the summary statistic $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$.

To understand the effect of these two sources of error, we derive a result for the asymptotic distribution of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$, where we consider randomness solely due to the randomness of the data.

THEOREM 3.1. *Assume conditions (C1)–(C5), (C7)–(C10), and (C11)-(C16) in the appendix. Then if* $\varepsilon_n = o(1/\sqrt{a_n})$,

$$a_n(\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} - \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)),$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Theorem 3.1 says when ε_n goes to 0 at a rate faster than $1/\sqrt{a_n}$, the bias brought by ε_n is asymptotically negligible. Hence regardless of the sufficiency of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, the ABC estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal with the asymptotic variance equal to the Cramer-Rao lower bound for estimating θ given the summary statistic. This is minimised by any sufficient statistic satisfying (C3), illustrated in the remark below, and also by choices such as $E[\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{Y}_{obs}]$ suggested in [17, Theorem 3].

How to choose the dimension d of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ is of interest, since larger d gives possibly more informative $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ but slower convergence of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ when N increases [8]. The following proposition states that when d exceeds the dimension of the parameter, $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ based on $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ is equivalent in the first order to $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ based on p linear combinations of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. Thus we can use a p dimensional statistic without loss of asymptotic efficiency.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.1. If d is larger than p, let $C = D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T A^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, then $I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ where $I_C(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the $I(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ matrix of the summary statistic $C\boldsymbol{S}_n$. Therefore $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ based on $C\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ and $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ have the same asymptotic variance.*

PROOF. The equality can be verified by algebra. □

REMARK 3.1. Consider the MLES for the parameter, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} = \text{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}} \log f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and the corresponding MLES for our function of interest, $\boldsymbol{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$. Theorem 3.1 is based on two results. First, Lemma 3 states that

$$a_n(\boldsymbol{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) - \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)),$$

which means that $\boldsymbol{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ shares a similar central limit theorem to the standard MLE based on the full data, but with a different asymptotic variance that depends on the convergence properties of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. This is more general than the convergence result of MLES in [12] which assumes $\mathcal{P}$ is compact. Second, $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ is the same as $\boldsymbol{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ to the first order through a Bernstein Von-Mises type of convergence for the posterior distribution and expectations, stated in Lemma 4 and 5 in Appendix A. [46] developed a similar convergence of the posterior distribution which is limited to the case when $p = d$.

The equivalence between $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ and $\boldsymbol{h}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ also implies that the optimal asymptotic variance of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ is the Cramer-Rao lower bound, achieved when $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ is sufficient.

REMARK 3.2. The order $o(1/\sqrt{a_n})$ of ε_n is surprising due to the following observation. In [45] it is noted that the ABC posterior is the posterior under a wrong model likelihood. Specifically, let $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon} \equiv \boldsymbol{S}_n - \varepsilon X$ where $X \sim K(x)$. The approximate likelihood $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)$ used in ABC is the density of $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon}$. If $\varepsilon_n = o(1/a_n)$ then $a_n|\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon} - \boldsymbol{S}_n|$ will tend to 0 for large n, and we would expect the error introduced through using a non-zero ε_n to be negligible. However the theorem gives a much weaker condition on ε_n for the bias to be asymptotically negligible.

Theorem 3.1 leads to following natural definition.

DEFINITION 1. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1 hold. Then the* asymptotic variance *of* $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ *is*

$$AV_{\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}} = \frac{1}{a_n^2} D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0).$$

4. Asymptotic Monte Carlo Error of ABC. We now consider the Monte Carlo error involved in estimating $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$. Here we fix the data and consider randomness solely in terms of the stochasticity of the Monte Carlo algorithm. We focus on the importance sampling algorithm given in the introduction. Remember that N is the Monte Carlo sample size. For $i = 1, \ldots, N$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i$ is the proposed parameter value and w_i is its importance sampling weight. Let ϕ_i be the indicator that is 1 if and only if θ_i is accepted in step 3 of algorithm 1 and $N_{acc} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \phi_i$ be the number of accepted parameter.

Provided $N_{acc} \geq 1$ we can estimate $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ from the output of importance sampling algorithm with

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i) w_i \phi_i / \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i \phi_i.$$

Define

$$p_{acc,q} = \int q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \int f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K_\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{s} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\theta},$$

which is the acceptance probability of the importance sampling algorithm proposing from $q(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Furthermore, define

$$q_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon) \propto q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon),$$

the density of the accepted parameter; and

$$\Sigma_{IS,n} \equiv E_{\pi_{ABC}} \left[(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2 \frac{\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)}{q_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)} \right]$$

$$\text{and } \Sigma_{ABC,n} \equiv p_{acc,q_n}^{-1} \Sigma_{IS,n}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Sigma_{IS,n}$ is the IS variance with π_{ABC} as the target density and q_{ABC} as the proposal density. Note that p_{acc,q_n} and $\Sigma_{IS,n}$, and hence $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$, depend on $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$.

Standard results give the following asymptotic distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *For a given* n *and* $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$*, if* $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ *and* $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$ *are finite, then*

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}} - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, \Sigma_{ABC,n}),$$

as $N \to \infty$.

The proposition motivates the following definition.

DEFINITION 2. *For a given n and $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, assume that the conditions of Proposition 4.1 hold. Then the* asymptotic Monte Carlo variance *of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is*

$$MCV_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}} = \frac{1}{N}\Sigma_{ABC,n}.$$

From Proposition 4.1, it can be seen that the asymptotic Monte Carlo variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is equal to the IS variance $\Sigma_{IS,n}$ divided by the average number of acceptance Np_{acc,q_n}, and therefore depends on the proposal distribution and ε_n through these two terms.

REMARK 4.1 (Optimal proposal density). According the alternative expression of $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$ in the proof of Proposition 4.1 that

$$\Sigma_{ABC,n} = p_{acc,\pi}^{-1} E_{\pi_{ABC}}\left[(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2 \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right], \tag{3}$$

the optimal proposal density minimising $\mathrm{MCV}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}}$ is the density proportional to $\left|\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}\right|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)^{1/2}$. This can be obtained similarly as obtaining the optimal proposal density for the ratio estimate of importance sampling [24, Chapter2].

5. Asymptotic Properties of Rejection and Importance Sampling ABC. We have defined the asymptotic variance as $n \to \infty$ of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$, and the asymptotic Monte Carlo variance, as $N \to \infty$ of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$. Both the error of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ when estimating $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and the Monte Carlo error of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ when estimating $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ are independent of each other. Thus this suggests the following definition.

DEFINITION 3. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 3.1, and that $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ and $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$ are bounded in probability for any n. Then the* asymptotic variance *of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is*

$$AV_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}} = \frac{1}{a_n^2}\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \frac{1}{N}\Sigma_{ABC,n}.$$

That is the asymptotic variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is the sum of its Monte Carlo asymptotic variance for estimating $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$, and the asymptotic variance of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$. As mentioned in Remark 3.1, the first term on the right-hand side is the asymptotic variance of the MLES for $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Therefore let $\mathrm{AV}_{\mathrm{MLES}} = a_n^{-2}\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) D\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$.

We now wish to investigate the properties of this asymptotic variance, for large but fixed N, as $n \to \infty$. In particular we are interested in how $\mathrm{AV}_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}}$, compares to $\mathrm{AV}_{\mathrm{MLES}}$, and how this depends on the choice of ε_n and $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Thus we introduce the following definition:

DEFINITION 4. *For a choice of ε_n and $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, we define the asymptotic efficiency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ as*

$$AE_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{AV_{MLES}}{AV_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}}}.$$

If this limiting value is 0, we say that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is asymptotically inefficient.

We will investigate the asymptotic efficiency of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ under the assumption of Theorem 3.1 that $\varepsilon_n = o(1/\sqrt{a_n})$. We will further define $c_\varepsilon = \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n\varepsilon_n$, and assume that this limit exists. Note that c_ε can be either a constant or infinity. We will consider a family of proposal densities, defined for $\alpha \in [0,1]$,

$$\pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta},\varepsilon_n)^\alpha.$$

These can be viewed as tempered versions of the ABC posterior. For $\alpha = 0$ and 1, $\pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)$ respectively. For $\alpha = 1/2$, $\pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the proposal density minimising the ESS of [28], as shown in [17]. Whilst we could not use $\pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}$ directly as a proposal distribution, except for when $\alpha = 0$, this family should give us insight into the behaviour of different proposal distributions if we try and increasingly sample in areas of high ABC-posterior mass.

First we show that if we propose from the prior ($\alpha = 0$) or the posterior ($\alpha = 1$) then the ABC estimator is asymptotically inefficient. Let $a_{n,\varepsilon} = a_n \mathbb{1}_{c_\varepsilon<\infty} + \varepsilon_n^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{c_\varepsilon=\infty}$. Recall the interpretation in Remark 3.2 and given (C3), $a_{n,\varepsilon}$ is the convergence rate of $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon}$.

THEOREM 5.1. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and (C6). Consider a fixed N. Then we have:*

(i) If $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $p_{acc,q_n} = \Theta_p(\varepsilon_n^d a_{n,\varepsilon}^{d-p})$ and $\Sigma_{IS,n} = \Theta_p(a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-2})$.
(ii) If $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)$, $p_{acc,q_n} = \Theta_p(\varepsilon_n^d a_{n,\varepsilon}^{d})$ and $\Sigma_{IS,n} = \Theta_p(a_{n,\varepsilon}^{p})$.

In both cases $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is asymptotically inefficient.

The reason why $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is asymptotically inefficient is because the Monte Carlo variance decays more slowly than $1/a_n^2$ as $n \to \infty$. However the problem with the Monte Carlo variance is caused by different factors in each case.

To see this, consider the acceptance probability of a value of θ and corresponding summary $\boldsymbol{s}_n$ simulated in one iteration of the IS-ABC algorithm. This acceptance probability depends on

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{s}_n - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}}{\varepsilon_n} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\left[(\boldsymbol{s}_n - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + (\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) + (\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\right], \tag{4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, defined in (C3), is the limiting values of $\boldsymbol{s}_n$ as $n \to \infty$ if data is sampled from the model for parameter value θ. By (C3) the first and third bracketed terms within

the square brackets on the right-hand side are $O_p(a_n^{-1})$. If we sample from the prior, then the middle term is $O_p(1)$, and thus (4) will blow-up as ε_n goes to 0. Hence $p_{acc,\pi}$ goes to 0 as ε_n goes to 0 and thus causes the estimate to be inefficient. If we sample from the posterior, then by Theorem 3.1 we expect the middle term to also be $O_p(a_n^{-1})$. Hence (4) is well behaved as $n \to \infty$, and consequently $p_{acc,\pi}$ is bounded away from 0, provided either $\varepsilon_n = \Theta(a_n^{-1})$ or $\varepsilon_n = \Omega(a_n^{-1})$.

However, $\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)$ still causes the estimate to be inefficient due to an increasing variance of the importance weights. As n increases the proposal is more and more concentrated around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, while π does not change. Therefore the weight, which is the ratio of π_{ABC} and q_{ABC}, is increasingly skewed and causes $\Sigma_{IS,n}$ to go to ∞.

Whilst using $\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with either $\alpha = 0$, the prior, or $\alpha = 1$, the posterior, leads to asymptotically inefficient estimators, the following result shows that by using $\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ as a proposal we can avoid this problem. This is because such a choice of proposal leads to an acceptance probability that is bounded away from 0, and, if we further choose $\varepsilon_n = \Theta(a_n^{-1})$, the Monte Carlo IS variance for the accepted parameter values is $\Theta(a_n^{-2})$, i.e. having the same order as the variance of MLES.

THEOREM 5.2. *Assume the conditions of Theorem 5.1 and (C17)-(C20). Consider N is fixed. If $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $p_{acc,q_n} = \Theta_p(a_{n,\varepsilon}^d \varepsilon_n^d)$ and $\Sigma_{IS,n} = \Theta(a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-2})$. Then if $\varepsilon_n = \Theta(a_n^{-1})$, $AV_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}} = (1 + K/N)AV_{MLES}$ and $AE_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}} = 1 - K/(N + K)$ for some constant K.*

The above result shows that a good proposal distribution, in the sense of resulting in an ABC estimator whose asymptotic efficiency is $1 - O(1/N)$, will have a threshold ε_n that is $\Theta(a_n^{-1})$ and an acceptance probability that is bounded away from 0 as n increases. This supports the intuitive idea of using the acceptance rate in ABC to choose the threshold based on aiming for an appropriate proportion of acceptances [e.g. 15, 5].

5.1. *Iterative Importance Sampling ABC.* From Theorem 5.2 and [17], we suggest proposing from an approximation to $\pi_{ABC}^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. We suggest using an iterative procedure [similar in spirit to that of 3], see Algorithm 2.

In this algorithm, N is the number of simulations allowed by the computing budget, $N_0 < N$ and $\{p_k\}$ is a sequence of acceptance rate, which we use to choose the bandwidth. The rule for choosing the new proposal distribution is based on the mean and variance of $\pi_{ABC}^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ being approximately equal to the mean and twice of the variance of $\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ respectively, as shown in the proof of Theorem 5.2. A natural choice of $q_1(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. $\{p_k\}$ can be set to decrease initially from a relatively large percentage and then stay at a small value, so that the centre μ_k can stably move towards the true parameter and a small enough bandwidth can be achieved at last. Starting from a small percentage may accelerate the convergence, but if the summary is not accurate enough about the parameter, it may cause inaccurate μ_k. It can also be adjusted automatically by assessing some quality criterion of

Algorithm 2: Iterative Importance Sampling ABC

At the k_{th} step,

1. run IS-ABC with simulation size N_0, proposal density $q_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and acceptance rate p_k, and record the bandwidth ε_k.
2. If $\varepsilon_{k-1} - \varepsilon_k$ is smaller than some positive threshold, stop. Otherwise, let μ_{k+1} and Σ_{k+1} be the empirical mean and variance matrix of the weighted sample from step 1, and let $q_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the density with centre μ_{k+1} and variance matrix $2\Sigma_{k+1}$.
3. If $q_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is close to $q_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, stop. Otherwise, return to step 1.

After the iteration stops at the K_{th} step, run the IS-ABC with proposal density $q_{K+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $N - KN_0$ simulations and p_{K+1}.

the importance weights, like the ESS used in [15]. When comparing $q_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $q_{k+1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, a simple criteria is the difference $\|\mu_k - \mu_{k+1}\| + |\Sigma_k - \Sigma_{k+1}|^{1/2}$. Besides constructing $q_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as a unimodal density, other methods of constructing the importance proposal can be applied including [37, 10, 44, 29]. Since algorithm 2 has the same simulation size as the rejection ABC and the additional calculation is ignorable, the iterative procedure does not introduce additional computational cost.

5.2. *Comparison with Indirect Inference.* We can compare the efficiency of IS-ABC with that of Indirect Inference (II) [22]. II is an alternative likelihood-free method that involves (i) approximating the model of interest, henceforth the "true model" by a tractable auxiliary model; (ii) estimating the parameters of the auxiliary model; (iii) mapping the estimates of these auxiliary model parameters to estimates of parameters of the true model using simulation from the true model. The estimates of the auxiliary model parameters have the same role as the summary statistics in ABC. Thus if we implement ABC with these summary statistics, which of II and IS-ABC will be more accurate?

In the situation where there are the same number of parameters in the auxiliary model, or equivalently summary statistics, as there are parameters in the true model, then both II and IS-ABC have similar asymptotic efficiency. In both cases it is $1 - O(1/N)$ times the efficiency of the MLES [23]. Here N is the number of simulations from the true model for either II or IS-ABC, and is proportional to the computational cost of the method. If the number of parameters in the auxiliary model is greater than the number of parameters in the true model, II requires a weight-matrix to be specified. The asymptotic efficiency of II depends on this choice of weight-matrix. If chosen optimally then II will obtain the same asymptotic efficiency as IS-ABC; otherwise for sufficiently large N IS-ABC will lead to more accurate estimates than II. (Note that there are simulation based approaches that will consistently estimate the optimal weight-matrix in indirect inference.)



	n=100	500	2000	10000
ϕ	0.94	0.48	0.17	0.055
σ_v	1.2	1.2	0.51	0.2
$\log\overline{\sigma}$	1.1	1.3	0.94	0.61

FIG 1. *Comparisons of R-ABC and IIS-ABC for increasing n. For each n, the logarithm of average MSE for* 100 *datasets multiplying by n is reported. For each dataset, the Monte Carlo sample size of ABC estimators is* 10^4. *The ratio of the MSEs of the two methods is given in the table, and smaller values indicate better performance of the IIS-ABC.*

6. Stochastic Volatility with AR(1) Dynamics. Consider the stochastic volatility model in [40]

$$\begin{cases} x_n &= \phi x_{n-1} + \eta_n,\ \eta_n \sim N(0, \sigma_\eta^2) \\ y_n &= \overline{\sigma} e^{\frac{x_n}{2}} \xi_n,\ \xi_n \sim N(0,1), \end{cases}$$

where η_n and ξ_n are independent, y_n is the demeaned return of a portfolio obtained by subtracting the average of all returns from the actual return and $\overline{\sigma}$ is the average volatility level. By the transformation $y_n^* = \log y_n^2$ and $\xi_n^* = \log \xi_n^2$, the state-space model can be transformed to

$$\begin{cases} x_n &= \phi x_{n-1} + \eta_n,\ \eta_n \sim N(0, \sigma_\eta^2) \\ y_n^* &= 2\log\overline{\sigma} + x_n + \xi_n^*,\ \exp\{\xi_n^*\} \sim \chi_1^2, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

which is linear and non-Gaussian.

The ABC method can be used to obtain an off-line estimator for the unknown parameter of the state-space models, which is recently discussed by [32]. Here we illustrate the effectiveness of iteratively choosing the importance proposal for large n by comparing the performance of the rejection ABC (R-ABC) and the iterative IS-ABC (IIS-ABC). Consider the estimation of the parameter $(\phi, \sigma_\eta, \log\overline{\sigma})$ with the uniform prior in

the area $[0,1) \times [0.1,3] \times [-10,-1]$. The setting with the true parameter $(\phi, \sigma_\eta, \log \overline{\sigma}) = (0.9, 0.675, -4.1)$ is studied, which is motivated by the empirical studies and the details are stated in [40]. For any dataset $\boldsymbol{Y} = (y_1, \cdots, y_n)$, let $\boldsymbol{Y}^* = (y_1^*, \cdots, y_n^*)$. The summary statistic $\boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y}) = (\widetilde{Var}[\boldsymbol{Y}^*], \widetilde{Cor}[\boldsymbol{Y}^*], \widetilde{E}[\boldsymbol{Y}^*])$ is used, where $\widetilde{Var}$, $\widetilde{Cor}$ and $\widetilde{E}$ denote the empirical variance, lag-1 autocorrelation and mean. If there were no noise in the state equation for ξ_n^* in (5), then $\boldsymbol{s}_n(\boldsymbol{Y})$ would be a sufficient statistic of $\boldsymbol{Y}^*$, and hence is a natural choice to make for summary statistic. The uniform kernel is used in the accept-reject step of ABC.

The performance of R-ABC and IIS-ABC for $n = 100, 500, 2000$ and 10000 with the simulation budget $N = 10000$. For the IIS-ABC, the sequence $\{p_k\}$ has the first five values being 5% to 1%, decreasing by 1%, and the other values being 1%. For R-ABC, both 5% and 1% quantiles are tried and 5% is chosen for its better performance. For each iteration, $N_0 = 1000$. The simulation results are shown in figure 1.

It can be seen that for all parameters, the IIS-ABC shows increasing advantage over the R-ABC as n increases. For larger n, since the summary statistic is more accurate about the parameter, by constructing the importance proposal with only the simulations within a small distance to the observed summary, the iterative procedure tends to obtain the centre closer to the true parameter and the smaller bandwidth than those used in the R-ABC, and the comparison becomes more significant when n increases. For smaller n, both perform similarly, since when the summary statistic is not accurate enough, the ABC posterior is not much different from the prior, and the benefit of sampling from a slightly better proposal does not compensate the increased Monte Carlo variance from the importance weight. For ϕ and σ_v, the values of n for which IIS-ABC starts to show advantage are smaller than that for $\log \bar{\sigma}$. Because with the informative summary statistic $\widetilde{E}[\boldsymbol{Y}^*]$ the limit of which is in a linear relationship with $\log \bar{\sigma}$, the estimation of $\log \bar{\sigma}$ is easier than that of ϕ and σ_v, and more improvement can be made upon the R-ABC estimators of ϕ and σ_v.

7. Summary and Discussion. The results in this paper suggest that ABC can scale to large data, at least for models with a fixed number of parameters. Under the assumption that the summary statistics obey a central limit theorem (as defined in Condition C3), then we have that asymptotically the ABC posterior mean of a function of the parameters is normally distributed about the true value of that function. The asymptotic variance of the estimator is equal to the asymptotic variance of the MLE for the function give the summary statistic. And without loss of asymptotic efficiency we can always use a summary statistic that has the same dimension as the number of parameters. This is a stronger result than that of [17], where they show that choosing the same number of summaries as parameters is optimal when interest is in estimating just the parameters.

We have further shown that appropriate importance sampling implementations of ABC are efficient, in the sense of increasing the asymptotic variance of our estimator by a factor that is just $O(1/N)$. However similar results are likely to apply to SMC and MCMC implementations of ABC. For example ABC-MCMC will be efficient provided the acceptance

probability does not degenerate to 0 as n increases. However at stationarity, ABC-MCMC will propose parameter values from a distribution close to the ABC posterior density, and Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 suggest that for such a proposal distribution the acceptance probability of ABC will be bounded away from 0.

Whilst our theoretical results suggest that point estimates based on the ABC posterior have good properties, they do not suggest that the ABC posterior is a good approximation to the true posterior, nor that the ABC posterior will accurately quantify the uncertainty in estimates. As shown by the Gaussian example in Section 1.1, the ABC posterior will tend to over-estimate the uncertainty.

Acknowledgements This work was support by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, grant EP/K014463.

Appendix. Here technical lemmas and proofs of the main results are presented. Throughout the appendix the data are considered to be random, and $O(\cdot)$ and $\Theta(\cdot)$ denote the limiting behaviour when n goes to ∞. For a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ and a density $f(\boldsymbol{x})$, let $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}$ be the first k coordinates of $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $f(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$ be the marginal density on $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}$. For two sets A and B, the sum of integrals $\int_A f(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x} + \int_B f(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x}$ is written as $(\int_A + \int_B) f(\boldsymbol{x})\,d\boldsymbol{x}$. Let $\boldsymbol{T}_{obs} = A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1/2} a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$ and by (C3), $\boldsymbol{T}_{obs} \sim N(0, I_d)$ where I_d is the identity matrix with dimension d.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF SECTION 3

Denote $Var_{\pi_{ABC}}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon]$ by $V_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$ and $E_{\pi_{ABC}}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon]$ by $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$. Then $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon_n)$. Consider the following conditions:

(C11) $E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = O_p(1)$ and $Var[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = O_p(1)$.

(C12) Let $g_c(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon) = \int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $g_{\boldsymbol{h}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon) = \int \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon) = \int (\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon))^2 \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon)\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Assume that in $D_\varepsilon g_{\boldsymbol{h}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon)$, $D_\varepsilon g_c(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon)$ and $D_\varepsilon g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon)$, the differentiation and integration can be exchanged.

(C13) $\exists c_{tol} > 0$ such that $\max_{\varepsilon \in (0, c_{tol})} H_\varepsilon \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon) = O_p(1)$ and $\max_{\varepsilon \in (0, c_{tol})} H_\varepsilon V_{ABC}(\varepsilon) = O_p(1)$.

(C12) and (C13) are the technical conditions needed for applying Taylor expansions on the ABC posterior moments. (C13) can be interpreted in the following framework. By Remark 3.2, $\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon)$ is the posterior density taking the density of $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon}$ as the likelihood and then $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$ and $V_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$ are the corresponding posterior mean and variance given $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon} = \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. In this sense, since $\boldsymbol{S}_{n,\varepsilon} = O_p(1)$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ by condition (C3), it is reasonable to assume the uniform convergences of $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$ and $V_{ABC}(\varepsilon)$ in a compact set. Comparing to this, (C13) is stronger for assuming uniform convergence on the second derivative.

Let $V_{ABC} = V_{ABC}(\varepsilon_n)$. The proof of Theorem 3.1 proceeds as follows. First, in Lemma 1, the ABC posterior mean $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ and variance V_{ABC} are expanded to separate the bandwidth ε_n and the posterior moments based on $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$. Then in Lemma 4, the Bernstein Von-Mises

theorem is extended for the posterior distribution and expectation based on $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, which, in Lemma 5, leads to the expansions of the posterior mean with the leading term being the MLES and variance with the leading term being the asymptotic variance in Theorem 3.1. Lemma 3 and Lemma 2 give the convergence of the MLES.

LEMMA 1. *Assume conditions (C2)(i) and (C11)-(C13). For any $\varepsilon < c_{tol}$, $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}$ and V_{ABC} have the following expansion,*

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] + \boldsymbol{r}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n)\varepsilon_n^2, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{r}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n) = O_p(1),$$
$$\text{and } V_{ABC} = Var[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] + \boldsymbol{r}_2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n)\varepsilon_n^2, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{r}_2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n) = O_p(1).$$

PROOF. Given conditions (C2)(i) and (C12), a basic fact that will be used throughout this proof is that $D_\varepsilon f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, 0) = 0$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. With the notation in (C12), $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = g_{\boldsymbol{h}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)/g_c(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)$, $V_{ABC}(\varepsilon_n) = g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)/g_c(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, \varepsilon_n)$. Applying Taylor expansion on ε, since $D_\varepsilon g_c(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, 0) = 0$ and $D_\varepsilon g_{\boldsymbol{h}}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, 0) = 0$ by condition (C12), we have

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(0) + \boldsymbol{r}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n)\varepsilon_n^2, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{r}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n) = H_\varepsilon \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(\varepsilon'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} < \varepsilon_n.$$

By condition (C12) and the product rule of differentiation, it is not difficult to see that $D_\varepsilon g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, 0) = 0$. Then

$$V_{ABC}(\varepsilon_n) = V_{ABC}(0) + \boldsymbol{r}_2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n)\varepsilon_n^2, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{r}_2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n) = H_\varepsilon V_{ABC}(\varepsilon'_V) \text{ and } 0 < \varepsilon'_V < \varepsilon_n.$$

By condition (C13) and noting that $\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}(0) = E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ and $V_{ABC}(0) = Var[\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$, the lemma holds. □

As n increases to ∞, based on the classical Bernstein Von-Mises theorem, it is well known the posterior mean and variance of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ conditional on the full dataset can be expanded with the leading terms being the MLE and the Fisher information matrix respectively. See [19, Sections 4.1-4.2]. The difference here is that the posterior moments are for the function $\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and conditional on the summary statistic instead of the full dataset. Therefore we need extensions of the classical result. [12] gives the central limit theorem for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}$ when $a_n = \sqrt{n}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ is compact. According to the proof in [12], extending the result to the general a_n is straightforward. Additionally, we give the extension for general $\mathcal{P}$.

LEMMA 2. *Assume conditions (C1), (C3)-(C5). Then it holds that $a_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{MLES} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))$ as $n \to \infty$.*

PROOF. According to (C4), $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(1)$ and hence $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ has the order $O_p(a_n^d)$ by (C3). Then by (C5), for large enough n, with probability 1, $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is larger than $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0^c$ and hence $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} = \text{argmax}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then from [12], the lemma holds. □

The central limit theorem of $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ is needed. Given the condition (C9), by Lemma 2 and the delta method, the following holds.

LEMMA 3. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 2 and (C9). Then*

$$a_n(h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{MLES}) - h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} N(0, Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Here we prove a posterior normality result more general than the Bernstein Von-Mises type of normality, which is given in Corollary 1, by following the the derivations for posterior normality in [20]. Let $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. The following conditions about how fast the likelihood changes around $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ are needed.

(C14) $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \in C^3(\mathcal{P}_0)$.

(C15) $a_n^{-2} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0} |\frac{\partial^3}{\partial\theta_i \partial\theta_j \partial\theta_k} l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \leq M(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ for any i, j, k of coordinate indices of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $M(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = O_p(1)$.

Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is the true parameter, it is natural to assume that the log-likelihoods of the the parameters outside $\mathcal{P}_0$ is smaller than and do not converge to that of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ as $n \to \infty$, as stated below.

(C16) $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}\left\{\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n^{-2} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0^c > \delta_0} [l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)] < -\epsilon\right\} = 1$ for some $\epsilon > 0$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\tau} = a_n(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ be the normalised $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Then we have the following convergence results for the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

LEMMA 4. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 2, (C14)-(C16) and (C7). Let $\pi_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ be the posterior density of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$. For any real function $g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) v(\boldsymbol{t})$ satisfying the following conditions:*

(a) *The limit of $g_n^*(0; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$, denoted by g_0, exists in probability and $\forall \|\boldsymbol{t}_n\| = o(a_n)$, $|g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}_n; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) - g_0| = o_p(1)$;*

(b) $\max_{\|\boldsymbol{t}\| \leq \delta_0 a_n} |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})| = O_p(1)$;

(c) *$\exists k \geq 0$ such that $|v(\boldsymbol{t})| \leq \|\boldsymbol{t}\|^k$ for any $\boldsymbol{t}$ and $\int |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{\tau}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})| \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{MLES}\|^k \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta} = O_p(1)$,*

it holds that

$$\int g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \pi_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{t} \xrightarrow{P} g_0 \int v(\boldsymbol{t}) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{p/2} |I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)|^{-1/2}} e^{-\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}/2} d\boldsymbol{t} \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

The introduction of $g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ is needed for extending the Bernstein Von-Mises convergence to the posterior moments, which can be seen later in the proof of Lemma 5. An example of $g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ satisfying (a)-(c) is $g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = h(a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ where the real function $h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is continuous at $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, bounded in $\{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq \delta_0\}$ and $\int h(\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$.

PROOF. By the fact that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}$ is a constant given $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, $\pi_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ can be obtained by transforming the posterior density of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ which is proportional to $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then we have

$$\pi_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \propto \pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \triangleq \exp\{l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}) - l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})\}\pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}),$$

which holds since $l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$ does not depend on $\boldsymbol{t}$. We only need to show

$$\int g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t} \xrightarrow{P} g_0\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\int v(\boldsymbol{t})e^{-\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}/2}d\boldsymbol{t}. \tag{6}$$

Because $g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \equiv 1$ obviously satisfies (a)-(c) with $v(\boldsymbol{t}) = 1$, and hence the normalising constant of $\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ converges in probability to $(2\pi)^{p/2}|I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)|^{-1/2}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Then by Slutsky's theorem, Lemma 4 holds.

We break $\mathcal{P}$ into three regions, $B_1 = \{\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{P} : \|\boldsymbol{t}\| \geq \delta_0 a_n\}$, $B_2 = \{\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{P} : c\log a_n \leq \|\boldsymbol{t}\| < \delta_0 a_n\}$ and $B_3 = \{\boldsymbol{t} \in \mathcal{P} : \|\boldsymbol{t}\| < c\log a_n\}$ for non-negative c. (6) will be justified by showing that the integrals of $g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ in B_1 and B_2 are $o_p(1)$ and that in B_3 converges to the RHS of (6) in probability.

In the region B_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_1} |g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{t} \\
\leq &\exp\{\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{t}\|\geq\delta_0 a_n}[l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}) - l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})]\}a_n^p \int |g_n(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta} \\
= &\exp\{\sup_{|\boldsymbol{\theta}-\boldsymbol{\theta}_0|\geq\delta_0}[l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)] + o_p(1)\}a_n^{p+k}\int |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v(\boldsymbol{\tau})|a_n^{-k}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta},
\end{aligned}$$

Then by condition (C16) and (c), it holds that $\int_{B_1} |g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t} = o_p(1)$.

In the region B_2, we have

$$\int_{B_2} |g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t} \leq \max_{\|\boldsymbol{t}\|\leq\delta_0 a_n} |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})| \int_{B_2} |v(\boldsymbol{t})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t}.$$

By condition (b), for proving the LHS of the above inequality is $o_p(1)$, we only need to show $\int_{B_2} |v(\boldsymbol{t})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t}$ is $o_p(1)$. By the definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}$, $D_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) = 0$. Then $\forall \boldsymbol{t}$,

$$l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}) - l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) = -\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_2\boldsymbol{t} + \frac{1}{6}a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{t}, \tag{7}$$

where $D_2 \equiv -a_n^{-2}H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})$, $D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t}) \equiv \sum_k \left[a_n^{-2}\frac{\partial^3}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j\partial\theta_k} l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + \epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}))\right]_{p\times p} t_k$ and $|\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t})| \leq \delta_0$.

By condition (C4), the Hessian matrix of $l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is similar to the Hessian matrix of its normal log-likelihood approximation, since

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} l_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\{\log \widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) + a_n^2 LR_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} \\ &= H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\{a_n^2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T A^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta})(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/2\} + a_n^2 H_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} LR_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= -a_n^2 I(\boldsymbol{\theta}) + a_n^2 O_p(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta})) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the RHS of the last equation, $O_p(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$ is a polynomial of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \eta(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ without constant terms and the convergence of $o_p(1)$ uniformly holds in $\mathcal{P}_0$. Then $D_2 = I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(1)$. By condition (C15), the absolute value of each element in $D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}), \boldsymbol{t})$ is less than or equal to $M(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \sum_k |t_k|$. Since $t_k/a_n < \delta_0$ for any $\boldsymbol{t} \in B_2$, by choosing appropriate δ_0, $I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)/4 - a_n^{-1} D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}), \boldsymbol{t})/6$ can be positive definite. Then with probability 1,

$$l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}) - l_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}}) \le -\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}. \tag{8}$$

Therefore for $\boldsymbol{t} \in B_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |v(\boldsymbol{t})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) &\le \|\boldsymbol{t}\|^k \exp\{-\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}\}\pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{t}}{a_n}) \\ &\le \delta_0^k a_n^k \exp\{-\frac{1}{4}c^2 r \log a_n\} \max_{\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}}\| \le \delta_0} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant r, which implies that

$$\int_{B_2} |v(\boldsymbol{t})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) d\boldsymbol{t} \le 2a_n^{k+1-c^2 r/4}\delta_0^k \max_{\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}}\| \le \delta_0} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Therefore by (C7) and choosing a large enough c, $\int_{B_2} |v(\boldsymbol{t})|\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) d\boldsymbol{t}$ is $o_p(1)$.

In the region B_3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_3} g_n(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{t} \\ =& g_0 \int_{B_3} v(\boldsymbol{t})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) d\boldsymbol{t} + \int_{B_3} [g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}; \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) - g_0] v(\boldsymbol{t})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{t}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

For the first integral in (9), by (7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_3} v(\boldsymbol{t})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{t} \\ =& \int_{B_3} v(\boldsymbol{t}) \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_2 \boldsymbol{t}\}\pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{t}}{a_n})\, d\boldsymbol{t} \\ &+ \int_{B_3} v(\boldsymbol{t}) \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_2 \boldsymbol{t}\}[\exp\{\frac{1}{6}a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}), \boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{t}\} - 1]\pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathrm{MLES}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{t}}{a_n})\, d\boldsymbol{t}. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Since B_3 goes to $\mathcal{P}$ and $\log a_n/a_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, the first integral in (10) converges to $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\int v(\boldsymbol{t})e^{-\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}/2}\,d\boldsymbol{t}$ in probability. For the second integral in (10), by noting that $|e^x - 1| \le e^{|x|}|x|$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_3} |v(\boldsymbol{t})| \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_2 \boldsymbol{t}\} |\exp\{\frac{1}{6}a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{t}\} - 1| \pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{t}}{a_n})\,d\boldsymbol{t} \\
\le &\int_{B_3} \|\boldsymbol{t}\|^k \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_2 \boldsymbol{t} + |\frac{1}{6}a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{t}|\} |\frac{1}{6}a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{t}^T D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t})\boldsymbol{t}| \pi(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + \frac{\boldsymbol{t}}{a_n})\,d\boldsymbol{t} \\
\le &M a_n^{-1} \max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in B_3} \|\boldsymbol{t}\|^{k+3} \int_{B_3} \exp\{-\frac{1}{4}\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}\}\,d\boldsymbol{t} \max_{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}-\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}\|\le\delta_0} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}),
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant M, where the second inequality follows the previous arguments about $D_3(\epsilon_1(\boldsymbol{t}),\boldsymbol{t})$ when $\boldsymbol{t} \in B_2$. Since $\max_{\boldsymbol{t}\in B_3}\|\boldsymbol{t}\|^{k+3} = (c\log a_n)^{k+3}$, when a_n is large enough, the second integral in (10) is $o_p(1)$.

For the second integral in (9), we have

$$\int_{B_3} [g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) - g_0] v(\boldsymbol{t})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\,d\boldsymbol{t} \le \max_{\|\boldsymbol{t}\|<c\log a_n} |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) - g_0| \int_{B_3} v(\boldsymbol{t})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\,d\boldsymbol{t}.$$

By (a), since $\log a_n = o(a_n)$, $\max_{\|\boldsymbol{t}\|<c\log a_n} |g_n^*(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) - g_0| = o_p(1)$. Then since the first integral in (9) has been shown to be $O_p(1)$, the second integral is $o_p(1)$. Therefore $\int_{B_3} g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\pi_n(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\,d\boldsymbol{t} \xrightarrow{P} g_0\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\int v(\boldsymbol{t})e^{-\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}/2}\,d\boldsymbol{t}$ which concludes the proof. □

The Bernstein Von-Mises type of asymptotic normality is stated below and holds obviously by letting $g_n(\boldsymbol{t};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = \mathbb{1}_{\boldsymbol{t}\in B}$.

COROLLARY 1. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 2, (C14)-(C16) and (C7). It holds that for any measurable set $B \subset \mathcal{P}$,*

$$\int_B \pi_n^*(\boldsymbol{t}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})d\boldsymbol{t} \xrightarrow{P} \int_B \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}|I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)|^{-1/2}} e^{-\boldsymbol{t}^T I(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{t}/2} d\boldsymbol{t} \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Based on the convergence of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, we can now expand the posterior moments $E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ and $Var[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$. For simplicity, consider the scalar function $h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and the results can be easily extended to the vector case.

LEMMA 5. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 4, (C8)-(C10). Then we have*

$$E[h(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{MLES}) + o_p(a_n^{-1}) \text{ and } Var[h(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = a_n^{-2} Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(a_n^{-2}),$$

PROOF. Since $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E[h(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] &= h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) + E[g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}], \\
\text{where } g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) &= h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}) - h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}Var[h(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] =& Var[g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]a_n^{-2}\\ =& Var[g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]a_n^{-2} + Var[g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]a_n^{-2}\\ & - 2E[g_{23}^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_{23}(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]a_n^{-2},\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = \frac{h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}} + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}) - h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) - Dh(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})^T a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}}{a_n^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|},\ g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = Dh(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}),$$

$$g_{23}^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}),\ v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|,\ v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \boldsymbol{\tau} \text{ and } v_{23}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = \boldsymbol{\tau}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|.$$

If (a)-(c) of Lemma 4 are satisfied for the following functions: $g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$, $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, $g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, $(g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}))^2$, $\left(g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})\right)^2$ and $g_{23}^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_{23}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, the explicit forms of the expansions would be given by Lemma 4.

For $g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$, (a) is obviously satisfied with $g_0 = 0$ and (b) is satisfied by condition (C9). Since by condition (C10),

$$\int |g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \int |h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = O_p(1),$$

(c) holds for $v(\boldsymbol{t}) = 1$ and $k = 0$. Therefore by Lemma 4, $E[g_1^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = o_p(1)$.

For $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $(g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}))^2$, by condition (C9), $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{t}_n;\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ when $|\boldsymbol{t}_n| = o(a_n)$ and $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{t}_n;\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ is bounded when $|\boldsymbol{t}_n| = O(a_n)$. Hence (a) and (b) are satisfied for $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ and $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^2$ with $g_0 = 0$. For (c), by condition (C10) and (C8) and noting that $a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau} = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int |g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})|\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}\|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} &= \int |h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) - Dh(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})^T(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}\\ &= O_p(1).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\int |g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^2|\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}\|^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = O_p(1)$. Hence (c) is satisfied for $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ and $(g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau}))^2$. Then by Lemma 4, $Var[g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})v_2(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = o_p(1)$.

For $g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, consider $D_k h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})T_k$ where T_k is the k_{th} coordinate of $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ for each k. (a)-(c) are obviously satisfied with $g_0 = D_k h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Hence by Lemma 4, $E[g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = o_p(1)$. Similarly, $\left(g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})\right)^2$, consider $D_i h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})D_j h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}})T_i T_j$ for each (i,j) pair. (a)-(c) are obviously satisfied with $g_0 = D_i h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)D_j h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Hence by Lemma 4, $E[\left(g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_3(\boldsymbol{\tau})\right)^2|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] \xrightarrow{P} Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$.

For $g_{23}^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_{23}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, following the arguments for $g_2^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ and $g_3^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have $E[g_{23}^*(\boldsymbol{\tau};\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})^T v_{23}(\boldsymbol{\tau})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = o_p(1)$. Therefore the lemma holds. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Combining Lemma 1 and Lemma 5, we have

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} = h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) + o_p(a_n^{-1}) + \boldsymbol{r}_1(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}, n)\varepsilon_n^2.$$

Then with $\varepsilon_n = o(a_n^{-1/2})$ and Lemma 3, the central limit theorem holds. □

APPENDIX B: PROOF OF SECTION 4

In the following we use the convention that for a d-dimension vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, the matrix $\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{x}^T$ is denoted by $\boldsymbol{x}^2$.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1. For the i.i.d sample $(\phi_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{s}_n^{(i)})$, $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_i, \boldsymbol{s}_n^{(i)})$ are generated from $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\boldsymbol{s}_n|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, and conditional on $\boldsymbol{s}_n = \boldsymbol{s}_n^{(i)}$, ϕ_i are generated from the Bernoulli distribution with probability $K_{\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$. Then since $\widehat{\boldsymbol{h}}$ is the ratio of means of sample functions, we can use the delta method to show that the central limit theorem holds, with mean

$$\frac{E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1 \phi_1]}{E[w_1\phi_1]} = \frac{E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1 K_{\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})]}{E[w_1 K_{\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})]} = \frac{\int \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_n|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K_{\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{s}_n\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_n|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K_{\epsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})\, d\boldsymbol{s}_n\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC},$$

and variance

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{E^2[w_1\phi_1]} Var[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1\phi_1] + \frac{E^2[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1\phi_1]}{E^4[w_1\phi_1]} Var[w_1\phi_1] - 2\frac{E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1\phi_1]}{E^3[w_1\phi_1]} Cov[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1\phi_1, w_1\phi_1]^T \\
=& p_{acc,\pi}^{-2} \left\{ \left(E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)^2 w_1^2 \phi_1] - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}^2 p_{acc,\pi}^2\right) + \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}^2 \left(E[w_1^2\phi_1] - p_{acc,\pi}^2\right) - 2\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}\left(E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) w_1^2\phi_1] - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC} p_{acc,\pi}^2\right)^T \right\} \\
=& p_{acc,\pi}^{-2} E[(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)^2 - 2\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)^T + \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC}^2) w_1^2 K_{\varepsilon_n}(\boldsymbol{s}_n^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs})] \\
=& p_{acc,\pi}^{-1} E_{\pi_{ABC}} \left[(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2 \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

In the above expression we have used the fact that $p_{acc,\pi} = E[w_1\phi_1]$. It is easy to verify by algebra that

$$\Sigma_{ABC,n} = p_{acc,\pi}^{-1} E_{\pi_{ABC}} \left[(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2 \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \right].$$

Therefore the CLT holds. □

APPENDIX C: PROOF OF SECTION 5

Denote $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \varepsilon_n)$ by $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ for short. By plugging in the expression of $\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the acceptance probability and the IS variance for $\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are

$$p_{acc,\pi_{ABC}^{(\alpha)}} = \varepsilon_n^d \frac{\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1+\alpha}\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\alpha}\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tag{11}$$

$$\text{and } \Sigma_{IS,n} = \frac{\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1+\alpha}\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}}{[\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}]^2} \int (\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2 \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^{1-\alpha}\, d\boldsymbol{\theta}. \tag{12}$$

Extend the definition of $\pi^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ to $\gamma \in [0,2]$. It can be seen that the proof of Theorem 5.1 and 5.2 require to study the convergence order of the normalising constant of $\pi^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, denoted by

$$c_\gamma(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = \int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma \, d\boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

The main idea is as follows. Divide $\mathbb{R}^p$ into $B_\delta = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| < \delta\}$ and B^c_δ for some $\delta < \delta_0$. First, in B^c_δ, Lemma 6 shows that the integration is ignorable. In B_δ, by treating $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$ as a non-normalised density, Lemma 9 shows that its normalising constant is independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and then (17) states that the integration in B_δ can be written as the product of the marginal density of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, under the posterior distribution with the normalised $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$ as likelihood, and the normalising constant of $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$. The convergence rate of the normalising constant of $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$ is given in Lemma 9, and that of the marginal density is given in Lemma 11 by applying the posterior convergence results on non-normal likelihood in [18]. Finally, the convergence rate of $c_\gamma(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ is stated in Lemma 12, implied by the above results.

Consider the non-trivial case where $\gamma \in (0,2]$. For some $\delta < \delta_0$, decompose $c_\gamma(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ into two parts, including

$$c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \triangleq \int_{B_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma \, d\boldsymbol{\theta} \text{ and } c_{\gamma,B^c_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) \triangleq \int_{B^c_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma \, d\boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

First of all, the following lemma shows that the integral in B^c_δ can be ignored.

LEMMA 6. *Assume conditions (C2) and (C5). Then* $\forall \delta > 0$, $\int_{B^c_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma \, d\boldsymbol{\theta} = o_p(a^{\gamma d - p}_{n,\varepsilon})$.

PROOF. It is sufficient to show that $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = O_p(e^{-a^\alpha_{n,\varepsilon} c})$ for some positive constants c and α. Let $c_3 = \min(c_1, c_2)$, $\alpha_3 = \min(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ and $\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)} = \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} \int f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{v}) \, d\boldsymbol{v} \\
&= e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}\| > M_1} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\varepsilon_n^{-1} \boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}) \varepsilon_n^{-d} \, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)} \\
&\quad + e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}\| \le M_1} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{v}) \, d\boldsymbol{v} \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

The first term in the RHS of (13) is bounded by $K(\varepsilon_n^{-1} M_1) \varepsilon_n^{-d} e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3}$ and hence has the order $O_p(1)$ by (C2)(iii) and noting that $a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} / \varepsilon_n^{-\alpha_1} = O(1)$. The second term is bounded by $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}_{obs}\| \le M_1} f_n(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3}$ and hence has the order $O_p(1)$ by (C5), $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} \xrightarrow{P} \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ and noting that $a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} / \alpha^{\alpha_2}_n = O(1)$. Therefore $e^{a^{\alpha_3}_{n,\varepsilon} c_3} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}^c_0} \int f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) K(\boldsymbol{v}) \, d\boldsymbol{v} = O_p(1)$ and the lemma holds. □

Then we only need to consider the integration in B_δ. Let $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int \widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta})K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}$ and $LR_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log(f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})/\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. The following lemma states a result similar to (C4) for $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

LEMMA 7. *Assume the conditions (C4) and (C6). Then* $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0}|LR_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = o_p(1)$.

PROOF. By (C6), $f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is dominated by the integration in the set where $\|\boldsymbol{v}\| < M_2\varepsilon_n^{-1}$. For $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, (C6) automatically holds and therefore it is also dominated by the integration in this set. This can be seen by letting M_3 to be big enough and comparing the maximum of $\widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in $\{\boldsymbol{v} : \|\boldsymbol{v}\| \geq M_2\varepsilon_n^{-1}\}$ and its minimum in $\{\boldsymbol{v} : \|\boldsymbol{v}\| \leq m\}$, where m satisfies $K(m) > 0$, for big enough n. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\\
&= \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|<M_2\varepsilon_n^{-1}} \exp\{\log f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \log\widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\}\widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta})K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}(1+o_p(1))\\
&\leq \exp\{\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s}-\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}\|\leq M_2}|LR_n(\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{\theta})|\}\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})(1+o_p(1)),
\end{aligned}
$$

and $LR_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s}-\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}\|\leq M_2}|LR_n(\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{\theta})|+o_p(1)$. Similarly, $-LR_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \leq \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{s}-\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}\|\leq M_2}|LR_n(\boldsymbol{s},\boldsymbol{\theta})|+o_p(1)$. Therefore by (C4), $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathcal{P}_0}|LR_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| = o_p(1)$. □

Lemma 7 implies the approximation that

$$
c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = \int_{B_\delta}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}(1+o_p(1)),
$$

and therefore $c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ can be evaluated based on the analytical form of $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Regarding $K(\boldsymbol{v})$, the following lemma states several useful properties of $K(\boldsymbol{v})$.

LEMMA 8. *Assume the condition (C2). Then it holds that*

(i) $\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v} < \infty$ *and* $\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x}K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v} = O(e^{-cx^\alpha})$ *for some positive constants* c *and* α *as* $x\to\infty$.

(ii) $\int K(\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p} < \infty$ *and* $\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p}\|>x}K(\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p} = O(e^{-cx^\alpha})$ *for some positive constants* c *and* α *as* $x\to\infty$.

(iii) *Let* $K_p(\boldsymbol{u}) = K(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)$ *for* $\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{R}^p$. *Then* $\int K_p(\boldsymbol{u})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{u} < \infty$ *and* $\int_{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|>x}K_p(\boldsymbol{u})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{u} = O(e^{-cx^\alpha})$ *for some positive constants* c *and* α *as* $x\to\infty$.

PROOF. By (C2)(iii), when $\|\boldsymbol{v}\| > x_0$ for some large enough x_0, $K(\boldsymbol{v}) \leq Me^{-c_1\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^{\alpha_1}}$ for some positive constant M. Then by the decomposition

$$
\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v} = (\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\leq x_0} + \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x_0})K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v} \leq V_{x_0} + \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x_0}K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{v},
$$

where V_{x_0} is the volume of the d-dimension sphere with radius x_0, $\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma d\boldsymbol{v}$ is bounded if $\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x_0} K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma d\boldsymbol{v}$ is bounded. Since $\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x_0} K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma d\boldsymbol{v} \le M \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>x_0} e^{-c_1\gamma\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^{\alpha_1}} d\boldsymbol{v}$ the RHS of which has the order $O(e^{-c_1\gamma x_0^{\alpha_1}})$ by integrating in the spherical coordinate, (i) of the lemma holds.

For (ii), since $K(\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p}) = \int K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}_{p+1:d}$, by the inequality that $e^{-c_1\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^{\alpha_1}} \le e^{-c_1(\|\boldsymbol{v}_{1:p}\|+\|\boldsymbol{v}_{p+1:d}\|)^{\alpha_1}/2}$, it is easy to show that (ii) holds by the similar argument and integrating in the spherical coordinate. For (iii), since $K_p(\boldsymbol{u}) = K(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)$, it follows from the similar arguments. □

Consider $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$ as a non-normalised density of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$ and define the normalised density by $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \propto \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma$, with which $c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ may be evaluated through the results on posterior convergence. The following lemma verifies the validity of $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ being a density and evaluates its normalising constant.

LEMMA 9. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 7 and (C2), then for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathcal{P}_0$ it holds that*

$$\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s} = a_{n,\varepsilon}^{(\gamma-1)d} M_{\gamma,n},$$

where $M_{\gamma,n} = \Theta(1)$ and is independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. More specifically,

(i) *when $c_\varepsilon < \infty$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{\gamma,n} \le 2^{d+1}(2\pi)^{(1-\gamma)d/2}\gamma^{-d/2} + 2^{-d+1}c_\varepsilon^{(1-\gamma)d} \int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}$;*
(ii) *when $c_\varepsilon = \infty$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{\gamma,n} = \int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}$.*

PROOF. Let $M_{\gamma,n} = a_{n,\varepsilon}^{(1-\gamma)d} \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s}$. When $c_\varepsilon < \infty$, with transformation $\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)} = a_n(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, it can be written that

$$\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s} = a_n^{(\gamma-1)d} \int \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)} + a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; 0, I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v}) d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}. \tag{14}$$

In the RHS of (14), $\forall \boldsymbol{T} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, by (C2)(ii), we have the decomposition that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T} + a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; 0, I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma \\
&= \left[\Big(\int_{\|a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}\| \le \|\boldsymbol{T}\|/2} + \int_{\|a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}\| > \|\boldsymbol{T}\|/2}\Big) N(\boldsymbol{T} + a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; 0, I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma \\
&\le \left[(2\pi)^{d/2} \exp\{-\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|^2}{8}\} \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\| \le \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|}{2a_n\varepsilon_n}} K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} + K(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|}{2a_n\varepsilon_n}) \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\| > \frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|}{2a_n\varepsilon_n}} N(\boldsymbol{T} + a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; 0, I_d)\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right] \\
&\le \left[(2\pi)^{d/2} \exp\{-\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|^2}{8}\} + (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-d} K(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}\|}{2a_n\varepsilon_n})\right]^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for positive constants x and y, when $\gamma \geq 1$, by Jensen's inequality, $(x+y)^\gamma \leq 2^{\gamma-1}(x^\gamma + y^\gamma)$ and when $\gamma < 1$, by the order of l_p norm, $(x+y)^\gamma \leq x^\gamma + y^\gamma$. Therefore

$$M_{\gamma,n} \leq 2\int (2\pi)^{\gamma d/2} \exp\{-\frac{\gamma\|\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}\|^2}{8}\}\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)} + 2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{(1-\gamma)d}\int (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-d} K(\frac{\|\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}\|}{2a_n\varepsilon_n})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(1)}, \tag{15}$$

and the inequality in (i) of the lemma holds by taking the limit of the RHS of (15).

When $c_\varepsilon = \infty$, with the transformation $\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} = \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, it can be written that

$$\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s} = \varepsilon_n^{-(\gamma-1)d}\int \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)}. \tag{16}$$

By dominated convergence theorem, $\forall \boldsymbol{T} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(\boldsymbol{T} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} = \int \lim_{n\to\infty} N(\boldsymbol{T} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} = K(\boldsymbol{T}).$$

If the limit and the integral of $\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)}$ in $M_{\gamma,n}$ can be exchanged, then we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} M_{\gamma,n} = \int \left[\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} = \int K(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)},$$

and (iii) of the lemma holds. The exchangeability holds by the uniform integrability of the integrands $\{\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ which is shown in the following. Let $\mu(\cdot)$ be the Lebesgue measure. When $\gamma < 1$, $\forall \epsilon > 0$, choose $\sigma = \epsilon^{\gamma-1}$. By Jensen's inequality, $\forall E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying $\mu(E) < \sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_E \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} \\
\leq &\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)}\in E\}}}{\mu(E)}\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)}\right]^\gamma \mu(E) \\
= &\mu(E)^{1-\gamma}\int\int_E N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d)\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} \\
\leq &\mu(E)^{1-\gamma} < \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

When $\gamma \geq 1$, $\forall \epsilon > 0$, by Lemma 8, the σ can be chosen such that $\forall E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$\mu(E) < \sigma$, $\int_E K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma \boldsymbol{v} < \epsilon$. Then let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v} + \boldsymbol{T}^{(2)}$, by Jesen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_E \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} \\
&= \int_E \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)} - \boldsymbol{T}^{(2)})\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} \\
&\le \int_E \int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)} - \boldsymbol{T}^{(2)})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} \\
&= \int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) \int_{E'} K(\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)}\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)} = \boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} - \boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$ and E' is E under the transformation. Since $\mu(E') = \mu(E)$ for any $\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}$, $\int_{E'} K(\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)} < \epsilon$ and

$$\int_E \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(2)} \le \epsilon \int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)}; 0, (a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d)\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(2)} = \epsilon.$$

Therefore the integrands are uniformly integrable.

Since the RHS of (14) and (16) do not depend on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, $M_{\gamma,n}$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. □

Then $c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$ can be written as

$$c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = \int_{B_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta} \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s}(1 + o_p(1)), \tag{17}$$

that is the product of the marginal density of $\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}$, for the posterior distribution with prior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as the likelihood, and the normalising constant of $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which has been evaluated in Lemma 9. For the marginal density, the results of posterior convergence in non-regular cases in [18] can be applied.

Since the posterior convergence results in [18] are based on the convergence of the likelihood ratio between the true parameter and its neighbourhood, the following lemma about the convergence rate of $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is needed.

LEMMA 10. *Assume the conditions of Lemma 9. Then* $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \Theta_p(a^d_{n,\varepsilon})$.

PROOF. When $c_\varepsilon = \infty$, since $K(\boldsymbol{v}) \le 1$,

$$\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \varepsilon_n^{-d} \int \widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} + \boldsymbol{v}^{(1)}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) K(\varepsilon_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)})\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(1)} \le \varepsilon_n^{-d},$$

and let M_3 be a positive constant satisfying $\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} K(\boldsymbol{v}) < 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) &\ge \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} K(\boldsymbol{v}) \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} \widetilde{f}_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\,d\boldsymbol{v}\\ &= \varepsilon_n^{-d} \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} K(\boldsymbol{v}) \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} N(\boldsymbol{v}+(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{T}_{obs};0,(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)\,d\boldsymbol{v}\\ &= \varepsilon_n^{-d} \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} K(\boldsymbol{v})(1+o_p(1)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \Theta_p(\varepsilon_n^{-d})$ and $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma = \Theta_p(\varepsilon_n^{-\gamma d})$.

When $c_\varepsilon < \infty$, $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \le a_n^d(2\pi)^{-d/2}$, and

$$\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \ge a_n^d(2\pi)^{-d/2}\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3}\|\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+(c_\varepsilon+o(1))\boldsymbol{v}\|^2\}\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le M_3} K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v},$$

where the RHS of this inequality has the order $\Theta_p(a_n^d)$. Hence $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \Theta_p(a_n^d)$ and $\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma = \Theta_p(a_n^{\gamma d})$. Then by Lemma 9, the lemma holds. □

Now we are ready to prove the posterior convergence taking $\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as the likelihood.

LEMMA 11. *Assume conditions (C2)-(C5) and (C6). Then $\exists\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{B_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\widetilde{f}^{(\gamma)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \Theta_p(a_{n,\varepsilon}^{d-p}).$$

PROOF. Let $P(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the $p\times p$ matrix $D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^T$. δ is selected such that $\forall\boldsymbol{\theta}\in B_\delta$, $P(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $A(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are positive definite. Such a δ exists since $D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ has rank p by (C3)(iii) and $A(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is positive definite. Then we can choose positive constants $\lambda_{P,min}$, $\lambda_{P,max}$, $\lambda_{A,min}$ and $\lambda_{A,max}$ such that $\forall\boldsymbol{\theta}\in B_\delta$, $P(\boldsymbol{\theta})-\lambda_{P,min}I_p$, $\lambda_{P,max}I_p-P(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $A(\boldsymbol{\theta})-\lambda_{A,min}I_d$, $\lambda_{A,max}I_d-A(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ are positive definite.

To simplify the notations, we can assume $A(\boldsymbol{\theta})\equiv I_d$ without without loss of generality by noting that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{B_\delta}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^\gamma\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}\\ \in&\left[\frac{\lambda_{A,min}^{\gamma d/2}}{\lambda_{A,max}^{\gamma d/2}}\int_{B_\delta}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\int N(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),\lambda_{A,min}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right)^\gamma d\boldsymbol{\theta},\right.\\ &\left.\frac{\lambda_{A,max}^{\gamma d/2}}{\lambda_{A,min}^{\gamma d/2}}\int_{B_\delta}\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\left(\int N(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}),\lambda_{A,max}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right)^\gamma d\boldsymbol{\theta}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Let $U_n = \{a_{n,\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in B_\delta\}$, and for $\boldsymbol{u} \in U_n$, let

$$Z_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})^\gamma}{\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma} \text{ and } \xi_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = \frac{Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})}{\int_{U_n} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\, d\boldsymbol{u}}.$$

Here $Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})$ is the likelihood ratio, since the normalising constants are identical, and $\xi_n(\boldsymbol{u})$ is the posterior density of $a_{n,\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Then we have

$$\int_{B_\delta} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\, d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \widetilde{f}_{ABC}^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-p}\int_{U_n} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\, d\boldsymbol{u}.$$

From [18, Proposition 2], $\xi_n(\boldsymbol{u}) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} Z(\boldsymbol{u})/\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} Z(\boldsymbol{u})\, d\boldsymbol{u}$ as a random element in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^p)$ and hence

$$\int_{U_n} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_{n,\varepsilon}^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\, d\boldsymbol{u} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{L}} \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\int Z(\boldsymbol{u})d\boldsymbol{u},$$

by (IH3) below and the weak convergence of the ratio of random sequences, if $Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})$ satisfies the following conditions:

(IH1) For some $M > 0$, $m > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$,

$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}[Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_1) - Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_2)]^2 \le M(1 + R^m)\|\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2\|^\alpha,$$

for all $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2 \in U_n$ satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{u}_1\| \le R$ and $\|\boldsymbol{u}_2\| \le R$;

(IH2) For all $\boldsymbol{u} \in U_n$,

$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) \le exp\{-g_n(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)\},$$

where $\{g_n\}$ is a sequence of real-value functions on $[0, \infty)$ satisfying the following: (a) for a fixed $n \ge 1$, $g_n(y) \uparrow \infty$ as $y \uparrow \infty$; (b) for any $N > 0$,

$$\lim_{y\to\infty, n\to\infty} y^N \exp\{-g_n(y)\} = 0;$$

(IH3) The finite-dimensional distributions of $\{Z_n(\boldsymbol{u}) : \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p\}$ converge to those of a stochastic process $\{Z(\boldsymbol{u}) : \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p\}$.

Therefore by Lemma 10, in order for the lemma to hold, we only need to verify (IH1)-(IH3) for $Z_n(\boldsymbol{u})$ and that $\int Z(\boldsymbol{u})d\boldsymbol{u} \in (0, \infty)$. The verification proceeds by discussing the cases of $c_\varepsilon < \infty$ and $c_\varepsilon = \infty$.

When $c_\varepsilon < \infty$, $a_{n,\varepsilon} = a_n$. For (IH1),

(18)
$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}[Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_1) - Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_2)]^2 = 2\left[1 - \frac{\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{\gamma/2}\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}}{\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s}}\right].$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, in the RHS of (18),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{\gamma/2}\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s} \\
\geq &\int \left[\int \widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{s} + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{1/2}\widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{s} + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{1/2}K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{s} \\
= &\int \left[\int \exp\{-\frac{a_n^2}{8}\|\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1) - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)\|^2\}\right. \\
&\left.\cdot N(\boldsymbol{s} + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1) + \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)), \frac{1}{a_n^2})K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{s} \\
= &\exp\{-\frac{\gamma a_n^2}{8}\|\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1) - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)\|^2\}a_n^{(\gamma-1)d}\int \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)} + a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}; 0, I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^{\gamma} d\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{T}^{(3)} = a_n\left[\boldsymbol{s} - 2^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1) + \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2))\right]$. By Taylor expansion, $a_n(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1) - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)) = D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2)$ where $\|a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'\| \leq \delta$. Then by (14) and plugging in the above inequality in (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}[Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_1) - Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_2)]^2 &\leq 2\left[1 - \exp\{-\frac{\gamma}{8}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2)\|^2\}\right] \\
&\leq \gamma\lambda_{P,max}\|\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2\|^2/4,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by the fact that $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for $x > 0$. Hence (IH1) is satisfied.

For (IH2),

$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) = \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})^{\gamma/2}\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}. \tag{19}$$

Since $\gamma/2 \leq 1$, by applying Jensen's inequality twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) &= \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})^{\gamma/2}\frac{\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}}{\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}}\, d\boldsymbol{s}\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}. \\
&\leq \left[\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]\left[\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]^{1-\gamma/2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) \leq \left[a_n^{-d}\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]^{(1-\gamma/2)\gamma/2}\left[a_n^{\gamma d/2}\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]^{1-\gamma/2}. \tag{20}$$

For the second term in (20), since $1-\gamma/2 \in (0, 2]$, by Lemma 9 and Lemma 8, it is bounded by some positive constant. For the first term in the RHS of (20), by algebra and exchanging

the order of integration,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&a_n^{-d}\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\,d\boldsymbol{s}\\
&=a_n^{-d}\int \widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{s}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\widetilde{f}(\boldsymbol{s}+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{w}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}d\boldsymbol{s}\\
&=\int N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0));\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)},2I_d)K(\frac{\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})K(\frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2d}\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}d\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}=a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}=a_n\varepsilon_n\omega$. By Taylor expansion, $a_n(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)=D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}$ where $\|a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}''\|\le\delta$. In order to evaluate the last integral in the above equality, we divide the integration space $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ into two parts: $R_1=\{(\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)},\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}):\|\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}\|\le 2^{-1}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|\}$ and R_1^c. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{R_1} N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)},2I_d)K(\frac{\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})K(\frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2d}\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}d\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}\\
\le&(4\pi)^{-d/2}\exp\{-\frac{1}{4}\inf_{(\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)},\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)})\in R_1}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}-(\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)})\|^2\}\\
&\cdot\int_{R_1}K(\frac{\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})K(\frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2d}\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}d\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}\\
\le&(4\pi)^{-d/2}\exp\{-\frac{1}{8}\lambda_{P,min}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

and by letting $\boldsymbol{V}^{(3)}$ and $\boldsymbol{W}^{(1)}$ be independent random vectors with density $K((a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v})(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-d}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{R_1^c} N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)},2I_d)K(\frac{\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})K(\frac{\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}}{a_n\varepsilon_n})(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2d}\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(3)}d\boldsymbol{w}^{(1)}\\
\le&(4\pi)^{-d/2}P((\boldsymbol{V}^{(3)},\boldsymbol{W}^{(1)})\in R_1^c)\\
\le&(4\pi)^{-d/2}P(\|\boldsymbol{V}^{(3)}\|+\|\boldsymbol{W}^{(1)}\|>\frac{1}{2}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|\text{ and }\|\boldsymbol{V}^{(3)}\|\ge\|\boldsymbol{W}^{(1)}\|)\\
\le&2(4\pi)^{-d/2}P(\|\boldsymbol{V}^{(3)}\|\ge\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|)\\
\le&2(4\pi)^{-d/2}P(\|\boldsymbol{V}\|>\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_{P,min}}}{4a_n\varepsilon_n}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|),
\end{aligned}
\tag{22}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{V}$ is the random vector with density $K(\boldsymbol{v})$. Therefore,

$$
E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u})\le c\left[\exp\{-\frac{1}{8}\lambda_{P,min}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2\}+2P(\|\boldsymbol{V}\|>\frac{\sqrt{\lambda_{P,min}}}{4a_n\varepsilon_n}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)\right]^{(1-\gamma/2)\gamma/2},
$$

where c is some positive constant, and by Lemma 8, (IH2) is satisfied.

For (IH3), with probability 1, by dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = \left[\frac{\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}))+a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}}{\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))+a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}}\right]^\gamma$$
$$= \left[\frac{\int \lim_{n\to\infty} N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))+D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}'')^T\boldsymbol{u}+a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}}{\int \lim_{n\to\infty} N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))+a_n\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}}\right]^\gamma$$
$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n\to\infty} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u}) = Z(\boldsymbol{u}) \triangleq \frac{\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T\boldsymbol{u}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma}{\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma}.$$

Hence (IH3) is satisfied.

For $\int Z(\boldsymbol{u})\,d\boldsymbol{u}$, when $c_\varepsilon = 0$, it is obviously in $(0,\infty)$. When $c_\varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$, we only need to show the integral in the numerator of $Z(\boldsymbol{u})$ over $\mathbb{R}^p$ is in $(0,\infty)$. By algebra,

$$\int\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T\boldsymbol{u}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v};0,I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{u}$$
$$=\int\left[\int N(P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{u}+P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1/2}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v});0,I_p)(4\pi)^{-\frac{d-p}{2}}\right.$$
$$\left.\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v})^T(I_d-D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^TP(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0))(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v})\}K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{u}. \tag{23}$$

Since $I_d - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^TP(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is a projection matrix and hence positive-semidefinite, the RHS of (23) is bounded by

$$(4\pi)^{-\frac{\gamma(d-p)}{2}}\int\left[\int N(P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{u}+P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1/2}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)(\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{v});0,I_p)K(\boldsymbol{v})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{u}. \tag{24}$$

Since the eigenvalues of $D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^TP(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ are 0 and 1, by singular value decomposition, there exists a p-dimension unitary matrix Q_1 and a q-dimension unitary matrix Q_2 such that $P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1/2}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = Q_1\left[I_p\vdots 0\right]_{p\times d}Q_2$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD} = Q_2\boldsymbol{v}$, $\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD} = Q_1\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD,1:p}$, $\boldsymbol{u}^* = P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{u} + P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{-1/2}D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\boldsymbol{T}_{obs}$, $K_{SVD}(\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD}) = K(Q_2^T\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD})$ and $K_{SVD,p}(\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD}) = K_{SVD}(Q_1^T\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD})$. Then (24) can be transformed to be

$$(4\pi)^{-\frac{\gamma(d-p)}{2}}\|P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|^{-1/2}\int\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{u}^*+c_\varepsilon Q_1\left[I_p\vdots 0\right]_{p\times d}\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD};0,I_p)K(Q_2^T\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD})\,d\boldsymbol{v}_{SVD}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{u}^*$$
$$=(4\pi)^{-\frac{\gamma(d-p)}{2}}\|P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|^{-1/2}\int\left[\int N(\boldsymbol{u}^*+c_\varepsilon\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD};0,I_p)K_{SVD,p}(\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD})\,d\boldsymbol{u}_{SVD}\right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{u}^*. \tag{25}$$

With Lemma 8 and the arguments similar to the proof of Lemma 9(i), it can be shown that (25) is in $(0,\infty)$ which implies that the LHS of (23) is in $(0,\infty)$. Therefore $\int Z(\boldsymbol{u})\,d\boldsymbol{u} \in (0,\infty)$.

Now we consider the case when $c_\varepsilon = \infty$ and $a_{n,\varepsilon} = \varepsilon_n^{-1}$. For (IH1), in (18), with the transformation $\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} = \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{u}_2))$,

$$\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{u}_2)^\gamma = \varepsilon_n^{(1-\gamma)d} \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n \varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} \right]^\gamma,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{and } \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{u}_1)^\gamma &= \varepsilon_n^{(1-\gamma)d} \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} + \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{u}_2) - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{u}_1)) + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n \varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})\, d\boldsymbol{v} \right]^\gamma \\ &= \varepsilon_n^{(1-\gamma)d} \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} + \boldsymbol{v}^{(4)}; 0, (a_n \varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} \right]^\gamma,\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} = \boldsymbol{v} + D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)$. Then by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{\gamma/2} \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s} \\ &\geq \varepsilon_n^{(1-\gamma)d} \int \left[\int N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n \varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})^{1/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{1/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v} \right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)}.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The RHS of (26) is similar to the the RHS of (16), differing in the integrand that $K(\boldsymbol{v})^{1/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{1/2}$ is in the place of $K(\boldsymbol{v})$. Note that in the proof of Lemma 9(ii), regarding $K(\boldsymbol{v})$, the uniform integrability only needs $\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}$ to be bounded. Since $\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v} \leq [\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v} \int K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}]^{1/2}$ which is bounded, similar to the arguments in Lemma 9(ii), it can also be shown that the integrands in the RHS of (26) are uniformly integrable and then

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty} \varepsilon_n^{(\gamma-1)d} \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{\gamma/2} \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s} \\ &\geq \int \left[\int \lim_{n\to\infty} N(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} + \boldsymbol{v}; 0, (a_n \varepsilon_n)^{-2} I_d) K(\boldsymbol{v})^{1/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}')^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{1/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v} \right]^\gamma d\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} \\ &= \int K(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)})^{\gamma/2} K(\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{T}^{(4)}.\end{aligned}$$

Then by Lemma 9(ii),

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_1)^{\gamma/2} \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_2)^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}}{\int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{s}} \\ &\geq \frac{\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v}}{\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^\gamma\, d\boldsymbol{v}} + o(1).\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In order to obtain an appropriate lower bound for the leading term of the RHS of (27), divide $\mathbb{R}^d$ into two parts: $R_2 = \{\boldsymbol{v} : \|\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\| \geq \|\boldsymbol{v}\|\}$ and R_2^c. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v} &= \Big(\int_{R_2} + \int_{R_2^c}\Big) K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma/2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{v} \\ &\geq \int_{R_2} K(\boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1))^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v} + \int_{R_2^c} K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v} \\ &= \int_{R_2'} K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} + \int_{R_2^c} K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v},\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} = \boldsymbol{v} - D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \boldsymbol{h}_1)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)$ and $R_2' = \{\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} : \|\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)}\| \geq \|\boldsymbol{v}^{(4)} + D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\|\}$. Let Q_3 be the rotation matrix that $Q_3 D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1) = \|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\|\boldsymbol{e}_1$ where $\boldsymbol{e}_1 = (1, 0, 0, \ldots) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then by letting $\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)} = Q_3\boldsymbol{v}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big(\int_{R_2'} + \int_{R_2^c}\Big) K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v} &= \Big(\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)}\| \geq \|\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)} + \|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\|\boldsymbol{e}_1\|} + \int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)}\| \geq \|\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)} - \|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\|\boldsymbol{e}_1\|}\Big) K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)} \\ &= \Big(\int_{|\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)}| \geq |\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)} + \|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\||} + \int_{|\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)}| \geq |\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)} - \|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T(\boldsymbol{u}_2 - \boldsymbol{u}_1)\||}\Big) K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)}$ is the first coordinate of $\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)}$,

$$\geq \int_{|\boldsymbol{v}_1^{(5)}| \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_{P,max}}\|\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2\|} K(\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v}^{(5)}.$$

Therefore by (18) and (27),

$$\begin{aligned}E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}[Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_1) - Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}_2)]^2 &\leq 2\left[1 - \int_{|\boldsymbol{v}_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_{P,max}}\|\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2\|} \frac{K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}}{\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v}}\, d\boldsymbol{v}\right] \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\boldsymbol{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}} K^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{v}_1)\sqrt{\lambda_{P,max}}\|\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2\|,\end{aligned}$$

where $K^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{v}) \propto K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}$. Since $\int K(\boldsymbol{v})^{\gamma}\, d\boldsymbol{v} < \infty$, $K^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{v})$ is a valid density and hence $\sup_{\boldsymbol{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}} K^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{v}_1) < \infty$, which implies that (IH1) is satisfied.

For (IH2), similar to (20), we have

(28)
$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0} Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u}) \leq \left[\varepsilon_n^d \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]^{(1-\gamma/2)\gamma/2} \left[\varepsilon_n^{-\gamma d/2} \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^{1-\gamma/2}\, d\boldsymbol{s}\right]^{1-\gamma/2}.$$

For the second term in (28), since $1 - \gamma/2 \in (0, 2]$, by Lemma 8 and Lemma 9, it is bounded by some positive constant. For the first term in the RHS of (28), by algebra and exchanging

the order of integration,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon_n^d \int \widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u})\widetilde{f}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}|\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\,d\boldsymbol{s}\\
=&(a_n\varepsilon_n)^d \int N(a_n(\boldsymbol{s}(\theta_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u})-\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0));a_n\varepsilon_n(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}),2I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}\\
=&\int N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w},2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}'''\|\le\delta$. Divide $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d$ into two parts: $R_1'=\{(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w}):\|\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}\|\le 2^{-1}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|\}$ and $R_1'^c$. Then similar to (21), we have

(29)
$$\int_{R_1} N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w},2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}\le(4\pi)^{-d/2}(a_n\varepsilon_n)^d\exp\{-\frac{1}{8}a_n\varepsilon_n\lambda_{P,min}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2\}.$$

For the integral in $R_1'^c$, let $\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}=\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{R_1'^c} N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w},2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}\\
=&\int_{\|\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}\|>2^{-1}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|} N(\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)};D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u},2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)\int K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any $\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}$ satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}\|>2^{-1}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)})\,d\boldsymbol{v}&=(\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|>\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|}+\int_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|})K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)})\,d\boldsymbol{v}\\
&\le K(\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|)+K(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|\le\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|}\|\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}\|)\\
&\le 2K(\frac{1}{4}\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+\varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u}\|)\le 2K(\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_{P,min}}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

(30)
$$\int_{R_1'^c} N(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0+a_n^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u};\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{w},2(a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-2}I_d)K(\boldsymbol{v})K(\boldsymbol{w})\,d\boldsymbol{v}d\boldsymbol{w}\le 2K(\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_{P,min}}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|).$$

Therefore by (29) and (30), for some positive constant c,

$$E_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}Z_n^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{u})\le c\left[(4\pi)^{-d/2}(a_n\varepsilon_n)^d\exp\{-\frac{1}{8}a_n\varepsilon_n\lambda_{P,min}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2\}+2K(\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda_{P,min}}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)\right]$$

and by (C2)(iii), (IH2) is satisfied.

For (IH3), let $\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)} = a_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v})) + a_n\varepsilon_n \boldsymbol{v}$ and by dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} Z_n(\boldsymbol{u}) &= \left[\frac{\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)};0,I_d)K((a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)} - \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u})))\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)}}{\lim_{n\to\infty}\int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)};0,I_d)K((a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)} - \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)))\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)}}\right]^{\gamma} \\ &= \left[\frac{\int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)};0,I_d)\lim_{n\to\infty} K((a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)} - \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) + D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \varepsilon_n\boldsymbol{u}''')^T\boldsymbol{u})\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)}}{\int N(\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)};0,I_d)\lim_{n\to\infty} K((a_n\varepsilon_n)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)} - \varepsilon_n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs} - \boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)))\,d\boldsymbol{v}^{(6)}}\right]^{\gamma} \\ &= K(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T\boldsymbol{u})^{\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (IH3) is satisfied with $Z(\boldsymbol{u}) = K(D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T\boldsymbol{u})^{\gamma}$.

Finally,

$$\int Z(\boldsymbol{u})\,d\boldsymbol{u} = \int K(\|D\boldsymbol{s}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T\boldsymbol{u}\|)^{\gamma}\,d\boldsymbol{u} = |P(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)|^{-1/2}\int K(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|)^{\gamma}\,d\boldsymbol{u}$$

which is in $(0,\infty)$ by Lemma 8(iii). □

LEMMA 12. *Assume conditions (C2)-(C5) and (C6). Then* $\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\gamma}\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \Theta_p(a_{n,\varepsilon}^{\gamma d-p})$ *for* $\gamma \in (0,2]$.

PROOF. Since $c_{\gamma}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) = c_{\gamma,B_\delta}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}) + c_{\gamma,B_\delta^c}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs})$, by Lemma 6, (17), Lemma 9 and Lemma 11, the lemma immediately holds. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.1. Since $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{ABC}^{(0)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{ABC}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the order of their acceptance probabilities follow immediately from (11) and Lemma 11. For $\Sigma_{IS,n}$, when $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, $\Sigma_{IS,n} = V_{ABC}$. By Lemma 1 and Lemma 3, $\Sigma_{IS,n} = \Theta_p(a_n^{-2} + \varepsilon_n^2)$. When $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)$, plugging $q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ into the alternative expression (3) of $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$, we have

$$\Sigma_{ABC,n} = p_{acc,\pi}^{-1}\int(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} = p_{acc,\pi}^{-1}\left[Var_{\pi}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] + (E_{\pi}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})] - \boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2\right].$$

Then since $\Sigma_{IS,n} = p_{acc,q_n}\Sigma_{ABC,n}$, $\Sigma_{IS,n} = cp_{acc,\pi_{ABC}}/p_{acc,\pi} = \Theta(a_{n,\varepsilon}^p)$. □

Due to the complication from the power α in $\Sigma_{ABC,n}$, the following notations and conditions similar to (C12), (C13), (C8) and (C10) are needed.

(C17) Let $g_c^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon) = \int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta},\varepsilon)^{\gamma}\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon) = \int(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})-\boldsymbol{h}_{ABC})^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})f_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta},\varepsilon)^{\gamma}\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Assume that in $D_\varepsilon g_c^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon)$ and $D_\varepsilon g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon)$, the differentiation and integration can be exchanged.

(C18) $\max_{\varepsilon\in(0,c_{tol})} H_\varepsilon\{g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon)/g_c^{(\gamma)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon)\} = O_p(1)$ for $\gamma \in (0,1)$.

(C19) $\int |A(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^{\alpha/2}\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^k\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$ for $k = 0,1,2$.

(C20) $\int |A(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^{\alpha/2}|h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$ and $\int |A(\boldsymbol{\theta})|^{\alpha/2}h_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta} < \infty$..

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2. For $q(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, since $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the order of p_{acc,q_n} is $O(a^d_{n,\varepsilon}\varepsilon^d_n)$, following from (11) and Lemma 11. Using the notations in (C17), from (12),

$$\Sigma_{IS,n} = \frac{g_c^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)g_c^{(1+\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)}{g_c^2(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)}\frac{g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)}{g_c^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)},$$

which is a product of two ratios. The first ratio has the order $\Theta_p(1)$ by Lemma 11. For the second ratio, by Taylor expansion and (C18),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)}{g_c^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},\varepsilon_n)} &= \frac{g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},0)}{g_c^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},0)} + H_\varepsilon\left\{\frac{g_{\boldsymbol{h}2}^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},c'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}2})}{g_c^{(1-\alpha)}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs},c'_{\boldsymbol{\theta}2})}\right\}\varepsilon_n^2 \\ &= \frac{\int(\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}])^2\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}}{\int\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})\,d\boldsymbol{\theta}} + O_p(\varepsilon_n^2). \\ &= Var^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] + (E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] - E^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}])^2 + O_p(\varepsilon_n^2), \qquad (31)\end{aligned}$$

where $E^{(1-\alpha)}[\cdot|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ and $Var^{(1-\alpha)}[\cdot|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ are the posterior mean and variance with prior density $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and likelihood proportional to $f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. In order to evaluate (31), results similar to Lemma 5 are needed. Although $f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is unnormalised, by noting that the proof of Lemma 4-5 do not utilise the fact that $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is normalised and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}$ is also the maximum point of $f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, similar results would hold for $E^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ and $Var^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}]$ if the corresponding conditions, which are (C4) and (C14)-(C16) with $f_n(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ replaced by $f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$, are satisfied. It is easy to verify that (C4) and (C14)-(C16) are also satisfied for $f_n^{1-\alpha}(\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Therefore $Var^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = a_n^{-2}(1-\alpha)^{-1}Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T I^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)Dh(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + o_p(a_n^{-2})$ and $E^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{MLES}}) + o_p(a_n^{-1})$ implying that $E[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] - E^{(1-\alpha)}[\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\boldsymbol{s}_{obs}] = o_p(a_n^{-1})$. Therefore $\Sigma_{IS,n} = \Theta_p(a_n^{-2} + \varepsilon_n^2)$. □

APPENDIX D: CALCULATIONS FOR SIMPLE GAUSSIAN EXAMPLE

To obtain the ABC posterior for the Gaussian model of Section 1.1, we use the result of [45]. For bandwidth, chosen so that the kernel is that of a Gaussian with marginal variance ε, the ABC posterior is equivalent to the posterior distribution if we fit a model where

$$\mathbf{s}_n(\boldsymbol{y}) \sim \text{MVN}\left((\theta,\theta), \begin{pmatrix} 2/n+\varepsilon^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2/n+\varepsilon^2 \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

From which the ABC posterior follows by standard calculations.

Now consider the acceptance probability of the IS-ABC algorithm using $\pi^{(\alpha)}_{ABC}(\theta)$ as a proposal. Conditional on the proposed θ value, the simulated summary statistic is $\tilde{S} \sim \text{N}(\theta, 1/n)$. So, as the proposal distribution of θ is

$$\text{N}\left(\frac{\alpha\tilde{s}_{obs}}{1/n+\varepsilon^2+\alpha}, \frac{1+n\varepsilon^2}{n\alpha+1+n\varepsilon^2}\right),$$

this gives that the marginal proposal distribution of $\tilde{S}$ as

$$\mathrm{N}\left(\frac{\alpha\tilde{s}_{obs}}{1/n+\varepsilon^2+\alpha}, \frac{1+n\varepsilon^2}{n\alpha+1+n\varepsilon^2}+\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

The resulting acceptance probability can be calculated using the moment generating function of a non-central chi-squared, as

$$\mathrm{E}\left(\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(\tilde{S}-\tilde{s}_{obs})^2}{\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+t}}\exp\left\{-\frac{\lambda t}{2+2t}\right\}$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{n(1+n\varepsilon^2)^2\tilde{s}_{obs}^2}{(1+n\varepsilon^2+n\alpha)(n+n^2\epsilon^2+n\alpha+1+n\epsilon^2)}, \text{ and } t = \frac{1}{n\varepsilon^2}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}\frac{1+n\varepsilon^2}{n\alpha+1+n\varepsilon^2}.$$

Finally note that $\lambda \leq \tilde{s}_{obs}^2$ and $t/(2+2t) < 1/2$, so we can bound the acceptance probability both above and below by a constant times $1/\sqrt{1+t}$. For $\alpha = 0$, we have $t > 1/\epsilon^2$ and this will go to infinity as $n \to \infty$ because $\epsilon = O(n^{-1/2})$. For $\alpha > 0$ we have t is bounded above and below by a constant time $1/(n\epsilon^2)$.

Simple but tedious manipulations gives that the variance of the importance sampling weights for accepted θ values is

$$\frac{\sigma_{acc}}{\sigma_{ABC}^2}\int \exp\left\{\frac{(\theta-\mu_{ABC})^2}{\sigma_{ABC}^2}-\frac{(\theta-\mu_{acc})^2}{2\sigma_{acc}^2}\right\}\mathrm{d}\theta,$$

where μ_{ABC} and σ_{ABC}^2 are the ABC posterior mean and variance, and μ_{acc} and σ_{acc}^2 are the mean and variance of accepted θ values. For this to be finite we need $2\sigma_{acc}^2 < \sigma_{ABC}^2$. Now we can calculate σ_{acc}^2 in a similar to σ_{ABC}^2 above. This gives

$$\sigma_{acc}^2 = \frac{1+n\epsilon^2}{n\alpha+1+n\epsilon^2+n},$$

which using $n\epsilon^2 = c$ simplifies to

$$\sigma_{acc}^2 = \frac{1+c}{n\alpha+1+c+n} = \sigma_{ABC}^2\frac{n+1+c}{n\alpha+1+c+n}.$$

as $\sigma_{ABC}^2 = (1+c)/(n+1+c)$. This gives

$$\frac{\sigma_{acc}^2}{\sigma_{ABC}^2} = \frac{n+1+c}{n\alpha+1+c+n} \to \frac{1}{1+\alpha},$$

as $n \to \infty$. Note further that this ratio in monotonically decreasing as n increases. We require the ratio to be greater than $1/2$, which occurs if and only if $\alpha < 1$.

REFERENCES

[1] Barber, S., Voss, J., and Webster, M. (2013). The rate of convergence for approximate Bayesian computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2038*.

[2] Beaumont, M. A. (2010). Approximate Bayesian computation in evolution and ecology. *Annual review of ecology, evolution, and systematics*, 41:379–406.

[3] Beaumont, M. A., Cornuet, J.-M., Marin, J.-M., and Robert, C. P. (2009). Adaptive approximate Bayesian computation. *Biometrika*, 96(4):983–990.

[4] Beaumont, M. A., Zhang, W., and Balding, D. J. (2002). Approximate Bayesian computation in population genetics. *Genetics*, 162:2025–2035.

[5] Biau, G., Cérou, F., and Guyader, A. (2012). New insights into approximate Bayesian computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.6461*.

[6] Blum, M. G. (2010). Approximate Bayesian computation: a nonparametric perspective. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(491).

[7] Blum, M. G. and François, O. (2010). Non-linear regression models for approximate Bayesian computation. *Statistics and Computing*, 20(1):63–73.

[8] Blum, M. G., Nunes, M. A., Prangle, D., Sisson, S. A., et al. (2013). A comparative review of dimension reduction methods in approximate bayesian computation. *Statistical Science*, 28(2):189–208.

[9] Bortot, P., Coles, S. G., and Sisson, S. A. (2007). Inference for stereological extremes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):84–92.

[10] Cappé, O., Douc, R., Guillin, A., Marin, J., and Robert, C. (2008). Adaptive importance sampling in general mixture classes. *Statistics and Computing*, 18(4):447–459.

[11] Cornuet, J.-M., Santos, F., Beaumont, M. A., Robert, C. P., Marin, J.-M., Balding, D. J., Guillemaud, T., and Estoup, A. (2008). Inferring population history with DIY ABC: a user-friendly approach to approximate Bayesian computation. *Bioinformatics*, 24(23):2713–2719.

[12] Creel, M. and Kristensen, D. (2013). Indirect likelihood inference (revised). UFAE and IAE working papers, Unitat de Fonaments de l'Analisi Economica (UAB) and Institut d'Analisi Economica (CSIC).

[13] Dean, T. A. and Singh, S. S. (2011). Asymptotic behaviour of approximate Bayesian estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.3655*.

[14] Dean, T. A., Singh, S. S., Jasra, A., and Peters, G. W. (2014). Parameter estimation for hidden Markov models with intractable likelihoods. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*.

[15] Del Moral, P., Doucet, A., and Jasra, A. (2012). An adaptive sequential Monte Carlo method for approximate Bayesian computation. *Statistics and Computing*, 22(5):1009–1020.

[16] Duffie, D. and Singleton, K. J. (1993). Simulated moments estimation of Markov models of asset prices. *Econometrica*, 61(4):929–952.

[17] Fearnhead, P. and Prangle, D. (2012). Constructing summary statistics for approximate Bayesian computation: semi-automatic approximate Bayesian computation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(3):419–474.

[18] Ghosal, S., the, J. K., and Samanta, T. (1995). On convergence of posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2145–2152.

[19] Ghosh, J. K., Delampady, M., and Samanta, T. (2006). *An introduction to Bayesian analysis: theory and methods*. Springer.

[20] Ghosh, J. K. and Ramamoorthi, R. (2003). *Bayesian nonparametrics*, volume 1. Springer.

[21] Gordon, N., Salmond, D., and Smith, A. F. M. (1993). Novel approach to nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian state estimation. *IEE proceedings-F*, 140:107–113.

[22] Gouriéroux, C. and Ronchetti, E. (1993). Indirect inference. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8:s85–s118.

[23] Heggland, K. and Frigessi, A. (2004). Estimating functions in indirect inference. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, series B*, 66:447–462.

[24] Hesterberg, T. (1988). *Advances in Importance Sampling*. PhD thesis, Stanford University.

[25] Hesterberg, T. (1995). Weighted average importance sampling and defensive mixture distributions.

Technometrics, 37(2):185–194.

[26] Jasra, A., Kantas, N., and Ehrlich, E. (2014). Approximate inference for observation-driven time series models with intractable likelihoods. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)*, 24(3):13.

[27] Lee, A. and Latuszynski, K. (2012). Variance bounding and geometric ergodicity of Markov chain Monte Carlo kernels for approximate Bayesian computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.6703*.

[28] Liu, J. S. (1996). Metropolized independent sampling with comparisons to rejection sampling and importance sampling. *Statistics and Computing*, 6(2):113–119.

[29] Loredo, T. J., Berger, J. O., Chernoff, D. F., Clyde, M. A., and Liu, B. (2012). Bayesian methods for analysis and adaptive scheduling of exoplanet observations. *Statistical Methodology*, 9(1):101–114.

[30] Marin, J.-M., Pillai, N. S., Robert, C. P., and Rousseau, J. (2013). Relevant statistics for Bayesian model choice. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*.

[31] Marjoram, P., Molitor, J., Plagnol, V., and Tavare, S. (2003). Markov chain Monte Carlo without likelihoods. *PNAS*, 100:15324–15328.

[32] Martin, G. M., McCabe, B. P., Maneesoonthorn, W., and Robert, C. P. (2014). Approximate Bayesian computation in state space models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.8363*.

[33] Peters, G. W., Kannan, B., Lasscock, B., Mellen, C., Godsill, S., et al. (2011). Bayesian cointegrated vector autoregression models incorporating alpha-stable noise for inter-day price movements via approximate Bayesian computation. *Bayesian Analysis*, 6(4):755–792.

[34] Picchini, U. (2013). Inference for SDE models via approximate Bayesian computation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, (just-accepted).

[35] Prangle, D., Fearnhead, P., Cox, M. P., Biggs, P. J., and French, N. P. (2013). Semi-automatic selection of summary statistics for ABC model choice. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 74:67–82.

[36] Pritchard, J. K., Seielstad, M. T., Perez-Lezaun, A., and Feldman, M. W. (1999). Population growth of human Y chromosomes: a study of Y chromosome microsatellites. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 16:1791–1798.

[37] Raftery, A. and Bao, L. (2010). Estimating and projecting trends in hiv/aids generalized epidemics using incremental mixture importance sampling. *Biometrics*, 66(4):1162–1173.

[38] Ratmann, O., Andrieu, C., Wiuf, C., and Richardson, S. (2009). Model criticism based on likelihood-free inference, with an application to protein network evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26):10576–10581.

[39] Rubio, F., Johansen, A. M., et al. (2013). A simple approach to maximum intractable likelihood estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1632–1654.

[40] Sandmann, G. and Koopman, S. (1998). Estimation of stochastic volatility models via Monte Carlo maximum likelihood. *Journal of Econometrics*, 87(2):271–301.

[41] Sisson, S., Peters, G., Briers, M., and Fan, Y. (2010). A note on target distribution ambiguity of likelihood-free samplers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1005.5201*.

[42] Toni, T., Welch, D., Strelkowa, N., Ipsen, A., and Stumpf, M. P. (2009). Approximate Bayesian computation scheme for parameter inference and model selection in dynamical systems. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 6(31):187–202.

[43] Wegmann, D., Leuenberger, C., and Excoffier, L. (2009). Efficient approximate Bayesian computation coupled with Markov chain Monte Carlo without likelihood. *Genetics*.

[44] West, M. (1993). Approximating posterior distributions by mixture. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 55(2):409–422.

[45] Wilkinson, R. D. (2013). Approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) gives exact results under the assumption of model error. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 12(2):129–141.

[46] Yuan, A. and Clarke, B. (2004). Asymptotic normality of the posterior given a statistic. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 32(2):119–137.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
E-mail: w.li@lancaster.ac.uk
E-mail: p.fearnhead@lancaster.ac.uk