

REPLY TO “ON SOME PROBLEMS IN THE ARTICLE *EFFICIENT LIKELIHOOD ESTIMATION IN STATE SPACE MODELS*<sup>1</sup>”

BY CHENG-DER FUH

[*Ann. Statist.* 34 (2006) 2026–2068]

BY CHENG-DER FUH

*National Central University and Academia Sinica*

The author is grateful for the comments by Dr. Jensen. This note is in reply to his comments.

**Problem 2.1. Definition of iterated function system.**

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_j)h(x) = \int_{y \in \mathcal{X}} p_\theta(y, x) f(\xi_j; \theta|x, \xi_{j-1})h(y)m(dy).$$

Define the composition of two random functions as

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_{j+1}) \circ \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_j)h(x) \\ &= \int_{z \in \mathcal{X}} p_\theta(z, x) f(\xi_{j+1}; \theta|x, \xi_j) \\ & \quad \times \left( \int_{y \in \mathcal{X}} p_\theta(y, z) f(\xi_j; \theta|z, \xi_{j-1})h(y)m(dy) \right) m(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Page 2042. C1. ...for all  $s_0, s_1 \in \mathbf{R}^d$ , and  $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x)m(dy) < \infty$ . Since  $m$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, there exist pairwise disjoint  $\mathcal{X}_n$  such that  $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{X}_n$ , and  $0 < m(\mathcal{X}_n) < \infty$ . Assume  $E[\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2^n} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} f(\xi_1; \theta|x, s_0)] < \infty$  for all  $s_0 \in \mathbf{R}^d$ . Denote  $g_\theta(\xi_0, \xi_1) = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x) f(\xi_1; \theta|x, \xi_0)m(dy)$ . Furthermore, we assume that there exists  $p \geq 1$  as in K2 such that

$$(5.2) \quad \sup_{(x_0, s_0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbf{R}^d} E_{(x_0, s_0)}^\theta \left\{ \log \left( g_\theta(s_0, \xi_1) \cdots g_\theta(\xi_{p-1}, \xi_p) \frac{w(X_p, \xi_p)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right) \right\} < 0.$$

The example on Page 2044, L12, holds if  $\alpha \neq 0$ . The original (5.6) was wrong; it should be

$$(5.6) \quad M_n := \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_n) \circ \cdots \circ \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_1) \circ \mathbf{P}_\theta(\xi_0)\pi \quad (\text{page 2045}).$$

---

Received August 2009; revised September 2009.

<sup>1</sup>Editors' note: The standard *Annals of Statistics* policy is that brief author responses and corrigenda are only reviewed for style and appropriateness; authors themselves are responsible for their correctness.

Page 2046. LEMMA 3. ...Furthermore, under conditions C1, C6–C9, the function  $g$  defined in (5.7) belongs to  $\mathcal{L}(Q \times Q)$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA 3. We consider only the case of  $\mathbf{P}(\xi_1)$ , since the case of  $\mathbf{P}(\xi_0)$  and  $\mathbf{P}(\xi_j)$ , for  $j = 2, \dots, n$ , is a straightforward consequence. For any two elements  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbf{M}$ , and two fixed elements  $s_0, s_1 \in \mathbf{R}^d$ , by (5.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d(\mathbf{P}(s_1)h_1, \mathbf{P}(s_1)h_2) \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \int p_\theta(y, x) f(s_1; \theta|x, s_0) h_1(y) m(dy) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int p_\theta(y, x) f(s_1; \theta|x, s_0) h_2(y) m(dy) \right| \\ & \leq d(h_1, h_2) \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x) f(s_1; \theta|x, s_0) m(dy) \\ & \leq C \left( \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x) m(dy) \right) d(h_1, h_2), \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 < C = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x) f(s_1; \theta|x, s_0) m(dy) < \infty$ , and by assumption C1, is a constant. Note that  $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(y, x) m(dy) < \infty$  by assumption C1. The equality holds only if  $h_1 = h_2$   $m$ -almost surely. This proves the condition of Lipschitz continuity in the second argument.

Note that C1 implies that K1 holds. Recall that  $M_n = \mathbf{P}(\xi_n) \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{P}(\xi_1) \circ \mathbf{P}(\xi_0) \pi$  for  $\pi \in \mathbf{M}$  in (5.6). To prove the weighted mean contraction property K2, we observe that for  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ \log \left( L_p \frac{w(X_p, \xi_p)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ \log \left( \sup_{h_1 \neq h_2} \frac{d(M_p h_1, M_p h_2)}{d(h_1, h_2)} \frac{w(X_p, \xi_p)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right) \right\} \\ (7.1) \quad & < \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ \log \left( \prod_{j=1}^p \left[ \sup_{x_j \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(x_{j-1}, x_j) \right. \right. \right. \\ & \quad \times f(\xi_j; \theta|x_j, s_{j-1}) \\ & \quad \left. \left. \left. \times m(dx_{j-1}) \right] \frac{w(X_p, \xi_p)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right) \right\} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from (5.2) in condition C1.

To verify that assumption K3 holds, as  $m$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, we have  $\mathcal{X} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{X}_n$  where the  $\mathcal{X}_n$  are pairwise disjoint and  $0 < m(\mathcal{X}_n) < \infty$ . Set

$$(7.2) \quad h(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{I_{\mathcal{X}_n}(x)}{2^n m(\mathcal{X}_n)}.$$

It is easy to see that  $\int_{x \in \mathcal{X}} h(x)m(dx) = 1$  and hence belongs to  $\mathbf{M}$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \mathbf{E}d^2(\mathbf{P}(\xi_1)h, h) \\
 &= \mathbf{E} \left[ \sup_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \int p_\theta(x_0, x_1) f(\xi_1; \theta|x_1, s_0) h(x_0) m(dx_0) - h(x_1) \right| \right] \\
 (7.3) \quad &\leq \mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \sup_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}_n} f(\xi_1; \theta|x_1, s_0) \right] \left[ \sup_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(x_0, x_1) m(dx_0) \right] \\
 &\quad + \sup_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} |h(x_1)|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $h(x)$  is piecewise constant by definition (7.2),  $E[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_n} f(\xi_1; \theta|x, s_0)] < \infty$  for all  $s_0 \in \mathbf{R}^n$  by assumption C1 and  $p_\theta(x_0, x_1)$  is integrable of  $x_0$  over the subset  $\mathcal{X}_n$  by assumption C1. These imply that (7.3) is finite.

Finally, we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ L_1 \frac{w(X_1, \xi_1)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right\} \\
 &= \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ \sup_{h_1 \neq h_2} \frac{d(\mathbf{P}(\xi_1)h_1, \mathbf{P}(\xi_1)h_2)}{d(h_1, h_2)} \frac{w(X_1, \xi_1)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right\} \\
 &< \sup_{x_0, s_0} \mathbf{E}_{(x_0, s_0)} \left\{ \left( \sup_{x_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \int p_\theta(x_0, x_1) f(\xi_1; \theta|x_1, s_0) m(dx_0) \right) \frac{w(X_1, \xi_1)}{w(x_0, s_0)} \right\} \\
 &< \infty.
 \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from (5.3) in condition C1.

Note that C8 and C9 imply that  $g \in \mathcal{L}(Q \times Q)$ . Hence, the proof is complete. □

**Problem 2.2. Harris recurrence of iterated function.** This paper is an extension of Fuh (2003) for finite state space in which the likelihood function can be expressed as the  $L_1$ -norm of products of Markovian random matrices. Note that  $M_n$  defined in (5.6) is an iterated random functions system governed by a Markov chain  $Y_n$ . And  $Y_n = (X_n, \xi_n)$  in the state space models case. In Theorem 1 I only assume  $Y_n = (X_n, \xi_n)$  is Harris recurrent. The purpose of the statement, “*Note that under K1–K3, . . . a Markovian iterated random functions system in Theorem 2,*” is to relate Theorems 1 and 2, to which I can apply limiting theorems in Markov chains to the law of large numbers and central limit theorem (and Edgeworth expansion) for  $(Y_n, M_n)$ .

In Lemma 4 I want to prove  $Z_n = ((X_n, \xi_n), M_n)$  is Harris recurrent ( $Z_n$  is defined in lines 1 and 2 on page 2056). In the proof, I can use the results in Theorem 1 since only  $Y_n = (X_n, \xi_n)$  is assumed to be Harris recurrent in Theorem 1. It is known that C1 implies that  $Y_n = (X_n, \xi_n)$  is Harris recurrent. A new proof of Lemma 3 was given on pages 1 and 2.

**Problem 2.3. Asymptotic properties of score function and observed information.** Page 2060, L12. In the proof of Lemma 6, (7.9) defined a new iterated functions system; therefore Corollary 1 cannot be used directly. The same situation happens for Theorems 5 and 7. The rigorous proofs of these results will be given in a separate paper.

**Problem 2.4. Generality of conditions.** C5. For  $\theta \in N_\delta(\theta_0)$ ,

$$E_x^\theta \left( \frac{\partial \log \int_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \pi(x) p(x, y) f(s_0; \theta|x) f(\xi_1; \theta|y, s_0) m(dy)}{\partial \theta_i} \right)^2 < w(x, s_0)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, q$ .

Change C5 accordingly. It is straightforward to check that C5 holds for the examples considered in Section 6. The proof of Lemma 5 can be done under C5.

**Other typos and mistakes.** Page 2032, L1.  $\dots p_\theta(y, x) f(\xi_j; \theta|x, \xi_{j-1}) \dots$   
 $X_{j-1} = y$  and  $X_j \in dx, \dots$

$$(3.7) \quad \pi(y) \mathbf{P}(Y_n \in dz, M_n \in \cdot | Y_0 = y) = \pi(z) \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(\tilde{Y}_n \in dy, \tilde{M}_n \in \cdot | \tilde{Y}_0 = z).$$

Page 2028, L5.  $(1 - \alpha^2)$ . Page 2043, C7,  $\theta \rightarrow \varphi_x(\theta)$  was a typo; delete it. Page 2047, L1, then, “each component of” the Fisher information matrix. L5, replace “positive definite” by “finite.” Page 2048, Theorem 5, assume  $\mathbf{I}(\theta_0)$  is invertible. Page 2057, L3, the notation  $m \times Q \times Q$  may be confusing; change it to  $m \times Q \times \tilde{Q}$ .

GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF STATISTICS  
 NATIONAL CENTRAL UNIVERSITY  
 JHONGLI  
 TAIWAN  
 E-MAIL: [stcheng@stat.sinica.edu.tw](mailto:stcheng@stat.sinica.edu.tw)