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# NOTES ON STOCHASTIC APPROXIMATION METHODS 

VÁCLAV DUPAČ, Praha

(Received March 11, 1957)


#### Abstract

In section 1 and 2, asymptotic properties of the Robbins-Monto and the Kiefer-Wolfowitz stochastic approximation methods are studied under the assumption, that the solution lies in an a priori known finite interval. In section 3, a stochastic approximation method is considered for solving systems of linear equations with a symmetric matrix of coefficients.


## 0. Introduction and summary

Stochastic approximation methods deal with the following problems: $M(x)$ is the (unknown) regression function of a family of random variables $\left\{Y_{x}\right\}$; we have to solve the equation $M(x)=\alpha$, or we have to find the value of $x$ for which $M(x)$ achieves its maximum, by means of an iterative process, using observations of $Y$ on various levels of $x$. The former problem has been solved by Robbins and Monro [1], the latter by Kiefer and Wolfowitz [2]; both problems -- so as the methods of solution - have multidimensional analoga (Blum, [3]). The theoretical investigations of these methods go in two directions:
$1^{\circ}$ they are conditions studied, under which the approximations $x_{n}$ converge to the solution $\Theta$ with probability one;
$2^{\circ}$ the asymptotic order of second moments $E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}\right]$, or the asymptotic distribution of $x_{n}$ are studied, and conclusions are drawn about the optimal choice of some eligible constants occurring in the approximation scheme.

In the second direction, the Chung's paper [4], concerning Robbins-Monro procedure, is the most advanced. Chung's methods were adapted by Derman [5] and - independently - by the author [6] to derive asymptotic properties of Kiefer-Wolfowitz procedure.

The present paper contains two contributions to the investigations sub $2^{\circ}$. First it is shown, that the conditions under which the approximation procedure

Thas satisfactory asymptotic properties, can be considerably weakened, if the approximations $x_{n}$ are all restricted to a finite interval known as containing the solution $\Theta$. This is done in Section 1 for the Robbins-Monro procedure, and in Section 2 for the Kiefer-Wolfowitz method. Secondly, a multidimensional modification of the Robbins-Monro procedure is considered in a special case of linear regression with a symmetrical matrix. The upper bounds for the quantities $E\left[\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}\right]$ are given (Section 3).

In the following, $K_{0}, K_{1}, \ldots, K_{9}$ are positive constants numbered in order of appearance. As $[f(x)]_{A}^{B}$ will be denoted the function

$$
g(x)= \begin{cases}A, & \text { if } f(x)<A, \\ f(x), & \text { if } A \leqq f(x) \leqq B, \\ B, & \text { if } f(x)>B\end{cases}
$$

A lemma, due to Chung (Lemma 1 in [4]), will be used repeatedly:
Let $\left\{b_{n}\right\}, n \geqq 1$, be a sequence of real numbers such that for $n \geqq n_{0}$.

$$
b_{n+1} \leqq\left(1-\frac{c}{n}\right) b_{n}+\frac{c_{1}}{n^{p+1}}
$$

where $c>p>0, c_{1}>0$. Then

$$
b_{n} \leqq \frac{c_{1}}{c-p} \cdot \frac{1}{n^{p}}+O\left(\frac{1}{n^{p+1}}+\frac{1}{n^{c}}\right) .
$$

## 1. The Robbins-Monro stochastic approximation method

Let to each value $x$ from a finite interval $\langle A, B\rangle$ correspond a distribution function $H(y \mid x)$, let $M(x)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x)$ be a Borel measurable function bounded in $\langle A, B\rangle$. Suppose that the equation $M(x)=\alpha$ has a unique root $x=\Theta$ in $(A, B)$, and that the inequality $(M(x)-a)(x-\Theta)>0$ holds for all $x \neq \Theta, x \in\langle A, B\rangle$.

Let $a$ be a positive constant. Take $x_{1} \in\langle A, B\rangle$ arbitrarily and for $n \geqq 1$ set recursively

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{n+1}=\left[x_{n}+\frac{a}{n}\left(x-y_{n}\right)\right]_{A}^{B}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y_{n}$ is a random variable whose distribution function, for given $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$, $y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}$, is $H\left(y \mid x_{n}\right)$.

We shall add the following assumptions:
Assumption $\left(\mathrm{I}_{1}\right)$ : There exists a constant $\sigma^{2}$, such that

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{2} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x) \leqq \sigma^{2} \quad \text { for all } \quad x \in\langle A, B\rangle
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{II}_{1}\right)$ : For every $\delta>0$ we have

$$
\inf _{|x-\Theta|>\delta, x \in\langle A, B\rangle}|M(x)-\lambda|=K_{0}(\delta)>0 .
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{III}_{1}\right)$ : We have $M^{\prime}(\Theta)>0$.
We derive a simple consequence of the assumptions. For a given $\eta, 0<\eta \ll$ $<1$, let $\delta_{0}(\eta)$ be the supremum of all $\delta$, such that

$$
\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \leqq \delta \Rightarrow\left|M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right| \geqq \eta M^{\prime}(\Theta)
$$

The existence of such $\delta$ 's follows from ( $\mathrm{III}_{1}$ ). From $\left(\mathrm{II}_{1}\right)$ it follows that

$$
\left|M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right| \geqq K_{0}\left(\delta_{0}(\eta)\right) \geqq \frac{K_{0}\left(\delta_{0}(\eta)\right)}{B-A}\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \quad \text { for }\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|>\delta_{n}(\eta)
$$

since $\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \leqq B-A$, by the definition of $x_{n}$. Now set

$$
\varrho(\eta)=\operatorname{Min}\left(\eta M^{\prime}(\Theta), \frac{K_{0}\left(\delta_{0}(\eta)\right)}{B-A}\right) \text { and } K_{1}=\sup _{0<\eta<1} \varrho(\eta)
$$

Evidently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right| \geqq K_{1}\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \text { holds for all } n=1,2, \ldots \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, from ( $\mathrm{III}_{1}$ ) and from the boundedness of $M(x)$ in $\langle A, B\rangle$ it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right| \leqq K_{2}\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \text { for all } n=1,2, \ldots \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall denote the second moment $E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}\right]$ as $b_{n}$.
Theorem I. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{1}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{1}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{II}_{1}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{1}}$. Then

$$
\bar{b}_{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) .
$$

Remark. The choice of $a$ depends on the unknown constant $K_{1}$. We can avoid this fact by replacing the factor $\frac{a}{n}$ in (1) through $\frac{a^{\prime}}{n} \log n$, where now $a^{\prime}$ is an arbitrary positive constant. Then - under the same assumptions -$b_{n}=o\left(\frac{1}{n^{1-\varepsilon}}\right)$ for every $\varepsilon>0$, as could be easily shown.

Proof of the Theorem 1: From (1) it follows

$$
\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{2}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
(A-\Theta)^{2} \text { for } x_{n}-\Theta+\frac{a}{n}\left(x-y_{n}\right)<A-\Theta \\
(B-\Theta)^{2} \text { for } x_{n}-\Theta+\frac{a}{n}\left(\lambda-y_{n}\right)>B-\Theta \\
\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left(x_{n}-\alpha\right)^{2}-\frac{2 a}{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\left(y_{n}-\alpha\right) \text { otherwise. }
\end{array}\right.
$$

If we square the inequatities $x_{n}-\Theta+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right)<A-\Theta$, or $>B-\Theta$ respectively, and note that $A-\Theta$ is negative, $B-\Theta$ positive, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{2} \leqq\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left(y_{n}-x\right)^{2}-\frac{2 a}{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\left(y_{n}-\alpha\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all three possibilities.
Writing $y_{n}-\alpha=y_{n}-M\left(x_{n}\right)+M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha$, taking conditional expectations on both sides of (4), and using ( $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ ), we get

$$
\begin{gathered}
E\left[\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{2} \mid x_{n}\right] \leqq\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left\{\sigma^{2}+\left(M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right)^{2}\right\}- \\
-\frac{2 a}{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\left(M\left(x_{n}\right)-\alpha\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

hence by (2) and (3)

$$
b_{n+1} \leqq b_{n}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left(\sigma^{2}+K_{2}^{2} b_{n}\right)-\frac{2 a}{n} K_{1} b_{n}
$$

i. e.,

$$
b_{n+1} \leqq\left(1-\frac{2 K_{1} a+o(1)}{n}\right) b_{n}+\frac{\sigma^{2} a^{2}}{n^{2}}
$$

Hence by Chung's lemma

$$
b_{n} \leqq \frac{\sigma^{2} a^{2}}{2 K_{1} a-1} \cdot \frac{1}{n}+O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2}}+\frac{1}{n^{2 K_{1} a}}\right) .
$$

In order to prove the asymptotic normality of $x_{n}$ we shall make further assumptions.

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{IV}_{1}\right)$ : For every even integer $p>2$ there exists a constant $C_{p}$, such that

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{p} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x) \leqq C_{p} \text { for all } x \epsilon\langle A, B\rangle
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}\right)$ : The function

$$
\sigma^{2}(x)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{2} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x)
$$

is continuous and nonvanishing at $x=\Theta$.
Theorem 2. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{1}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{1}\right),\left(\mathrm{III}_{1}\right),\left(\mathrm{IV}_{1}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}\right)$ are sutisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{1}}$. Then the random variable $n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)$ tends in distribution to the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\frac{\sigma^{2}(\Theta) a^{2}}{{ }^{\prime} M^{\prime}(\Theta) a-1}$ :

Proof is very similar to that of an analogous theorem in [4], and will be only sketched here, with some differences pointed out.
$1^{\circ}$ Under the additional assumption $\left(\mathrm{IV}_{1}\right)$, the asymptotic order of the higher absolute moments $\beta_{n}^{(r)}=E\left[\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|^{r}\right]=O\left(n^{-\frac{r}{2}}\right)$ will be deduced by induction with respect to even $r$; (for odd $r$ it follows then by Lyapunov's inequality). As a consequence we get by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|>\delta} F_{n}(x) \mathrm{d} P=O\left(n^{-q}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every Borel measurable function $F$ bounded in $\langle A, B\rangle$ and for every $\delta>0$, $q>0$ (i. e. for $\delta$ arbitrarily small and $q$ arbitrarily large).
$2^{\circ}$ We observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P\left(x_{n}+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right)>B\right) \leqq P\left(x_{n}-\Theta>\frac{B-\Theta}{2}\right)+P\left(\frac{a}{n}\left(x-y_{n}\right)>\frac{B-\Theta}{2}\right) \leqq \\
& \leqq \frac{\beta_{n}^{(2 q)}}{\left(\frac{B-\Theta}{2}\right)^{2 q}}+\frac{E\left[\mid \alpha-y_{n} n^{q}\right]}{\left(\frac{B-\Theta}{2}\right)^{q} n^{q}}=O\left(n^{-q}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and, similarly, $P\left(x_{n}+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right)<A\right)=O\left(n^{-q}\right), q>0$ arbitrary. Therefore

$$
\begin{gathered}
E\left[\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{r}\right]=E\left[\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{r} \left\lvert\, x_{n}+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right) \epsilon\langle A, B\rangle\right.\right]+O\left(n^{-q}\right)= \\
\quad=E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right)\right)^{r} \left\lvert\, x_{n}+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right) \epsilon\langle A, B\rangle\right.\right]+O\left(n^{-q}\right)= \\
\quad=E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta+\frac{a}{n}\left(\alpha-y_{n}\right)\right)^{r}\right]+O\left(n^{-q}\right), \text { for arbitrary } q>0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

Denoting $b_{n}^{(r)}=E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{r}\right]$, we get

$$
b_{n+1}^{(r)}=b_{n}^{(r)}+\sum_{t=1}^{r}(-1)^{t}\binom{r}{t} \frac{a^{t}}{n^{t}} E\left[\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{r-t}\left(y_{n}-\alpha\right)^{t}\right]+O\left(n^{-q}\right) .
$$

Evaluating expectations on the right side, we can by (5) reduce the integration to the interval $\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \leqq \delta$, where by means of $\left(\mathrm{III}_{1}\right)$ and $\left(V_{1}\right)$ more precise estimates are available; this enables us to prove (inductively) that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{r} b_{n}^{(r)}=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
0 \text { for } r=2 s-1 \\
\left(\frac{\sigma^{2}(\Theta) a^{2}}{2 M^{\prime}(\Theta) a-1}\right)^{s}(2 s-1)!!\text { for } r=2 s
\end{array}\right.
$$

which implies the statement of the theorem.

## 2. The Kiefer-Wolfowitz stochastic approximation method

Let again $\{H(y \mid x)\}$ be a family of distribution functions and $M(x)=$ $=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} y \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x)$ the corresponding regression function. Suppose that $M(x)$ achieves its maximum for a value $x=\Theta$ from a (known) finite interval $(A, B)$
and that $M(x)$ is increasing or decreasing according to $x<\Theta$ or $x>\Theta$ in a larger interval $\left\langle A-c^{\prime}, B+c^{\prime}\right\rangle$.

Let $a>0,0<c \leqq c^{\prime}, 0<\gamma<\frac{1}{2}$ be constants; denote $\frac{a}{n}=a_{n}, \frac{c}{n \gamma}=c_{n}$. Take $x_{1} \in\langle A, B\rangle$ arbitrarily and for $n \geqq 1$ set recursively

$$
x_{n+1}=\left[x_{n}+a_{n} \frac{y_{2 n}-y_{2 n-1}}{c_{n}}\right]_{A}^{B},
$$

where $y_{2 n}, y_{2 n-1}$ are random variables, which for given $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{2 n-2}$ have distribution functions $H\left(y \mid x_{n}+c_{n}\right), H\left(y \mid x_{n}-c_{n}\right)$ respectively, and are independent.

We shall still add the following assumptions.
Assumption $\left(\mathrm{I}_{2}\right)$ : There exists a constant $\sigma^{2}$, such that

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{2} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x) \leqq \sigma^{2} \text { for all } x \epsilon\left\langle A-c^{\prime}, B+c^{\prime}\right\rangle
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right)$ : There exist $K_{3}>0, K_{4}>0$ such that

$$
K_{3}|x-\Theta| \leqq\left|M^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq K_{4}|x--\Theta| \text { in some neighbourhood of } \Theta .
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{III}_{2}\right)$ : There exists a $K_{5}>0$ and for every $\delta>0$ a $K_{6}(\delta)>0$, such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|M^{\prime}(x)\right| \leqq K_{5} \text { for all } x \epsilon\left\langle A-c^{\prime}, B+c^{\prime}\right\rangle \\
\left|M^{\prime}(x)\right| \geqq K_{6}(\delta) \text { for all }|x-\Theta|>\delta, x \epsilon\left\langle A-c^{\prime}, B+c^{\prime}\right\rangle .
\end{gathered}
$$

Remark. The assumption $\left(\Pi_{2}\right)$ is certainly satisfied, if $M^{\prime \prime}(\Theta)<0$ exists.
We deduce first some consequences of the assumptions. Denote $M_{\varepsilon}(x)=$ $=\frac{M(x+\varepsilon)-M(x-\varepsilon)}{\Omega}$ for $x \in\langle A, B\rangle, 0<\varepsilon<c^{\prime}$; we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{\varepsilon}(x)=M^{\prime}\left(x+\vartheta_{1} \varepsilon\right)+M^{\prime}\left(x-\vartheta_{2} \varepsilon\right) \text { with } 0<\vartheta_{i}<1, i=1,2 . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Set $\varkappa(x)=-\frac{M^{\prime}(x)}{x-\Theta}$ for $x \neq \Theta, \varkappa(\Theta)=K_{3} ;$ by $\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right)$ it holds $K_{3} \leqq x(x) \leqq K_{4}$ in ssme neighbourhood of $\Theta$, say for $|x-\Theta| \leqq \delta$.

Smpose that $\varepsilon<\frac{1}{3} \delta$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{\varepsilon}(x)=\left[\varkappa\left(x+\vartheta_{1} \varepsilon\right)\right. & \left.+\varkappa\left(x-\vartheta_{2} \varepsilon\right)\right](x-\Theta)+\left[\vartheta_{2} \varkappa\left(x-\vartheta_{2} \varepsilon\right)-\right. \\
& \left.-\vartheta_{1} \varkappa\left(x+\vartheta_{1} \varepsilon\right)\right] \varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
(x-\Theta) M_{\varepsilon}(x) \leqq-2 K_{3}(x-\Theta)^{2}+K_{4} \varepsilon|x-\Theta| \quad \text { for }|x-\Theta| \leqq \delta-\varepsilon . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, by $\left(\mathrm{IH}_{2}\right)$ and (6), we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|M_{\varepsilon}(x)\right| \equiv 2 K_{6}\left(\frac{\delta}{3}\right) \text { for }|x-\Theta|>\delta-\varepsilon,  \tag{8}\\
M_{\varepsilon}^{2}(x) \leqq 4 K_{5}^{2} \text { for all } x \in\langle A, B\rangle . \tag{9}
\end{gather*}
$$

Returning to the approximation scheme, we see that $\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|<B-A$ for all $n$, and $c_{n}<\frac{1}{3} \delta$ for all $n>n_{0}(\delta)$; hence

$$
\left|M_{c_{n}}\left(x_{n}\right)\right|>\frac{2 K_{6}\left(\frac{\delta}{3}\right)}{B-A}\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \text { for }\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|>\delta-c_{n}, \quad n>n_{0}(\delta)
$$

or, taking in account that $M(x)$ is increasing or decreasing as $x<\Theta$ or $x>\Theta$, $\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) M_{c_{n}}\left(x_{n}\right) \leqq-\frac{2 K_{6}\left(\frac{\delta}{3}\right)}{B-A}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}$ for $\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|>\delta-c_{n}, n>n_{0}(\delta)$.

Combining this with (7), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) M_{c_{n}}\left(x_{n}\right) \leqq-K_{7} \cdot\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+K_{4} c_{n}\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right| \text { for } n>n_{0}(\delta) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

(without restriction on $x_{n}$ ).
Theorem 3. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{III}_{2}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{7}}$. Then

$$
b_{n}= \begin{cases}o\left(\frac{1}{n^{1-2 \gamma}}\right) & \text { for } \quad \gamma \geqq \frac{1}{4} \\ o\left(\frac{1}{n^{2 \gamma}}\right) & \text { for } \quad \gamma<\frac{1}{4}\end{cases}
$$

Remark. These upper bounds for $b_{n}$ cannot be lowered in general; therefore the choice $\gamma=\frac{1}{4}$, giving $b_{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$, is the optimal one (under the assumptions made above).

In order to prove the statement in the remark, we use a family $\{H(y \mid x)\}$ with $M(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}-(x-\Theta)^{2} \text { for } x \leqq \Theta \\ -\frac{1}{2}(x-\Theta)^{2} \text { for } x>\Theta\end{array}\right.$ and with $\sigma^{2}(x) \equiv \sigma^{2}>0$. This special case leads - for every choice of $\gamma$ - to $b_{n}$ of exactly that order which is given as opper bound in Theorem 3. (Cf. [6]!)

Proof of Theor. 3. As in Sect. 1, it is easily seen that

$$
\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{2} \leqq\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+a_{n}^{2} \frac{\left(y_{2 n}-y_{2 n-1}\right)^{2}}{c_{n}^{2}}+2 a_{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) \frac{y_{2 n}-y_{2 n-1}}{c_{n}}
$$

hence
$E\left[\left(x_{n+1}-\Theta\right)^{2} \mid x_{n}\right] \leqq\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{2}+2 \sigma^{2} a_{n}^{2} c_{n}^{-2}+a_{n}^{2} M_{c_{n}}^{2}\left(x_{n}\right)+2 a_{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) M_{c_{\boldsymbol{n}}}\left(x_{n}\right)$.
Taking once more expectations and using (9) and (10) we get

$$
b_{n+1} \leqq b_{n}+\frac{2 \sigma^{2} a^{2} c^{-2}}{n^{2-2 \gamma}}+\frac{4 K_{5}^{2} a^{2}}{n^{2}}-\frac{2 K_{7} a}{n} b_{n}+\frac{2 K_{4} a c}{n^{1+\gamma}} E\left[\mid x_{n}-\Theta!\right]
$$

By means of the inequality $E\left[\left|x_{n}-\Theta\right|\right] \leqq \varepsilon_{n}+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_{n}} b_{n}$ we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left(\text { setting } \varepsilon_{n}=\frac{2 K_{4} c}{\varepsilon K_{7} n^{\gamma}} \text { with } 0<\varepsilon<\frac{2}{a}\left(a-\frac{1}{2 K_{7}}\right)\right) \\
b_{n+1} \leqq\left(1-\frac{(2-\varepsilon) K_{7} a}{n}\right) b_{n}+\frac{2 \sigma^{2} a^{2} c^{-2}+o(1)}{n^{2-2 \gamma}}+\frac{4 K_{4}^{2} K_{7}^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} a c^{2}}{n^{1+2 \gamma}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

The application of Chung's lemma completes the proof.
The proofs of the following three theorems will be omitted; they are entirely analogous to the proofs of corresponding theorems in [6].

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{IV}_{2}\right)$; The bounded third derivative $M^{\prime \prime \prime}(x)$ exists in some neighbourhood of $\Theta$.

Theorem 4. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{III}_{2}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{IV}_{2}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{7}}$. Then

$$
b_{n}= \begin{cases}O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1-2 \gamma}}\right) & \text { for } \gamma \geqq \frac{1}{6} \\ O\left(\frac{1}{n^{4 \gamma}}\right) & \text { for } \gamma<\frac{1}{6}\end{cases}
$$

Remark. These bounds for $b_{n}$ cannot be lowered without adding further restrictive assumptions; therefore the choice $\gamma=\frac{1}{6}$, giving $b_{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{n^{\frac{2}{3}}}\right)$, is the optimal one.

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{V}_{2}\right)$ : The function $M(x)$ is analytical and symmetrical about $\Theta$ in some neighbourhood of $\Theta$.

Theorem 5. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{III}_{2}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{V}_{2}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{7}}$. Then

$$
b_{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{n^{1-2 \gamma}}\right) \text { for all } 0<\gamma<\frac{1}{2}
$$

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{VI}_{2}\right)$ : For every even integer $p>2$ there exists a constant $C_{p}$ such that

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{p} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x) \leqq C_{p} \text { for all } x \epsilon\langle A, B\rangle
$$

Assumiption $\left(\mathrm{VII}_{2}\right)$ : The function

$$
\sigma^{2}(x)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(y-M(x))^{2} \mathrm{~d} H(y \mid x)
$$

is continuous and nonvanishing at $x=\Theta$.

Theorem 6. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{II}_{2}\right),\left(\mathrm{VI}_{2}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{VI}_{2}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{7}}$. Then in each of the following three cases
$1^{\circ} \gamma \geqq \frac{1}{4}$ and the continuous $M^{\prime \prime}(x)<0$ exists in some neighbourhood of $\Theta$,
$2^{\circ} \gamma>\frac{1}{6}$ and the assumption $\left(\mathrm{IV}_{2}\right)$ is satisfied,
$3^{\circ}$ the assumption $\left(\mathrm{V}_{2}\right)$ is satisfied,
the random variable $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)$ tends in distribution to the normal distribntion with mean 0 and variance $\frac{\sigma^{2}(\Theta) a^{2}}{\left(-2 M^{\prime \prime}(\Theta) a-\frac{1}{2}+\gamma\right) c^{2}}$.

## 3. Solving systems of linear equations by a stochastic approximation method

In this section, the (column) vectors will be denoted by $x, x_{n}, \ldots, \Theta$, and by $\xi_{i}, \xi_{n i}, \ldots, \Theta_{i}(i=1, \ldots, r)$ - their coordinates. The rows of a matrix $M$, considered as row vectors, will be denoted by $M_{i}$. The Euclidean norm $\|x\|=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{r} \xi_{i}^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and the corresponding norm of a matrix $\|M\|=\left(\operatorname{Max}_{i} \lambda_{i}\left(M^{\prime} M\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ will be used.

Let to each $x \in E_{r}$ correspond a distribution function of $r$ variables $H(y \mid x)$. Suppose that the regression of $y$ on $x$ (i. e. the vector function, whose $i$-th coordinate is given by the integral $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta \mathrm{d} H_{i}(\eta \mid x)$, where $H_{i}(\eta \mid x)=H(+\infty, \ldots$, $\eta, \ldots,+\infty), \eta$ on the $i$-th place) is of the type $M x$, where $M$ is a matrix with constant elements. Suppose that $M$ is nonsingular, so that, for given $a$, the system of linear equations $M x=\alpha$ has a unique solution $\Theta$.

Let $a$ be a positive constant. Define the approximation procedure by taking $x_{1}$ arbitrarily, and for $n \geqq 1$ setting recursively

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{n+1}=x_{n}-\frac{a}{n} y_{n}, \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y_{n}$ is a random vector whose distribution function, for given $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$ $y_{1}^{*}, \ldots, y_{n}^{*}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-1}$, is $H\left(y \mid y_{n}^{*}-\mathrm{a}\right)$, and $y_{n}^{*}$ is a random vector whose distribution function, for given $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, y_{1}^{*}, \ldots, y_{n-1}^{*}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n-1}$, is $H\left(y \mid x_{n}\right)$.

Remark. The realization of this approximation scheme is the following: Given $x_{n}$, we get first $y_{n}^{*}$ as a result of an observation on the level $x_{n}$; then we get $y_{n}$ as result of an observation on the level $y_{n}^{*}-\alpha$, and construct $x_{n+1}$ according to (11).

We make further following two assumptions:

Assumption $\left(\mathrm{I}_{3}\right)$ : There exists a constant $S^{2}$ such that

$$
\int_{E_{r}}\|y-M x\|^{2} \mathrm{~d} P_{x} \leqq S^{2} \quad \text { for all } x \in E_{r}
$$

where $P_{x}$ denotes the probability measure in $E_{r}$ induced by $H(y \mid x)$.
Assumption $\left(\mathrm{II}_{3}\right)$ : The matrix $M$ is symmetrical.
Set $K_{8}=\operatorname{Min}_{i} \lambda_{i}^{2}, K_{9}=1+\underset{i}{\operatorname{Max}} \lambda_{i}^{2}=1+\|M\|^{2}$, where $\lambda_{i}$ are the latent roots of the (symmetrical!) matrix $M$. Denote $b_{n}=E\left[\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}\right]$.

Theorem 7. Suppose that the assumptions $\left(\mathrm{I}_{3}\right)$ and $\left(\mathrm{II}_{3}\right)$ are satisfied, and that $a>\frac{1}{2 K_{8}}$. Then

$$
b_{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \text { or, more precisely, } b_{n} \leqq \frac{K_{9} S^{2} a^{2}}{2 K_{8} a-1} \cdot \frac{1}{n}+O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2}}+\frac{1}{n^{2 K_{8} a}}\right)
$$

Proof. First we observe that

$$
\begin{gather*}
E\left[\eta_{n i} \mid y_{n}^{*}, x_{n}\right]=M_{i}\left(y_{n}^{*}-\alpha\right)  \tag{12}\\
E\left[\eta_{n i} \mid x_{n}\right]=E\left[M_{i}\left(y_{n}^{*}-\alpha\right) \mid x_{n}\right]=M_{i} M\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) . \tag{13}
\end{gather*}
$$

Then we shall find an upper bound for $E\left[\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right]$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{r} \eta_{n i}^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\left\{\left[\eta_{n i}-M_{i}\left(y_{n}^{*}-\alpha\right)\right]+\left[M_{i}\left(y_{n}^{*}-\alpha\right)-M_{i} M\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\right]+\right. \\
\left.+\left[M_{i} M\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\right]\right\}^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

hence by (12)

$$
\begin{gathered}
E\left[\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2} \mid y_{n}^{*}, x_{n}\right]=E\left[\left\|y_{n}-M\left(y_{n}^{*}-\alpha\right)\right\|^{2} \mid y_{n}^{*}, x_{n}\right]+ \\
+\left\|M\left(y_{n}^{*}-M x_{n}\right)\right\|^{2}+\left\|M^{2}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\right\|^{2}+2 \sum_{i=1}^{r}\left[M_{i}\left(y_{n}^{*}-M x_{n}\right)\right] \cdot\left[M_{i} M\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

further, by the definition of $y_{n}^{*}$, by $\left(\mathrm{I}_{3}\right)$ and by (13),

$$
\begin{align*}
E\left[\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right] & \leqq S^{2}+E\left[\left\|M\left(y_{n}^{*}-M x_{n}\right)\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right]+\left\|M^{2}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)\right\|^{2} \leqq \\
& \leqq\left(1+\|M\|^{2}\right) S^{2}+\|M\|^{4}\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2} . \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Now, by (11) and in the next row by (13),

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left\|x_{n+1}-\Theta\right\|^{2}=\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}-\frac{2 a}{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{\prime} y_{n}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2}, \\
E\left[\left\|x_{n+1}-\Theta\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right]=\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}-\frac{2 a}{n}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{\prime} M^{2}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}} E\left[\left\|y_{n}\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right] . \tag{15}
\end{gather*}
$$

Since $M$ is nonsingular and symmetrical, the matrix $M^{2}$ is positive definite, so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right)^{\prime} M^{2}\left(x_{n}-\Theta\right) \geqq K_{8}\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

. with $K_{8}$ equal to the smallest latent root of $M^{2}$.

Inserting (14) and (16) into (15), we obtain

$$
\begin{gathered}
E\left[\left\|x_{n+1}-\Theta\right\|^{2} \mid x_{n}\right] \leqq\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}-\frac{2 K_{8} a}{n}\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}+\frac{a^{2}}{n^{2}}\left[\left(1+\|M\|^{2}\right) S^{2}+\right. \\
\left.+\|M\|^{4}\left\|x_{n}-\Theta\right\|^{2}\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

and finally,

$$
b_{n+1} \leqq\left(1-\frac{2 K_{8} a+o(1)}{n}\right) b_{n}+\frac{K_{9} S^{2} a^{2}}{n^{2}} .
$$

Applying Chung's lemma, we get the statement of the theorem.

## REFERENCES

(AMS - Annals of Mathematical Statistics)
[1] H. Robbins, S. Monro: A stochastic approximation method, AMS 22 (1951), 400-407.
[2] J. Kiefer, J. Wolfowitz: Stochastic estimation of the maximum of a regression function, AMS 23 (1952), 462-466.
[3] J. R. Blum: Multidimensional stochastic approximation methods, AMS 25 (1954), 737-744.
[4] K. L. Chung: On a stochastic approximation method, AMS 25 (1954), 463-483.
[5] C. Derman: An application of Chung's lemma to the Kiefer-Wolfowitz stochastic approximation procedure, AMS 27 (1956), 532-536.
[6] V. Dupač: On the Kiefer-Wolfowitz approximation method (in Czech), Čas. pro pěst. matem. 82 (1957), 47-75.

# Резюме <br> <br> ЗАМЕТКИ К СТОХАСТИЧЕСКИМ АППРОКСИМАЦИОННЫМ <br> <br> ЗАМЕТКИ К СТОХАСТИЧЕСКИМ АППРОКСИМАЦИОННЫМ МЕТОДАМ 

 МЕТОДАМ}

ВАЦЛАВ ДУПАЧ, (Václav Dupač), Прага (Поступило в редакцию 11/LII, 1957 г.)

Асимптотические свойства стохастического аппроксимашионного метода Роббинса-Монро были установлены Чжуном [4]; обменивая подход Чжуна, Дэрман [5] и автор [6] вывели аналогичные свойства аппроксимационного метода Кифера-Вольфовица; результаты всех трех работ выведены при довольно ограничивающих условиях.

В §§ 1-ом и 2 -ом настоящей статьи показано, что эти условия можно значительно ослабить, если предноложить, что искомое решение лежит в некотором заранее известном конечном промежутке.

В § 3-ем исследуется стохастический аппроксимационный метод для решения систем линейных уравнений с симметрической матрицей коэффициентов.

