Using mistral for reliability analysis

Clément Walter

2016-12-24

The package mistral provides some numerical methods for estimating the probability that a computer code exceeds a given threshold when its input parameters are random with a known distribution. In this vignette we give an overview of the available methods as well as some practical testcases to clarify both how to use them and what they do.

General setting

Given an input random vector \mathbf{X} with known distribution and a real-valued function g standing for the computer code, the general problem addressed in this package is to estimate the quantity:

$$p = P[g(\mathbf{X}) > q]$$

with p or q a given real:

- either q is given and the goal is to estimate the probability p; in this setting q is for instance a security threshold and one wants to estimate the probability that the code be greater than this value.
- or p is given and the goal is to find the corresponding threshold such that the probability of failure is lower than required.

The standard input space

By definition, we call the standard input space the case where **X** is a standard Gaussian vector, ie. a vector with independent standard Gaussian coordinates. **All the stochastic methods are developed for a standard Gaussian input space.** In other words, when the problem at hand does not use only independent standard Gaussian random variables, an iso-probabilistic transformation has to be done before a call to the code **g**, often called the limit-state function 1sf.

mistral provides a way to perform such transformations for model using correlated inputs with usual distributions. In the following the original vector is denoted by **X** while its conterpart in the standard space is denoted by **U**. The two functions mistral::UtoX and mistral::XtoU let go from one representation to the other.

Let us detail the use of UtoX (and similarly of XtoU). The supported distributions are:

- Normal: defined by its mean and standard deviation
- Lognormal: defined by its internal parameters P1=meanlog and P2=sdlog (see *lnorm help page)
- Uniform: defined by its internal parameters P1=min and P2=max (see *unif help page)
- Gumbel: defined by its internal parameters P1 and P2
- Weibull: defined by its internal parameters P1=shape and P2=scale (see *weibull help page)
- Gamma: defined by its internal parameters P1=shape and P2=scale (see *gamma help page)
- Beta: defined by its internal parameters P1=shape1 and P2=shape2 (see *beta help page)

Let us define for instance a random vector \mathbf{X} in 2d such that its coordinates are standard Gaussian:

```
distX1 <- list(type='Norm', MEAN=0.0, STD=1.0, P1=NULL, P2=NULL, NAME='X1')
distX2 <- list(type='Norm', MEAN=0.0, STD=1.0, P1=NULL, P2=NULL, NAME='X2')
input.margin <- list(distX1,distX2)</pre>
```

and correlated $cor(X_1, X_2) = 0.5$:

then the function UtoX writes:

```
U <- rnorm(2)
U <- cbind(U, U)
X <- mistral::UtoX(U, input.margin, L0)
X</pre>
## [,1] [,2]
```

```
## [1,] -0.6737564 -0.6737564
## [2,] -0.3023166 -0.3023166
```

The function UtoX works with vectors or matrices and always returns a matrix. Eventually the limit-state function can be defined by:

```
lsf_U = function(U) {
    X <- mistral::UtoX(U, input.margin, L0)
    lsf(X)
}</pre>
```

Defining a proper limit-state function 1sf

All the methods implemented in mistral and presented in this vignette require that lsf be a function taking a matrix as input and returning a vector as output. Indeed, in order to allow for parallel computing, batches of points to be evaluated are given as a matrix of column vectors. Hence, depending on the processing capabilities and/or the implementation, computation of the model g on the points \mathbf{X} can be made a lot faster.

Let us define an easy 2-dimensional function:

```
lsf <- function(x){
   x[1] + x[2]
}</pre>
```

This function can be called onto a vector:

```
x <- c(1,2)
lsf(x)

## [1] 3

or a matrix:
x <- as.matrix(x)
lsf(x)</pre>
```

```
## [1] 3
```

However, one wants it to be able to address matrices with several columns representing different points:

```
x <- cbind(x,x)
lsf(x)</pre>
```

```
## [1] 3
```

This obviously does not provide the expected result. There are indeed several possibilities to make the example fit into our framework. In this simple case, one has an analytical expression of the function. This

can arise when using the package for educational/illustrative purpose. An easy way to fix that is then to redefine the function with \mathbf{x} as a matrix:

```
lsf <- function(x) {
   x[1,] + x[2,]
}
lsf(x)</pre>
```

[1] 3 3

Note here that the function considers each **column** as a single point. This is to be consistent with the default behaviour of as.matrix function:

```
x <- 1:2
as.matrix(x)

## [,1]
## [1,] 1
## [2,] 2</pre>
```

Now looking back at our function, one has:

```
x <- cbind(x,x)
lsf(x[,1])
```

```
## Error in x[1, ]: incorrect number of dimensions
```

The function returns an error because default R behaviour is to drop the dimensions when selecting only one column. All together, a robust way to define a function is to apply first as.matrix:

```
lsf <- function(x) {
    x <- as.matrix(x)
    x[1,] + x[2,]
}
lsf(x[,1])</pre>
```

[1] 3

In general (practical) settings, no analytical expression is available. Let us denote by myCode the given computer code. myCode is supposed to be able to be called onto a vector. Then the apply function can be used:

```
lsf <- function(x){
  x <- as.matrix(x)
  apply(x, 2, myCode)
}</pre>
```

When parallel computing is availble, it is then possible to make a parallel calculation of a batch of points given as a matrix. Let us give an example using the foreach and iterators packages (we recommand the user to read their very nice vignettes to get started with the foreach loop, which is useful not only for parallel computing but also as a nice alternative to the *apply family).

```
require(foreach)
```

Loading required package: foreach

```
lsf <- function(x){
  x <- as.matrix(x)
  foreach(x = iterators::iter(x, by = 'col'), .combine = 'c') %dopar% {
    myCode(x)</pre>
```

```
}
}
```

Short tutorial for using parallel computation with foreach

In the previous section we have shown how to use the foreach loop to define a well-suited function for using parallel computation. Indeed, foreach requires the initilisation of a parallel backend to run *effectively* in parallel. For instance, using the above code without further initilisation will issue a Warning:

```
myCode <- function(x) x[1] + x[2]
x <- 1:2
lsf(x)</pre>
```

```
## Warning: executing %dopar% sequentially: no parallel backend registered
## [1] 3
```

Basically, a parallel backend can be understood as a way of defining what *parallel* means for the (master) R session. The simplest, and not of great interest, backend is the *sequential* one:

```
foreach::registerDoSEQ()
```

This tells R that *parallel* means indeed usual sequential computation. However the interest of parallel computation is to run *simultaneously* several tasks.

With R, the management of these parallel tasks is let to the task manager of the used computer. In other words, initialising a parallel backend with R is only a easy way to launch several R sessions and to make them communicate. This means that there is no theoretical requirement for initialising a backend with a number of parallel workers equal to the number of physical cores of the machine. Eventually if more parallel tasks than real cores are initialised, the management of the tasks is let to the native task manager while if less workers are initialised, the foreach loop distributes the computational load.

There are two main possible frameworks for parallel computing: OpenMP and MPI. Without digging to much into the details, OpenMP lets you use the several cores of one given *computer* (one shared memory) while MPI allows for using several computers connected with a bus.

Let us first focus on OpenMP. Depending on the OS of the workstation (Windows or Mac/Linux), you can use either doSNOW or doMC. SNOW (Simple Network of Workstations) is available for both Windows and Unix OS. It requires to first create a cluster with base package parallel::makeCluster(). This means that the subsequent R sessions (slave sessions in parallel terminology) are created once for all in the beginning. It is like opening several R sessions by hand: looking at your task manager you will see as many R processes as the size of the requested cluster.

```
# return the number of cores of the computer
n <- parallel::detectCores()
# default behaviour if n not specified explained in the help page
cl <- parallel::makeCluster(1)
doSNOW::registerDoSNOW(cl)
# Control that everything is set properly
foreach::getDoParName()</pre>
```

```
## [1] "doSNOW"
foreach::getDoParWorkers()
```

```
## [1] 1
```

In the end, the cluster has to be closed with:

```
parallel::stopCluster(cl)
```

The other option for Unix OS is doMC. The main difference is that the cluster is made by *forking* the current master session, ie. that the sub-sessions are a copy of the current session, including all the variables defined in the .GlobalEnv. It is easier to initialise and more robust (SNOW can miss variable even though foreach tries an automatic export of the necessary ones):

```
doMC::registerDoMC(1)
# Control that everything is set properly
foreach::getDoParName()

## [1] "doMC"
foreach::getDoParWorkers()
```

[1] 1

Here there is no need to close the cluster because it is created on-the-fly for each instance of the foreach loop.

The initialisation of an MPI backend is rather similar to the one of a SNOW backend:

```
# instead of parallel::detectCores() to see the available number of MPI threads
Rmpi::mpi.universe.size()
cl <- doMPI::startMPIcluster()
doMPI::registerDoMPI(cl)</pre>
```

and similarly in the end:

```
doMPI::closeCluster(cl)
Rmpi::mpi.quit()
```

The interested reader is referred to the vignettes of the above mentionned packages for further explanations.

Statistical methods for uncertainty quantification

In this section, we describe the *purely* statistical methods proposed in mistral for uncertainty quantification. Indeed the uncertainty quantification problem is twofold:

- is there an analytical formula for the sought probability?
- is it possible to use the real model myCode or is it necessary to build a surrogate model?

The statistical methods aim at solving the first issue, ie. at estiamting the probability when no analytical expression is found.

Crude Monte Carlo method

The crude Monte Caro method is based on the Strong Law of Large Numbers. Basically it makes an average of independent and identically distributed (iid) samples. A basic way to implement it could be:

```
X \leftarrow matrix(rnorm(2e5), nrow = 2) # generate 1e5 standard Gaussian samples Y \leftarrow mistral::kiureghian(X) # evaluate to model to get 1e5 iid samples q \leftarrow 0 # define the threshold (p \leftarrow mean(Y < q)) # estimate P[g(X) < 0]
```

[1] 0.00329

The function mistral::MonteCarlo is a wrap-up of this simple algorithm. However, instead of specifying a given number of samples, it works iteratively by adding N_batch samples per iteration until a target precision precision on the probability estimation is reached (usually a coefficient of variation of 5 or 10%) or N_max samples have been simulated.

```
mc <- mistral::MonteCarlo(dimension = 2, lsf = mistral::kiureghian, N_max = 1e5, q = q,

# these first parameters are exactly the one used above

N_batch = 1e4) # define the batch size
```

```
##
            Beginning of Monte-Carlo algorithm
##
  ______
##
##
 ______
              End of Monte-Carlo algorithm
##
##
##
##
   -p = 0.00297
   -q=0
##
   - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.002625838 < p < 0.003314162
##
   -\cos = 0.05793965
##
   - Ncall = 1e+05
```

In this latter example, the target precision is not reached but the algorithm stopped because of the limit given by N_max. It is possible to set N_max = Inf:

```
##
  ______
##
                Beginning of Monte-Carlo algorithm
##
  ______
##
   * STEP 1 : FIRST SAMPLING AND ESTIMATION
##
   * STEP 2 : LOOP UNTIL COV < PRECISION
##
   * cov = 0.1737902 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
##
   * cov = 0.1219646 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
   * cov = 0.1018986 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
   * cov = 0.09039757 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
##
   * cov = 0.08019734 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
##
  * cov = 0.07281815 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
  * cov = 0.06597368 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
   * cov = 0.06191651 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
##
   * cov = 0.0593503 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
  * cov = 0.05670808 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
  * cov = 0.05504928 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
   * cov = 0.05277275 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
##
   * cov = 0.05075714 > 0.05 and Inf remaining calls to the LSF
  ______
##
                  End of Monte-Carlo algorithm
##
  ______
##
##
    -p = 0.002921429
    -q=0
##
    - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.00263294
```

```
## - cov = 0.04937454
## - Ncall = 140000
```


and total number of calls (simulated samples) is 1.4×10^5 .

As for the base *cdf* functions p**** (pnorm, plnorm, punif...) the statistical methods of mistral integrate a lower.tail parameter specifying which tail is to be estimated:

- lower.tail = TRUE means that one estimates P[g(X) < q]
- lower.tail = FALSE means instead P[g(X) > q]

For illustrative purpose it is also possible to plot the contour of the limit-state function. All mistral functions let draw samples and contour with ggplot2 functions even though this can be quite memory and time demanding:

```
## ------
## Beginning of Monte-Carlo algorithm
## =-----
```




```
## - cov = 0.195861
## - Ncall = 10000
```

The MonteCarlo method also returns the empirical cdf of the real-valued random variable $Y = g(\mathbf{X})$ (similarly to the base stats::ecdf function):

```
require(ggplot2)
```

```
## Loading required package: ggplot2
## Warning: package 'ggplot2' was built under R version 3.3.2
y = seq(-5, 10, 1 = 200)
ggplot(data.frame(y=y, ecdf = mc$ecdf(y)), aes(y,ecdf)) + geom_line()
```



Subset Simulation method

As visible in the Monte Carlo method plot, this method is quite inefficient because it samples a lot in the safety domain (the red dots). To circumvent this limitation, the splitting method, also called *Subset Simulation* and implemented as mistral::SubsetSimulation works iteratively on the threshold q. Instead of trying to estimate directly P[g(X) < q] it creates a sequence of intermediate thresholds (q_i) such that the conditional probabilities are not too small. Hence, instead of simulating new iid N_batch it resamples the N_batch using Markov Chain drawing conditionally to be greater than a threshold defined as the p_0 empirical quantile of the previous batch.

```
##
                Beginning of Subset Simulation algorithm
##
  ______
##
     - q 0 = 2.985188
##
     -P = 0.1
     -q0 = 1.028202
##
##
     -P = 0.01
##
     - q_0 = 0
     -P = 0.003141
##
##
##
                 End of Subset Simulation algorithm
##
##
     -p = 0.003141
##
     - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.002858773 < p < 0.003423227
##
##
     -\cos = 0.04492627
     - Ncall = 410000
```

Note here that the total number of calls Ncall is much bigger than 3 x N. Indeed the conditional sampling with Markov Chain drawing requires to retain only one over thinning = 20 samples. In the end in this example it makes a total of $10^4 + 2 \times 20 \times 10^4 = 410000$. As a matter of fact a naive Monte Carlo estimator with the same computational budget (ie. 410000 samples) would have produced an estimator with a coefficient of variation:

$$cov \approx \sqrt{\frac{1}{p \times 410000}} = 0.027866$$

As a rule of thumbs when the sought probability is greater than 10^{-3} it is more efficient to use a crude Monte Carlo method than a advanced *Splitting* method¹.

Moving Particles

In the usual Subset Simulation method the cutoff probability for defining the intermediate thresholds is set to $p_0 = 0.1$. Hence at a given iteration N samples are generated conditionally greater than this empirical quantile. However, it has been shown that it is statistically optimal (total number of generated samples against coefficient of variation of the final estimator) to resample these N particles according to **their own** level. It means that instead of using the N-sample $(Y_i)_{i=1}^N = (g(\mathbf{X}_i))_{i=1}^N$ to estimate a p_0 quantile for Y, each \mathbf{X}_i is resampled conditionally to be greater than Y_i .

More precisely, the Moving Particle method aims at simulating independent and identically distributed (iid) realisations of a given random walk over the real-valued output $Y = g(\mathbf{X})$. This random walk is defined as follows: $Y_0 = -\infty$ and

$$Y_{n+1} \sim Y|Y > Y_n$$

In other words, each element is generated conditionally greater than the previous one. This random walk is a Poisson process and lets build true counterparts of the crude Monte Carlo estimators of a probability, of a quantile or of the cdf of Y.

Since the algorithm generates iid realisations of such a random walk, it is especially suited for using with parallel computing. Hence the code includes a foreach loop and will directly benefit from a parallel backend.

¹this rule depends on the thinning parameter.

```
##
   ### PARALLEL PART ###
##
   * backend:
   * N.batch = 1
##
## Warning: executing %dopar% sequentially: no parallel backend registered
  ______
##
                     End of MP algorithm
##
##
##
    -p = 0.002970145
    -q=0
##
    - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.00185114 
##
    - Total number of calls = 11680
```


One can compare this result with the one got from SubsetSimulation in terms of coefficient of variation against total number of calls.

```
ss$cov^2*ss$Ncall / (mp$cov^2*sum(mp$Ncall))
```

[1] 1.221557

The MP method not only returns an estimation of the sought probability p but also an empirical cdf of $Y = g(\mathbf{X})$ over the interval $[q, \infty)$ (with lower.tail = TRUE, the complementary cdf over $(-\infty, q]$ otherwise).

```
y = seq(0, 10, 1 = 200)
ggplot(data.frame(y=y, ecdf = mp$ecdf(y)), aes(y,ecdf)) + geom_line()
```



The empirical cdf is vectorized over q and returns a NA when the value is not in the right interval. It can also

be used to estimate a quantile:

```
mp \leftarrow mistral::MP(dimension = 2, lsf = mistral::kiureghian, p = mp$p, N = 1e2)
                  Beginning of MP algorithm
##
##
  ______
##
  STEP 1: MOVE PARTICLES A GIVEN NUMBER OF TIMES
##
  ##
##
##
  * Number of deterministic event per algorithm = 582
##
##
  ### PARALLEL PART ###
  * backend:
##
##
  * N.batch = 1
##
##
  _____
  STEP 2 : RESTART ALGORITHM UNTIL -0.3190821
##
##
  _____
##
##
  ### PARALLEL PART ###
##
  * backend:
  * N.batch = 1
##
##
##
  ______
##
                   End of MP algorithm
  ______
##
##
##
    -p = 0.002970145
    -q = -0.2438155
##
##
    - 95% confidence intervalle : NA < q < 0.1457947
    - Maximum number of moves/algorithm = 582
##
    -L_{max} = -0.3190821
##
##
    - Number of moves = 584
    - Targeted number of moves = 582
##
    - Total number of calls = 11760
```

This latter estimation also enables parallel computation but in a 2-step algorithm. The empirical *cdf* is estimated until the farthest *state* reached by the iid random walks. Note also that the condifence interval requires to run the algorithm a little bit longer and thus is optional: default parameter compute_confidence = FALSE.

```
* backend:
##
##
   * N.batch = 1
##
##
##
   STEP 2: RESTART ALGORITHM UNTIL -0.7064297
   _____
##
##
##
   ### PARALLEL PART ###
##
   * backend:
##
   * N.batch = 1
##
##
                      End of MP algorithm
##
##
  ______
##
##
    -p = 0.002970145
     -q = -0.2969594
##
##
     - 95% confidence intervalle : -0.6698008 < q < 0.1753014
##
     - Maximum number of moves/algorithm = 630
##
     -L \max = -0.7064297
##
     - Number of moves = 632
##
     - Targeted number of moves = 630
     - Total number of calls = 12720
##
```

Finally, the conditional sampling for the MP method also requires Markov Chain drawing and the same disclaimer as for the SubsetSimulation applies: this method is really worth for $p < 10^{-3}$.

Metamodel based algorithms

In the previous section, we have shown some statistical tools to estimate probability, quantile and cdf with a given function g. However, these statistics still require a lot a calls to the model g. Thus it may be necessary to approximate it, ie. to learn it with some of its input-output couples $(\mathbf{X}_i, Y_i)_i$.

In mistral there are basically three types of metamodel implemented:

- linear model: the FORM method replaces the model g with a hyperplane crossing the so-called Most Probable Failure Point. This point is, in the standard space, the failing sample the closest to the origin.
- Support-Vector Machine (SVM): this classifier is used in the S2MART method and relies on the e1071::svm function.
- Gaussian process regession; this is used in MetaIS, AKMCS and BMP. Here the model g is replaced by a
 Gaussian random process with known distribution. The regression is carried out using the DiceKriging
 package.

Short tutorial on the metamodels used

Support-Vector Machine

A Support-Vector Machine is a surrogate model which aims at **classifying** the samples of the input space according to some labels attached on it. In our context the label is straightforward: failing or safety domain. From a bunch of input-outputs couples, it builds a frontier and lets classify any new sample **X**.

When talking about SVM, one often makes mention of the *kernel trick*. Indeed the SVM was initially build as a linear classifier, ie that it looked for an hyperplane separating the input space into two subspaces, each one being related to a given label. However this was far too constraining. The use of a kernel instead of the natural inner product lets build more complex non-linear classifiers.

```
require(e1071)
X \leftarrow data.frame(x1 = rnorm(100), x2 = rnorm(100))
Y <- rowSums(X^2)
(svm.model <- svm(X, (Y>1), type = "C-classification"))
##
## Call:
## svm.default(x = X, y = (Y > 1), type = "C-classification")
##
##
## Parameters:
      SVM-Type: C-classification
##
   SVM-Kernel: radial
##
##
          cost: 1
##
         gamma: 0.5
##
## Number of Support Vectors: 42
X.test <- data.frame(x1=rnorm(1), x2=rnorm(1))</pre>
predict(svm.model, X.test)
##
      1
## TRUE
## Levels: FALSE TRUE
sum(X.test^2)
## [1] 6.729114
```

The interested reader is referred to the e1071::svm vignette for more details about SVM.

Kriging

-----## * estimation method

: MLE

Kriging refers to the case where the computer code g is seen as a specific realisation of a random process with known distribution.

In computer experiement, this random process is always supposed to be Gaussian. Furthermore, the parameters of the random process covariance are usually estimated with a plug-in approach: in a first step the model is fitted with some data (with Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Cross-Validation for instance). Then they are supposed to be known and thus the distribution of the process at any point \mathbf{x} is Gaussian with known mean and variance.

These quantities are referred to as the kriging mean and the kriging variance. While the first one usually serves as a cheap surrogate model for g, the second one lets characterise the *precision* of the prediction. Especially Kriging interpolates the data: the kriging variance at known location is 0.

```
require(DiceKriging)

## Loading required package: DiceKriging

X <- data.frame(x1 = rnorm(100), x2 = rnorm(100))

Y <- rowSums(X^2)

km.model <- km(design = X, response = Y)

##

## optimisation start</pre>
```

```
## * optimisation method : BFGS
## * analytical gradient : used
## * trend model : ~1
## * covariance model :
##
     - type : matern5_2
##
     - nugget : NO
     - parameters lower bounds : 1e-10 1e-10
##
     - parameters upper bounds : 10.92462 10.88048
##
     - best initial criterion value(s): 440.3613
##
## N = 2, M = 5 machine precision = 2.22045e-16
## At XO, O variables are exactly at the bounds
## At iterate
                  0 f=
                             -440.36 |proj g|=
                                                       1,2077
## At iterate
                  1 f =
                              -452.32 |proj g|=
##
## iterations 1
## function evaluations 2
## segments explored during Cauchy searches 2
## BFGS updates skipped 0
## active bounds at final generalized Cauchy point 2
## norm of the final projected gradient 0
## final function value -452.318
##
## F = -452.318
## final value -452.317540
## converged
x.new <- data.frame(x1=rnorm(1), x2=rnorm(1))</pre>
print(sum(x.new^2))
## [1] 1.336991
predict(km.model, x.new, type = "UK")[c('mean', 'sd')]
## $mean
## [1] 1.337026
##
## $sd
## [1] 0.0002365035
```

The FORM method

The mistral::FORM function always tries to estimate $P[g(\mathbf{X}) < 0]$ with \mathbf{X} in the standard space. As for statistical methods, mistral::UtoX can be used to transform the original limit-state function onto a suitable one.

Furthermore the limit-state function may have to be modified to fit the used framework: say for instance that one wants to estimate $P[g(\mathbf{X}) > q]$, then one should define:

```
lsf.FORM = function(x) {
  q - g(x)
}
```

The FORM function requires two parameters: a starting point for the research of the Most Probable Failing Point u.dep and a total number of calls N.calls:

```
form <- mistral::FORM(dimension = 2, mistral::kiureghian, N.calls = 1000, u.dep = c(0,0)) form$p
```

[1] 0.001832186

The FORM method gives an analytical expression of the sought probability replacing the true model g with the found hyperplane. However, mistral::FORM also implements an Importance Sampling scheme. Instead of using this ready-made formula, it makes an IS estimation with a Gaussian standard proposal distribution centred at the MPFP.

[1] 0.001976596

In this latter case, the variance and the confidence interval at 95% are given in output. Note however that the estimated variance may be far from the real one.

The MetaIS method

MetaIS, for Metamodel-based Importance Sampling, is another metamodelling technique using a surrogate model in addition to an importance sampling scheme. Here, instead of using the input distribution only re-centred at the MPFP, the optimal (zero-variance) importance distribution is approximated with a Kriging-based surrogate model.

More precisely, recall that the optimal distibution is given by:

$$\pi(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1_{g(\mathbf{x}) > q}}{P[g(\mathbf{X}) > q]}$$

the hard indicator function $1_{q(\mathbf{x})>q}$ is replaced by its kriging counterpart:

$$\tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{x}) = P[\xi(\mathbf{x}) > q]$$

where ξ is the Gaussian process modelling the uncertainty on the computer code g. With the Gaussian hypothesis, its distribution is known.

The algorithm is then twofold: first the Gaussian process is learnt, with means that input-output samples are calculated to get a conditional distribution of the process. Then a usual Importance Sampling scheme is run. The points added iteratively to the Design of Experiments (DoE) are chosen by clustering samples generated into the margin. When several calls to g can be made in parallel, several points can then be added to the DoE simultaneously by chosing the number of cluster $K_alphal00$ accordingly.

The enrichment step stops either when the stopping criterion is reached or when the total given number of samples is simulated. Then few other calls to q have to made for the Importance Sampling estimator.

```
##
  A- REFINEMENT OF PROBABILISTIC CLASSIFICATION FUNCTION PI
##
    _____
##
##
## FIRST DoE
  -----
## ITERATION 1
  -----
## ITERATION 2
## ITERATION 3
## ITERATION 4
##
## ITERATION 5
## ITERATION 6
##
##
##
  B- ESTIMATE AUGMENTED FAILURE PROBABILITY USING MC ESTIMATOR
##
    ______
##
  P epsilon = 0.002339153
##
  cov_epsilon = 0.03579131
##
##
  _____
  STEP 2: Adaptative importance sampling scheme
 ______
##
##
  alpha = 1.051986
  cov_alpha = 0.03346861
##
  ______
##
               End of Meta-IS algorithm
##
  ______
##
##
    - P_{epsilon} = 0.002339153
    - 95% conf. interv. on P_epsilon: 0.002171711 
##
##
    - alpha = 1.051986
##
    - 95% conf. interv. on alpha: 0.9815687 < alpha < 1.122403
##
    -p = 0.002460756
    -95\% conf. interv. on p: 0.002219521 < p < 0.00270199
```

The AKMCS method

AKMCS, for Active learning using Kriging an Monte Carlo Simulation, is an other kriging-based approach. Instead of using the Gaussian process to define a Importance density, it uses the Kriging mean as a cheap surrogate for the computer code g in a crude Monte Carlo estimator.

The originality and the efficiency of the AKMCS method comes from the fact that it samples **from the beginning** the Monte Carlo population and then focus on *learning* this population instead of the whole input space. The learning step is then an iterative search of the *more uncertain* points.

Note however that this discretisation makes the algorithm generating quite huge matrices and can lead to memory issues for extreme probabilities $p < 10^{<-5}$.

```
akmcs <- mistral::AKMCS(dimension = 2, lsf = mistral::waarts, N = 3e5, plot = TRUE, Nmax = 10)
##
                   Beginning of AK-MCS algorithm
  ______
   _____
   STEP 1 : GENERATION OF THE WORKING POPULATION
##
   _____
##
##
##
   ===========
##
   STEP 2 : FIRST DoE
## Warning: Quick-TRANSfer stage steps exceeded maximum (= 15000000)
    - minimum value of the criterion = 1.97357 estimated in 4.683 sec. with 1 worker(s)
  Warning: Not possible to generate contour data
##
   STEP 3 : UPDATE THE DoE
   _____
##
## Warning: Not possible to generate contour data
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.001855603 estimated in 4.16 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.006581695 estimated in 4.68 sec. with 1 worker(s)
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.0001506021 estimated in 4.182 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.001472631 estimated in 4.299 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.01484773 estimated in 4.418 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.01039495 estimated in 4.32 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.003436673 estimated in 4.827 sec. with 1 worker(s)
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.001034721 estimated in 4.739 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.0143589 estimated in 4.695 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
     - minimum value of the criterion = 0.01153575 estimated in 4.998 sec. with 1 worker(s)
##
##
   _____
   STEP 4: EVALUATE FAILURE PROBABILITY
##
   _____
##
##
     -p = 0.001172366
##
     - failure = 0
##
     - 95% confidence interval on Monte Carlo estimate: 0.001047413 < p < 0.001297319
##
   * cov = 0.05329089
     => cov too large; this order of magnitude for the probability brings N = 340791
##
```

The S2MART method

 S^2MART , for Subset by Support vector Margin Algorithm for Reliability esTimation, is combination of a statistical technique called Subset Simulation (see above) and a learning approache based on Support

Vector Machines.s

The core concept is to used a *small* population in the Subset Simulation algorithm in order to define the sequence of intermediate thresholds. But instead of estimating the conditional probability directly with the *iid* population, it starts a learning algorithm based on SVM, originally called SMART on the current threshold. In the end, the conditional probability is estimated with the boundary predicted by the SVM instead of using the code g. Note that this original method, referred to as SMART is accessible directly by using the triple dot command: mistral:::SMART although it is not recommended by the author.

This sequential approache allows this method to be used for extreme event, unlike AKMCS for instance. In the end, a lot of practical parameters can be set but default values are the ones set up by the author and should be modified very carefully as their meaning and impact is rather unclear.

```
______
##
           Beginning of S2MART algorithm
##
      _____
##
##
   SUBSET NUMBER 1
##
   -----
   * y = 1.58133
##
##
  ##
    Beginning of SMART algorithm
##
  _____
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
##
   STEP 2: REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
##
##
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
   STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
  ##
##
       End of SMART algorithm
##
  ##
   * proba = 0.120995
   * cov = 0.006026941
##
##
##
   * Current threshold = 1.58133 > -2 => start a new subset
##
     - Current probability = 0.120995
    - Current number of call = 182
##
##
   SUBSET NUMBER 2
##
##
  Warning: executing %dopar% sequentially: no parallel backend registered
##
     - 700 points generated in 1.506 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
```

```
- 0 duplicated samples
## * y = 0.3529304
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## =============
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
## ==============
##
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
     - 15616 points generated in 27.255 sec. with 7808 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 68 duplicated samples
  STEP 2 : REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
##
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
      - 15616 points generated in 29.129 sec. with 7808 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
##
     - 61 duplicated samples
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
      - 15616 points generated in 28.073 sec. with 7808 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 56 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
      - 78296 points generated in 147.542 sec. with 39148 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinnin
##
     - 340 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 78296 points generated in 166.523 sec. with 39148 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinni
##
     - 333 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
     - 217791 points generated in 547.859 sec. with 24199 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
##
     - 51677 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 217791 points generated in 558.497 sec. with 24199 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
     - 51847 duplicated samples
##
## STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1572935 points generated in 4096.791 sec. with 24199 seeds, 2e+05 points kept: burnin = 20 th
     - 1934 duplicated samples
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
##
     - MC_est = 0.061765
## =============
##
        End of SMART algorithm
## =============
##
   * proba = 0.061765
##
   * cov = 0.008715044
##
##
   * Current threshold = 0.3529304 > -2 \Rightarrow start a new subset
     - Current probability = 0.007473256
##
     - Current number of call = 363
##
##
##
   SUBSET NUMBER 3
##
##
     - 700 points generated in 1.692 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
```

##

- 4 duplicated samples

```
## * y = -0.1740052
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## ==============
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
## ===========
##
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
##
     - 11658 points generated in 25.541 sec. with 5829 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 207 duplicated samples
## STEP 2 : REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
     - 11658 points generated in 24.342 sec. with 5829 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 220 duplicated samples
##
  * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
     - 11658 points generated in 24.192 sec. with 5829 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 227 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 58368 points generated in 121.081 sec. with 29184 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 1198 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
##
     - 58368 points generated in 121.181 sec. with 29184 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinni
##
     - 1187 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 209814 points generated in 529.349 sec. with 12342 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
     - 77077 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 209814 points generated in 536.238 sec. with 12342 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
     - 77015 duplicated samples
##
## all switching points are kept
  STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1295910 points generated in 3269.911 sec. with 12342 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 20 th
     - 6111 duplicated samples
##
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
     - MC est = 0.17722
## =============
        End of SMART algorithm
## ==============
   * proba = 0.17722
   * cov = 0.004818041
##
##
##
   * Current threshold = -0.1740052 > -2 => start a new subset
##
     - Current probability = 0.00132441
##
     - Current number of call = 544
##
## SUBSET NUMBER 4
```

```
- 700 points generated in 1.598 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
     - 6 duplicated samples
##
## * y = -0.9184468
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## =============
##
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
## ============
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
     - 14356 points generated in 29.514 sec. with 7178 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
##
     - 213 duplicated samples
   STEP 2 : REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
     - 14356 points generated in 29.496 sec. with 7178 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
##
     - 238 duplicated samples
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
##
     - 14356 points generated in 28.787 sec. with 7178 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 236 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
     - 70846 points generated in 146.777 sec. with 35423 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinning
     - 1131 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 70846 points generated in 144.748 sec. with 35423 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinni
##
##
     - 1154 duplicated samples
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 212274 points generated in 465.043 sec. with 35379 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
##
     - 74644 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 212274 points generated in 490.792 sec. with 35379 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
     - 74498 duplicated samples
##
  STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1768950 points generated in 4065.731 sec. with 35379 seeds, 2e+05 points kept: burnin = 20 th
##
     - 7362 duplicated samples
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
##
     - MC est = 0.059625
## =============
##
        End of SMART algorithm
## ==============
   * proba = 0.059625
##
   * cov = 0.008880171
##
   * Current threshold = -0.9184468 > -2 => start a new subset
##
     - Current probability = 7.896797e-05
##
     - Current number of call = 725
##
##
## SUBSET NUMBER 5
##
     - 700 points generated in 1.507 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
##
```

```
- 6 duplicated samples
## * y = -1.404828
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## =============
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
## ==============
##
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
     - 14808 points generated in 37.628 sec. with 4936 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 474 duplicated samples
  STEP 2 : REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
##
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
      - 14808 points generated in 37.688 sec. with 4936 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 439 duplicated samples
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
     - 14808 points generated in 38.236 sec. with 4936 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 438 duplicated samples
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
##
     - 51006 points generated in 110.413 sec. with 25503 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 2547 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 51006 points generated in 114.666 sec. with 25503 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinni
##
     - 2473 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
     - 202215 points generated in 476.015 sec. with 11895 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
##
     - 96853 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 202215 points generated in 474.849 sec. with 11895 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
     - 96868 duplicated samples
##
## STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1248975 points generated in 2785.468 sec. with 11895 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 20 th
     - 12774 duplicated samples
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
##
     - MC_est = 0.165645
## =============
##
        End of SMART algorithm
## =============
##
   * proba = 0.165645
##
   * cov = 0.005018469
##
##
   * Current threshold = -1.404828 > -2 \Rightarrow start a new subset
     - Current probability = 1.308065e-05
##
     - Current number of call = 906
##
##
##
   SUBSET NUMBER 6
##
##
     - 700 points generated in 1.594 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
```

##

- 7 duplicated samples

```
## * v = -1.917505
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## ==============
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
## =============
##
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
##
     - 10496 points generated in 21.4 sec. with 5248 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning =
##
     - 636 duplicated samples
  STEP 2 : REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
##
     - 10496 points generated in 21.64 sec. with 5248 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 665 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
     - 10496 points generated in 21.212 sec. with 5248 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 688 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 74271 points generated in 186.955 sec. with 24757 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 3412 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
     - 74271 points generated in 184.893 sec. with 24757 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinni
##
     - 3399 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 230930 points generated in 480.021 sec. with 32990 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
     - 86158 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 230930 points generated in 479.202 sec. with 32990 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
     - 86236 duplicated samples
  STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1814450 points generated in 3792.73 sec. with 32990 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 20 this
##
     - 12570 duplicated samples
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
##
     - MC_{est} = 0.12977
## =============
##
        End of SMART algorithm
## =============
   * proba = 0.12977
##
   * cov = 0.005790484
##
##
   * Current threshold = -1.917505 > -2 => start a new subset
     - Current probability = 1.697476e-06
##
     - Current number of call = 1087
##
##
   SUBSET NUMBER 7
##
##
##
     - 700 points generated in 1.482 sec. with 10 seeds, 100 points kept : burnin = 20 thinning = 4
     - 11 duplicated samples
##
```

* y = -2.234664

```
- y<-2 => last subset & y = -2
## Warning in data.row.names(row.names, rowsi, i): some row.names duplicated:
## 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,
## --> row.names NOT used
## =============
     Beginning of SMART algorithm
##
  ##
   STEP 1 : EVALUATION OF A FIRST METAMODEL
##
     - 12392 points generated in 34.24 sec. with 3098 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 1140 duplicated samples
   STEP 2: REFINEMENT PROCEDURE
   * ITERATION 1 of 6 : Localisation stage
##
##
     - 12392 points generated in 35.009 sec. with 3098 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
     - 1090 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 2 of 6 : Localisation stage
     - 12392 points generated in 33.935 sec. with 3098 seeds, 10000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 1170 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 3 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
     - 63004 points generated in 172.563 sec. with 15751 seeds, 50000 points kept : burnin = 0 thinning
##
     - 5624 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 4 of 6 : Stabilisation stage
##
##
     - 63004 points generated in 173.555 sec. with 15751 seeds, 50000 points kept: burnin = 0 thinni
##
     - 5610 duplicated samples
##
   * ITERATION 5 of 6 : Convergence stage
     - 206640 points generated in 426.644 sec. with 25830 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
     - 97519 duplicated samples
##
##
   * ITERATION 6 of 6 : Convergence stage
##
     - 206640 points generated in 427.287 sec. with 25830 seeds, 2e+05 points kept : burnin = 0 thinn
##
     - 97523 duplicated samples
   STEP 3 : FAILURE PROBABILITY ESTIMATION
##
     - 1549800 points generated in 3221.668 sec. with 25830 seeds, 2e+05 points kept: burnin = 20 th
##
     - 15812 duplicated samples
##
##
   * Calculate Monte-Carlo estimator
##
     - MC_est = 0.696045
## =============
##
        End of SMART algorithm
## =============
##
   * proba = 0.696045
##
   * cov = 0.001477648
##
##
   * Current threshold = -2 => end of the algorithm
     - Final probability = 1.18152e-06
##
     - Total number of call = 1268
##
```

The BMP method

The BMP method is a Bayesian version of the previous MP algorithm. Indeed, in this algorithm, the code g is considered as a Gaussian random process ξ . Given a database of input-ouput couples, it is possible to estimate probability, quantile and moment of the *augmented* real-valued random variable $Y = \xi(\mathbf{X})$:

- X is the random vector of intputs
- ξ is a Gaussian random process embedding the uncertainty on the code g
- Y|X is a Gaussian random variable

* parallel backend version:

- number of workers: 1

##

##

• $P[Y > q] = \int_{\mathbb{X}} P[Y > q | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}] d\mu^X(\mathbf{x})$

For instance one can use the database created by the AKMCS method stored in the output akmcs:

```
bmp <- mistral::BMP(dimension = 2, lsf = mistral::waarts, q = 0, N = 100,</pre>
              N.iter = 0, learn_db = akmcs$learn_db, y = akmcs$lsf_value)
##
            Beginning of BMP algorithm
  _____
##
  * parallel backend registered: FALSE
##
  * parallel backend version:
##
    - number of workers: 1
##
  BEGINNING: FIRST DoE given in inputs: 30 samples
##
##
  _____
##
##
  * 30 points added to the model in 0.145 sec
##
    - covtype = matern5_2
    - coef.cov = 1.800358 1.962601
##
##
    - coef.var = 0.9178226
##
    - coef.trend = 0
  ##
##
  ENRICHMENT STEP: O samples to be added to the DoE
  ##
##
##
  * Final Poisson process N = 100 generated in 7.52 sec with 1 workers
  _____
##
##
                 End of BMP algorithm
##
##
##
  * Current alpha estimate = 0.001545487
  * Current cv estimate = 0.2544094
##
  * Current h estimate = 0.3305312
##
  * Current I estimate = 1.510334
##
    - alpha = 0.001545487
##
    - cv = 0.2544094
    -q=0
##
##
    - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.0009291548 < alpha < 0.002570648
    - Total number of calls = 30
The method can also be used, as the other one, to learn the metamodel:
bmp <- mistral::BMP(dimension = 2, lsf = mistral::waarts, q = -4, N = 100,</pre>
              N.iter = 2, plot = TRUE)
Beginning of BMP algorithm
* parallel backend registered: FALSE
##
```

```
BEGINNING: FIRST DoE with uniform design: 10 samples
##
   ______
##
##
  * 10 points added to the model in 0.079 sec
##
     - covtype = matern5_2
##
     - coef.cov = 0.3910832 22.98272
     - coef.var = 1.788158
##
     - coef.trend = 4
##
## Warning: Not possible to generate contour data
   _____
## ENRICHMENT STEP: 2 samples to be added to the DoE
  ______
##
## Remaining iter. : 2
  * Poisson process N = 100 generated in 1.346 sec with 1 workers
## * Current alpha estimate = 0.1063282
## * Current cv estimate = 0.1497072
## * Current h estimate = 0.6018658
  * Current I estimate = 0.741563
## * Evaluation of SUR criterion: integrated = TRUE, r = 1, approx = FALSE, approx.pnorm = FALSE, opti
## * SUR criterion: 323 points tested in 1.935 sec
## * Call the lsf on the proposed point(s)
   * Lsf evaluated in 0 sec
##
  * 1 points added to the model in 0.072 sec
    - covtype = matern5_2
##
     - coef.cov = 4.740902 \ 4.833794
     - coef.var = 4.49398
##
     - coef.trend = 4
## Remaining iter. : 1
   * Poisson process N = 100 generated in 7.834 sec with 1 workers
## * Current alpha estimate = 9.183634e-06
## * Current cv estimate = 0.3405597
## * Current h estimate = 0.9677711
   * Current I estimate = 8.474761
## * Evaluation of SUR criterion: integrated = TRUE, r = 1, approx = FALSE, approx.pnorm = FALSE, opti
## * SUR criterion: 1254 points tested in 30.241 sec
## * Call the lsf on the proposed point(s)
## * Lsf evaluated in 0 sec
## * 1 points added to the model in 0.075 sec
    - covtype = matern5_2
##
##
     - coef.cov = 5.304717 3.823271
##
     - coef.var = 3.798878
     - coef.trend = 4
##
## Warning: Not possible to generate contour data
## * Final Poisson process N = 100 generated in 5.023 sec with 1 workers
End of BMP algorithm
##
## * Current alpha estimate = 0.0002431874
## * Current cv estimate = 0.2884732
```

```
## * Current h estimate = 0.9773246
## * Current I estimate = 5.623371
## - alpha = 0.0002431874
- cv = 0.2884732
## - q = -4
## - 95% confidence intervalle : 0.0001365767 < alpha < 0.0004330178
## - Total number of calls = 12</pre>
```

In this latter case, the learning step is driven with the minimisation at each iteration of the integrated criterion I. This can be chosen with the argument sur. This integrated criterion is especially interesting when the sought probability is extreme. In this context, BMP is a preferred alternative to S2MART.

Note also that the estimation of quantities h and I can also be done in AKMCS and MetaIS at each iteration with their parameter sur=TRUE (default is sur=FALSE) to monitor the learning of the Gaussian process and to compare the different learning strategies.

Conclusion

In this vignette we wanted to present some of the methods implemented in mistral for reliability analysis. Precisely we focused on methods designed to estimate a probability of the code exceeding a given threshold.

In this setting, all the statistical and/or metamodel-based algorithms have proven in some cases good efficiency, though some of them are quite time consumming. In this context it should be remembered that they are defined considering that the calls to the limit-state functions are the only important parts while it can appear indeed that all the *side computations* take indeed much more time. The method should then be choosen accordingly. Especially in this vignette some parameters are very low to save computational time on laptop and should be increased for real experiments (see S2MART for instance).

Amongst all the strategies proposed in this package, the Moving Particles and Bayesian Moving Particles are the only one not only focusing on the given threshold but delivering an uncertainty quantification for the random output until this threshold. This means that the output is not a given probability but an estimation of the cdf of the unknown real-valued random variable.

The interested reader is referred to the academic papers for a deeper understanding of the algorithms and to the package documentation for a comprehensive list of the involved parameters. "'