

# Week 11, March 11-15: Resampling Techniques, Bootstrap and Blocking

Morten Hjorth-Jensen Email [morten.hjorth-jensen@fys.uio.no](mailto:morten.hjorth-jensen@fys.uio.no)<sup>1,2</sup>

Department of Physics and Center for Computing in Science Education, University  
of Oslo, Oslo, Norway<sup>1</sup>

Department of Physics and Astronomy and Facility for Rare Ion Beams, Michigan  
State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA<sup>2</sup>

March 11-15

© 1999-2024, Morten Hjorth-Jensen Email [morten.hjorth-jensen@fys.uio.no](mailto:morten.hjorth-jensen@fys.uio.no). Released under CC

Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 license

# Overview of week 11, March 11-15

## Topics

1. Reminder from last week about statistical observables, the central limit theorem and bootstrapping, see notes from last week
2. Resampling TechniquesL Blocking
3. Discussion of onebody densities
4. Start discussion on optimization and parallelization

## Teaching Material, videos and written material

- ▶ Overview video on the Bootstrap method
- ▶ Marius Johnson's Master thesis on the Blocking Method

# Why resampling methods ?

## Statistical analysis

- ▶ Our simulations can be treated as *computer experiments*. This is particularly the case for Monte Carlo methods
- ▶ The results can be analysed with the same statistical tools as we would use analysing experimental data.
- ▶ As in all experiments, we are looking for expectation values and an estimate of how accurate they are, i.e., possible sources for errors.

# Statistical analysis

- ▶ As in other experiments, many numerical experiments have two classes of errors:
  1. Statistical errors
  2. Systematical errors
- ▶ Statistical errors can be estimated using standard tools from statistics
- ▶ Systematical errors are method specific and must be treated differently from case to case.

## And why do we use such methods?

As you will see below, due to correlations between various measurements, we need to evaluate the so-called covariance in order to establish a proper evaluation of the total variance and the thereby the standard deviation of a given expectation value.

The covariance however, leads to an evaluation of a double sum over the various stochastic variables. This becomes computationally too expensive to evaluate. Methods like the Bootstrap, the Jackknife and/or Blocking allow us to circumvent this problem.

## Central limit theorem

Last week we derived the central limit theorem with the following assumptions:

### Measurement $i$

We assumed that each individual measurement  $x_{ij}$  is represented by stochastic variables which independent and identically distributed (iid). This defined the sample mean of of experiment  $i$  with  $n$  samples as

$$\bar{x}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j x_{ij}.$$

and the sample variance

$$\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j (x_{ij} - \bar{x}_i)^2.$$

Note that we use  $n$  instead of  $n - 1$  in the definition of variance. The sample variance and mean are not necessarily equal to the exact values we would get if we knew the corresponding probability distribution.

# Running many measurements

## Adding $m$ measurements $i$

With the assumption that the average measurements  $i$  are also defined as iid stochastic variables and have the same probability function  $p$ , we defined the total average over  $m$  experiments as

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i \bar{x}_i.$$

and the total variance

$$\sigma_m^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{X})^2.$$

These are the quantities we used in showing that if the individual mean values are iid stochastic variables, then in the limit  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the distribution for  $\bar{X}$  is given by a Gaussian distribution with variance  $\sigma_m^2$ .

## Adding more definitions

The total sample variance over the  $mn$  measurements is defined as

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (x_{ij} - \bar{X})^2.$$

We have from the equation for  $\sigma_m^2$

$$\bar{x}_i - \bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (x_{ij} - \bar{X}),$$

and introducing the centered value  $\tilde{x}_{ij} = x_{ij} - \bar{X}$ , we can rewrite  $\sigma_m^2$  as

$$\sigma_m^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{X})^2 = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{x}_{ij} \right]^2.$$



## Further rewriting

We can rewrite the latter in terms of a sum over diagonal elements only and another sum which contains the non-diagonal elements

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_m^2 &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ \frac{i}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{x}_{ij} \right]^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{mn^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \tilde{x}_{ij}^2 + \frac{2}{mn^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j < k}^n \tilde{x}_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ik}.\end{aligned}$$

The first term on the last rhs is nothing but the total sample variance  $\sigma^2$  divided by  $m$ . The second term represents the covariance.

## The covariance term

Using the definition of the total sample variance we have

$$\sigma_m^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{m} + \frac{2}{mn^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j < k}^n \tilde{x}_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ik}.$$

The first term is what we have used till now in order to estimate the standard deviation. However, the second term which gives us a measure of the correlations between different stochastic events, can result in contributions which give rise to a larger standard deviation and variance  $\sigma_m^2$ . Note also the evaluation of the second term leads to a double sum over all events. If we run a VMC calculation with say  $10^9$  Monte carlo samples, the latter term would lead to  $10^{18}$  function evaluations. We don't want to, by obvious reasons, to venture into that many evaluations.

Note also that if our stochastic events are iid then the covariance terms is zero.

## Rewriting the covariance term

We introduce now a variable  $d = |j - k|$  and rewrite

$$\frac{2}{mn^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j < k}^n \tilde{x}_{ij} \tilde{x}_{ik},$$

in terms of a function

$$f_d = \frac{2}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n-d} \tilde{x}_{ik} \tilde{x}_{i(k+d)}.$$

We note that for  $d = 0$  we have

$$f_0 = \frac{2}{mn} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^n \tilde{x}_{ik} \tilde{x}_{i(k)} = \sigma^2!$$

## Introducing the correlation function

We introduce then a correlation function  $\kappa_d = f_d/\sigma^2$ . Note that  $\kappa_0 = 1$ . We rewrite the variance  $\sigma_m^2$  as

$$\sigma_m^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{m} \left[ 1 + 2 \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \kappa_d \right].$$

The code here shows the evolution of  $\kappa_d$  as a function of  $d$  for a series of random numbers. We see that the function  $\kappa_d$  approaches 0 as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ .

## Statistics, wrapping up from last week

Let us analyze the problem by splitting up the correlation term into partial sums of the form:

$$f_d = \frac{1}{n-d} \sum_{k=1}^{n-d} (x_k - \bar{x}_n)(x_{k+d} - \bar{x}_n)$$

The correlation term of the error can now be rewritten in terms of  $f_d$

$$\frac{2}{n} \sum_{k < l} (x_k - \bar{x}_n)(x_l - \bar{x}_n) = 2 \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} f_d$$

The value of  $f_d$  reflects the correlation between measurements separated by the distance  $d$  in the sample samples. Notice that for  $d = 0$ ,  $f$  is just the sample variance,  $\text{var}(x)$ . If we divide  $f_d$  by  $\text{var}(x)$ , we arrive at the so called *autocorrelation function*

$$\kappa_d = \frac{f_d}{\text{var}(x)}$$

## Statistics, final expression

The sample error can now be written in terms of the autocorrelation function:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{err}_X^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \text{var}(x) + \frac{2}{n} \cdot \text{var}(x) \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \frac{f_d}{\text{var}(x)} \\ &= \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \kappa_d \right) \frac{1}{n} \text{var}(x) \\ &= \frac{\tau}{n} \cdot \text{var}(x)\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

and we see that  $\text{err}_X$  can be expressed in terms the uncorrelated sample variance times a correction factor  $\tau$  which accounts for the correlation between measurements. We call this correction factor the *autocorrelation time*:

$$\tau = 1 + 2 \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \kappa_d \tag{2}$$

## Statistics, effective number of correlations

For a correlation free experiment,  $\tau$  equals 1.

We can interpret a sequential correlation as an effective reduction of the number of measurements by a factor  $\tau$ . The effective number of measurements becomes:

$$n_{\text{eff}} = \frac{n}{\tau}$$

To neglect the autocorrelation time  $\tau$  will always cause our simple uncorrelated estimate of  $\text{err}_X^2 \approx \text{var}(x)/n$  to be less than the true sample error. The estimate of the error will be too *good*. On the other hand, the calculation of the full autocorrelation time poses an efficiency problem if the set of measurements is very large.

## Can we understand this? Time Auto-correlation Function

The so-called time-displacement autocorrelation  $\phi(t)$  for a quantity  $M$  is given by

$$\phi(t) = \int dt' [M(t') - \langle M \rangle] [M(t' + t) - \langle M \rangle],$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\phi(t) = \int dt' [M(t')M(t' + t) - \langle M \rangle^2],$$

where  $\langle M \rangle$  is the average value and  $M(t)$  its instantaneous value. We can discretize this function as follows, where we used our set of computed values  $M(t)$  for a set of discretized times (our Monte Carlo cycles corresponding to moving all electrons?)

$$\phi(t) = \frac{1}{t_{\max} - t} \sum_{t'=0}^{t_{\max}-t} M(t')M(t'+t) - \frac{1}{t_{\max} - t} \sum_{t'=0}^{t_{\max}-t} M(t') \times \frac{1}{t_{\max} - t} \sum_{t'=0}^{t_{\max}-t} M(t')$$



# Time Auto-correlation Function

One should be careful with times close to  $t_{\max}$ , the upper limit of the sums becomes small and we end up integrating over a rather small time interval. This means that the statistical error in  $\phi(t)$  due to the random nature of the fluctuations in  $M(t)$  can become large. One should therefore choose  $t \ll t_{\max}$ .

Note that the variable  $M$  can be any expectation values of interest. The time-correlation function gives a measure of the correlation between the various values of the variable at a time  $t'$  and a time  $t' + t$ . If we multiply the values of  $M$  at these two different times, we will get a positive contribution if they are fluctuating in the same direction, or a negative value if they fluctuate in the opposite direction. If we then integrate over time, or use the discretized version of, the time correlation function  $\phi(t)$  should take a non-zero value if the fluctuations are correlated, else it should gradually go to zero. For times a long way apart the different values of  $M$  are most likely uncorrelated and  $\phi(t)$  should be zero.

## Time Auto-correlation Function

We can derive the correlation time by observing that our Metropolis algorithm is based on a random walk in the space of all possible spin configurations. Our probability distribution function  $\hat{w}(t)$  after a given number of time steps  $t$  could be written as

$$\hat{w}(t) = \hat{W}^t \hat{w}(0),$$

with  $\hat{w}(0)$  the distribution at  $t = 0$  and  $\hat{W}$  representing the transition probability matrix. We can always expand  $\hat{w}(0)$  in terms of the right eigenvectors of  $\hat{W}$  as

$$\hat{w}(0) = \sum_i \alpha_i \hat{v}_i,$$

resulting in

$$\hat{w}(t) = \hat{W}^t \hat{w}(0) = \hat{W}^t \sum_i \alpha_i \hat{v}_i = \sum_i \lambda_i^t \alpha_i \hat{v}_i,$$

# Time Auto-correlation Function

If we assume that  $\lambda_0$  is the largest eigenvector we see that in the limit  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\hat{w}(t)$  becomes proportional to the corresponding eigenvector  $\hat{v}_0$ . This is our steady state or final distribution. We can relate this property to an observable like the mean energy. With the probability  $\hat{w}(t)$  (which in our case is the squared trial wave function) we can write the expectation values as

$$\langle M(t) \rangle = \sum_{\mu} \hat{w}(t)_{\mu} M_{\mu},$$

or as the scalar of a vector product

$$\langle M(t) \rangle = \hat{w}(t) \mathbf{m},$$

with  $\mathbf{m}$  being the vector whose elements are the values of  $M_{\mu}$  in its various microstates  $\mu$ .

# Time Auto-correlation Function

We rewrite this relation as

$$\langle M(t) \rangle = \hat{w}(t) \mathbf{m} = \sum_i \lambda_i^t \alpha_i \hat{v}_i \mathbf{m}_i.$$

If we define  $m_i = \hat{v}_i \mathbf{m}_i$  as the expectation value of  $M$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  eigenstate we can rewrite the last equation as

$$\langle M(t) \rangle = \sum_i \lambda_i^t \alpha_i m_i.$$

Since we have that in the limit  $t \rightarrow \infty$  the mean value is dominated by the the largest eigenvalue  $\lambda_0$ , we can rewrite the last equation as

$$\langle M(t) \rangle = \langle M(\infty) \rangle + \sum_{i \neq 0} \lambda_i^t \alpha_i m_i.$$

We define the quantity

## Time Auto-correlation Function

The quantities  $\tau_i$  are the correlation times for the system. They control also the auto-correlation function discussed above. The longest correlation time is obviously given by the second largest eigenvalue  $\tau_1$ , which normally defines the correlation time discussed above. For large times, this is the only correlation time that survives. If higher eigenvalues of the transition matrix are well separated from  $\lambda_1$  and we simulate long enough,  $\tau_1$  may well define the correlation time. In other cases we may not be able to extract a reliable result for  $\tau_1$ . Coming back to the time correlation function  $\phi(t)$  we can present a more general definition in terms of the mean magnetizations  $\langle M(t) \rangle$ . Recalling that the mean value is equal to  $\langle M(\infty) \rangle$  we arrive at the expectation values

$$\phi(t) = \langle M(0) - M(\infty) \rangle \langle M(t) - M(\infty) \rangle,$$

resulting in

$$\phi(t) = \sum_{i,j \neq 0} m_i \alpha_i m_j \alpha_j e^{-t/\tau_i},$$

## Correlation Time

If the correlation function decays exponentially

$$\phi(t) \sim \exp(-t/\tau)$$

then the exponential correlation time can be computed as the average

$$\tau_{\text{exp}} = -\left\langle \frac{t}{\log \left| \frac{\phi(t)}{\phi(0)} \right|} \right\rangle.$$

If the decay is exponential, then

$$\int_0^\infty dt \phi(t) = \int_0^\infty dt \phi(0) \exp(-t/\tau) = \tau \phi(0),$$

which suggests another measure of correlation

$$\tau_{\text{int}} = \sum_k \frac{\phi(k)}{\phi(0)},$$

called the integrated correlation time

## Resampling methods: Blocking

The blocking method was made popular by [Flyvbjerg and Pedersen \(1989\)](#) and has become one of the standard ways to estimate  $V(\hat{\theta})$  for exactly one  $\hat{\theta}$ , namely  $\hat{\theta} = \bar{X}$ .

Assume  $n = 2^d$  for some integer  $d > 1$  and  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  is a stationary time series to begin with. Moreover, assume that the time series is asymptotically uncorrelated. We switch to vector notation by arranging  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  in an  $n$ -tuple. Define:

$$\hat{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n).$$

The strength of the blocking method is when the number of observations,  $n$  is large. For large  $n$ , the complexity of dependent bootstrapping scales poorly, but the blocking method does not, moreover, it becomes more accurate the larger  $n$  is.

## Blocking Transformations

We now define blocking transformations. The idea is to take the mean of subsequent pair of elements from  $\vec{X}$  and form a new vector  $\vec{X}_1$ . Continuing in the same way by taking the mean of subsequent pairs of elements of  $\vec{X}_1$  we obtain  $\vec{X}_2$ , and so on. Define  $\vec{X}_i$  recursively by:

$$\begin{aligned}(\vec{X}_0)_k &\equiv (\vec{X})_k \\ (\vec{X}_{i+1})_k &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \left( (\vec{X}_i)_{2k-1} + (\vec{X}_i)_{2k} \right) \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq d-1\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The quantity  $\vec{X}_k$  is subject to  $k$  **blocking transformations**. We now have  $d$  vectors  $\vec{X}_0, \vec{X}_1, \dots, \vec{X}_{d-1}$  containing the subsequent averages of observations. It turns out that if the components of  $\vec{X}$  is a stationary time series, then the components of  $\vec{X}_i$  is a stationary time series for all  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$

We can then compute the autocovariance, the variance, sample mean, and number of observations for each  $i$ . Let  $\gamma_i, \sigma_i^2, \bar{X}_i$  denote the autocovariance, variance and average of the elements of  $\vec{X}_i$  and



## Blocking Transformations

Using the definition of the blocking transformation and the distributive property of the covariance, it is clear that since  $h = |i - j|$  we can define

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{k+1}(h) &= \text{cov}((X_{k+1})_i, (X_{k+1})_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \text{cov}((X_k)_{2i-1} + (X_k)_{2i}, (X_k)_{2j-1} + (X_k)_{2j}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k(2h) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k(2h+1) \quad h = 0\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \gamma_k(2h-1) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_k(2h) + \frac{1}{4} \gamma_k(2h+1) \quad \text{else} \tag{5}$$

The quantity  $\hat{X}$  is asymptotic uncorrelated by assumption,  $\hat{X}_k$  is also asymptotic uncorrelated. Let's turn our attention to the variance of the sample mean  $V(\bar{X})$ .

## Blocking Transformations, getting there

We have

$$V(\bar{X}_k) = \frac{\sigma_k^2}{n_k} + \underbrace{\frac{2}{n_k} \sum_{h=1}^{n_k-1} \left(1 - \frac{h}{n_k}\right) \gamma_k(h)}_{\equiv e_k} = \frac{\sigma_k^2}{n_k} + e_k \quad \text{if } \gamma_k(0) = \sigma_k^2. \quad (6)$$

The term  $e_k$  is called the **truncation error**:

$$e_k = \frac{2}{n_k} \sum_{h=1}^{n_k-1} \left(1 - \frac{h}{n_k}\right) \gamma_k(h). \quad (7)$$

We can show that  $V(\bar{X}_i) = V(\bar{X}_j)$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$  and  $0 \leq j \leq d-1$ .

## Blocking Transformations, final expressions

We can then wrap up

$$\begin{aligned} n_{j+1} \bar{X}_{j+1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_{j+1}} (\hat{X}_{j+1})_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j/2} (\hat{X}_j)_{2i-1} + (\hat{X}_j)_{2i} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\hat{X}_j)_1 + (\hat{X}_j)_2 + \cdots + (\hat{X}_j)_{n_j} \right] = \underbrace{\frac{n_j}{2}}_{=n_{j+1}} \bar{X}_j = n_{j+1} \bar{X}_j. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

By repeated use of this equation we get  $V(\bar{X}_i) = V(\bar{X}_0) = V(\bar{X})$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ . This has the consequence that

$$V(\bar{X}) = \frac{\sigma_k^2}{n_k} + e_k \quad \text{for all} \quad 0 \leq k \leq d-1. \tag{9}$$

Flyvbjerg and Petersen demonstrated that the sequence  $\{e_k\}_{k=0}^{d-1}$  is decreasing, and conjecture that the term  $e_k$  can be made as small as we would like by making  $k$  (and hence  $d$ ) sufficiently large. The sequence is decreasing (Master of Science thesis by Marius Jonsson, UiO 2018). It means we can apply blocking transformations until

## Example code from last week

```
# 2-electron VMC code for 2dim quantum dot with importance sampling
# Using gaussian rng for new positions and Metropolis- Hastings
# Added energy minimization
from math import exp, sqrt
from random import random, seed, normalvariate
import numpy as np
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from mpl_toolkits.mplot3d import Axes3D
from matplotlib import cm
from matplotlib.ticker import LinearLocator, FormatStrFormatter
from scipy.optimize import minimize
import sys
import os

# Where to save data files
PROJECT_ROOT_DIR = "Results"
DATA_ID = "Results/EnergyMin"

if not os.path.exists(PROJECT_ROOT_DIR):
    os.mkdir(PROJECT_ROOT_DIR)

if not os.path.exists(DATA_ID):
    os.makedirs(DATA_ID)

def data_path(dat_id):
    return os.path.join(DATA_ID, dat_id)

outfile = open(data_path("Energies.dat"), 'w')
```

## Resampling analysis

The next step is then to use the above data sets and perform a resampling analysis using the blocking method. The blocking code, based on the article of [Marius Jonsson](#) is given here

```
# Common imports
```

```
import os
```

```
# Where to save the figures and data files
```

```
DATA_ID = "Results/EnergyMin"
```

```
def data_path(dat_id):
```

```
    return os.path.join(DATA_ID, dat_id)
```

```
infile = open(data_path("Energies.dat"), 'r')
```

```
from numpy import log2, zeros, mean, var, sum, loadtxt, arange, array,
```

```
from numpy.linalg import inv
```

```
def block(x):
```

```
    # preliminaries
```

```
    n = len(x)
```

```
    d = int(log2(n))
```

```
    s, gamma = zeros(d), zeros(d)
```

```
    mu = mean(x)
```

```
    # estimate the auto-covariance and variances
```

```
    # for each blocking transformation
```

```
    for i in arange(0, d):
```