MA5233 Computational Mathematics

Lecture 24: Monte Carlo

Simon Etter



2019/2020

Introductory example

Assume we want to compute the integral

$$I:=\int_0^1\ldots\int_0^1 f(y_1,\ldots,y_d)\,dy_1\,\ldots\,dy_n.$$

Applying a one-dimensional quadrature rule $(x_k, w_k)_{k=1}^n$ with error $e_n = \mathcal{O}(n^{-p})$ repeatedly, we obtain

$$\begin{split} I &= \int_0^1 \dots \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k_1 = 1}^n f(x_{k_1}, y_2, \dots, y_d) \, w_{k_1} + \mathcal{O} \big(n^{-p} \big) \right) \, dy_2 \, \dots \, dy_n \\ &= \dots \\ &= \sum_n^n \dots \sum_n^n f(x_{k_1}, \dots, x_{k_d}) \, w_{k_1} \, \dots \, w_{k_d} + \mathcal{O} \big(n^{-p} \big). \end{split}$$

Observation: for increasing d, number of function evaluations N must scale as $\mathcal{O}(n^d)$ to achieve a constant error $\mathcal{O}(n^{-p}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{-p/d})!$ This phenomenon has been called the *curse of dimensionality*.

Introductory example (continued)

Different approach: reinterpret I as the expextation value

$$I = \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, \dots, X_n)], \qquad X_k \stackrel{\mathsf{iid}}{\sim} \mathsf{Uniform}[0, 1].$$

Expectations can be computed by taking the average of a sufficiently large number of samples $x_k^{(i)}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_1,\ldots,X_n)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_1^{(i)},\ldots,x_d^{(i)}) + \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2}).$$

 $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ error term follows from basic statistics. We will discuss this later.

Observation: N function evaluations lead to $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ error! In particular, Monte Carlo is better than midpoint rule (p=2) for d>4. See convergence().

Abstract Monte Carlo

$$\mathbb{E}[F] pprox Q := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} F_k \quad \text{where} \quad F, F_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{F}.$$

Many things can be written as expectations:

- Sums and integrals (see introductory example).
- ▶ Probabilities: $P(X \in S) = \mathbb{E}[f(X)]$ where $f(X) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X \in S, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Another example

- Assume we are playing a game like chess or go and we are unsure which move to make.
- ► Clearly, a move is good if it increases our chances of winning.
- ► This probability can be estimated by playing the game several times with random moves and counting how many times we won.
- ▶ This is one of the tools that AlphaGo used to beat humans in go.

Further remarks

- Monte Carlo idea: replace deterministic but lengthy calculations with random sampling.
- This idea was used for the first time by the physicists who developed nuclear weapons for the US army.
- ► "Monte Carlo" was originally a code name in reference to a casino of the same name.

Error estimation

- ▶ Note that the Monte Carlo estimate $Q \approx \mathbb{E}[F]$ is a random variable.
- For any N, it is thus possible that Q is a bad approximation to $\mathbb{E}[F]$. Conversely, even N=1 may yield the exact answer.
- ▶ The power of Monte Carlo methods is that the event $(|Q \mathbb{E}[F]| > C)$ becomes increasingly unlikely for $N \to \infty$.
- Central limit theorem on next slide provides a rigorous statement of this idea.

Central limit theorem

Assume $F, F_1, \ldots, F_N \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{F}$. Then, $Q := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N F_k$ is approximately normally distributed with $\mathbb{E}[Q] = \mathbb{E}[F]$ and $\text{Var}[Q] = \frac{\text{Var}[F]}{N}$.

Recap

►
$$X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$$
: $\iff P(X \in \mathcal{X}) \propto \int_{\mathcal{X}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx$
Also, $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \implies \mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$ and $Var[X] = \sigma^2$.

Application to Monte Carlo

► Expected error:
$$\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(Q - \mathbb{E}[F])^2]} = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}[F]}{N}}$$
.

► Confidence interval:
$$P\left(\left|Q - \mathbb{E}[F]\right| \leq C(\varepsilon)\sqrt{\frac{\mathsf{Var}[F]}{N}}\right) = 1 - \varepsilon$$
.

See variance_estimation().

Conclusions

- $\triangleright \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ convergence in N.
- ► Prefactor determined by Var[F].

Simulation of random variables

Two stages:

- ▶ Generate $U \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$.
- ▶ Map X = f(U) such that X has the desired distribution.

Def: Pseudo-random number generator (pRNG)

Deterministic algorithm mapping some seed s to a sequence $U_k \in [0,1]$ which looks as if $U_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Uniform}[0,1]$.

Remarks:

- ▶ There is no rigorous definition of "looks as if $U_k \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Uniform}[0,1]$ ". In practice, pRNGs are assessed by measuring their performance on a large number of statistical tests.
 - See e.g. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diehard_tests.
- ▶ pRNGs have at least two advantages over "true" RNGs:
 - They are faster, see rng_benchmarks().
 - They allow to exactly reproduce numerical results, which is useful for testing and debugging.

Thm: Transformation

Let F be a cumulative distribution function on \mathbb{R} , i.e. $F: \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ is non-decreasing, right-continuous and $F(-\infty) = 0$, $F(\infty) = 1$.

Let $U \sim \mathsf{Uniform}[0,1]$.

Then, $X := F^{-1}(U) \sim F$.

Proof.
$$P(X \le x) = P(F^{-1}(U) \le x) = P(U \le F(x)) = F(x)$$
.

Example

Consider triangular density function f(x) = 2x on [0,1].

We have $F(x) = \int_0^x 2x' dx = x^2$; hence $X := \sqrt{U} \sim f$.

See $transformation_sampling()$.

Discussion

Good: sampling by transformation is very efficient if $F^{-1}(U)$ is cheap.

Bad: only one-dimensional random variable have cumulative distribution function, and computing $F^{-1}(U)$ can be difficult.

Thm: Rejection sampling

Let f(x), g(x) be probability densities on Ω , i.e. $f, g: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\int_{\Omega} f(x) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} g(x) \, dx = 1$. Assume further that $f(x) \leq C \, g(x)$. Consider the samples F generated by the following algorithm.

- 1. Sample $G \sim g$ and $U \sim \mathsf{Uniform}[0,1]$.
- 2. If $U \leq \frac{f(G)}{Cg(G)}$, then return F := G. Otherwise, repeat from step 1.

We have $F \sim f$.

Proof.
$$P(F \in \mathcal{X}) = P(G \in \mathcal{X} \mid G \text{ is accepted})$$

$$= \frac{P(G \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and } G \text{ is accepted})}{P(G \text{ is accepted})}$$

$$= \frac{\int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x) \frac{f(x)}{Cg(x)} dx}{\int_{\Omega} g(x) \frac{f(x)}{Cg(x)} dx} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) dx.$$

Discussion

Good: rejection sampling works for almost all f.

Bad: rejection sampling can be very efficient if g(x) is a bad approximation to f(x).

More precisely, we have $P(G \text{ is accepted}) = \frac{1}{C}$, i.e. on average we generate C samples of G and U for every sample of F.

Example

Consider f(x) := 2x and g(x) := 1 on $\Omega = [0, 1]$.

We have $f(x) \le 2g(x)$; hence rejection sampling discards half of the samples.

See rejection_sampling().

Thm: Importance sampling

Let f,g be probability densities on Ω and $F \sim f$, $G \sim g$. Let h be a function on Ω . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[h(F)] = \mathbb{E}[h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)}]$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}[h(F)] = \int_{\Omega} h(x) f(x) dx = \int_{\Omega} h(x) \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} g(x) dx = \mathbb{E}[h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)}].$$

Discussion

Importance sampling theorem is useful if:

- ightharpoonup G is easier to sample than F.
- ▶ $h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)}$ has lower variance than h(F).

Example

Consider f(x) := 1 and g(x) := 2x on $\Omega = [0, 1]$, and h(x) = 2x. We observe:

$$h(F) = 2F \implies Var[h(F)] = \frac{1}{3},$$

 $h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)} = 1 \implies Var[h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)}] = 0.$

Monte Carlo applied to $\mathbb{E}[h(G) \frac{f(G)}{g(G)}]$ is exact! See importance_sampling() for a more realistic example.

Review Monte Carlo

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{O}(N^{-1/2})$ convergence of Monte Carlo is very slow, but it is faster than more traditional algorithms in high dimensions.
- ► Unlike most algorithms we have seen, Monte Carlo is straightforward to parallelise and runs efficiently on even the largest machines.

 See 24pp_parallel_monte_carlo.jl, https://www.karlrupp.net/
 wp-content/uploads/2015/06/40-years-processor-trend.png and https://www.top500.org/lists/2019/06/.
- Monte Carlo also suffers from curse of dimensionality if $Var[F] \propto a^d$. Monte Carlo can be effective in some cases because it implicitly exploits structure in the problem.

References and further reading

Excellent lecture notes:

- https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/statistics/staff/ academic-research/johansen/teaching/mcm-2007.pdf
- ▶ https://statweb.stanford.edu/~owen/mc/