#### Econ 512 HW 4

Yinshi Gao yzg115

### 1. Using Dart-Throwing Method with Quasi-Monto Carlo

## Program

```
%% Problem 1 Using Quasi-Monto Carlo
% Define indicator function
f = @(x,y) double((x.^2 + y.^2 <= 1))
% Use `N'eiderrieter, 'W'eyl and 'H'aber points do the 1000 draw
addpath ('../CETools');
[n] = qnwequi(1000, [0 0], [1, 1], 'N');
% Compute the value of f with each element of n
f_val = f(n(:,1), n(:,2));
% Compute PI
PI_1 = 4 / size(n,1) * sum(f_val)</pre>
```

### 2. Using Dart-Throwing Method with Newton-Cotes

Since Newton-Cotes is designed for one-dimensional integration, I first equally draw 1000 points in the y-axis. Then given each y, use Newton-Cotes method to integrate respect to x in the interval [0,1]. Finally, take mean along the y-axis. The approximation gotten is  $\pi = 3.140410000000001$ .

### **Program**

# 3. Using 2nd Approach with Quasi-Monto Carlo

Same in problem 1, I use Neiderrieter draw 1000 points in the interval  $x \in [0, 1]$ . The approximation gotten is  $\pi = 3.142530524029050$ .

# Program

```
%% Problem 3 Using Quasi-Monto Carlo
% Define function
f2  @@(x) sqrt(1-x.^2)
% Use `N'eiderrieter, 'W'eyl and 'H'aber points do the 1000 draw
[n] = qnwequi(1000, 0, 1, 'N');
% Compute PI
PI_3  # 4 / size(n,1) * sum(f2(n))
```

### 4. Using 2nd Approach with Newton-Cotes

Draw 1000 points along the interval  $x \in [0,1]$ . The approximation gotten is  $\pi = 3.141555466911027$ .

## Program

```
%% Problem 4 Using Newton-Cotes
%Compute PI
PI_4 = 4 * Int_trap(f2, 0,1,1000)
```

# 5. Table and Comparison

First, calculate mean squared error of 200 simulations for Quasi-Monto Carlo and Newton-Cotes methods, and squared error for Newton-Cotes method.

```
%% Problem 5
 % Calculate Mean Squared Error for Quasi-Monto Carlo
 Qmc_mse = [0,0,0];
 m = [1000, 10000, 10000000];
\exists for i = 1: size(m,2)
     j = 1;
     while j <=200
          [n] = qnwequi(m(i), 0, 1, 'N');
          Qmc_mse(i) = Qmc_mse(i) + (pi - 4 / size(n,1) * sum(f2(n)))^2;
         j = j + 1;
     end
     Qmc_mse(i) = Qmc_mse(i)/200;
 % Calculate Mean Squared Error for Newton-Cotes
 Nc_mse = [0,0,0];
 m = [1000, 10000, 1000000];
\neg for i = 1: size(m,2)
     j = 1;
     while j <=200
          Nc_mse(i) = Nc_mse(i) + (pi - 4 * Int_trap(f2, 0,1, m(i)))^2;
          j = j + 1;
     Nc_mse(i) = Nc_mse(i)/200;
 % Calculate Squared Error for Newton-Cotes
 Nc_se = [0,0,0];
 m = [1000, 10000, 10000000];
\neg for i = 1: size(m,2)
     Nc_se(i) = (pi - 4 * Int_trap(f2, 0,1, m(i)))^2;
```

And then generate table for comparison,

```
% Generate Table for Comparison

Method = {'Quasi-MC MSE'; 'Newton-Cotes MSE'; 'Newton-Cotes SE'};
Draw_1000 = [Qmc_mse(1); Nc_mse(1); Nc_se(1)];
Draw_100000 = [Qmc_mse(2); Nc_mse(2); Nc_se(2)];
Draw_1000000 = [Qmc_mse(3); Nc_mse(3); Nc_se(3)];

T = table(Method,Draw_1000,Draw_10000,Draw_1000000)
```

The table we get is,

Method	Draw_1000	Draw_10000	Draw_1000000
'Quasi-MC MSE'	8.79600960831437e-07	1.12073141383911e-09	2.9589673915603e-13
'Newton-Cotes MSE'	1.38284907761753e-09	1.38292536227552e-12	1.38293465815156e-18
'Newton-Cotes SE'	1.38284907761754e-09	1.38292536227552e-12	1.38293465815156e-18

We can see that, within each method, the more the draw, the less the (mean) squared error.

Across the method, we can see that mean squared error of Quasi-Monto Carlo method converges to 0 at the order of 2 with number of draws increases. Newton-Cotes method converges at the order of 3 with draw increases. Moreover, using same number of draws, Newton-Cotes performs better than Quasi-Monto Carlo.

The mean squared error for 200 simulations of Newton-Cotes is basically the same with squared error or Newton-Cotes method when using same number of draws.