## ADAPTIVE SIMPLE MONTE CARLO

## FRED J. HICKERNELL AND YUEWEI LIU

ABSTRACT. We attempt a

## 1. Introduction

An integration lattice, L, is a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and a superset of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  that has no accumulation point and that is closed under addition and subtraction modulo 1, i.e.,

$$x, t \in L \implies x \pm t \in L.$$

A shifted integration lattice,  $L_{\Delta}$  is defined as  $L_{\Delta} = \{x + \Delta \pmod{1} : x \in L\}$  for some integration lattice L and some fixed  $\Delta \in [0,1)^d$ . The shifted lattice is actually a coset of the lattice. The node set of an integration lattice is defined as those lattice points falling inside the unit cube, i.e.,  $P = L \cap [0,1)^d$ . Likewise, the node set of a shifted integration lattice is  $P_{\Delta} = L_{\Delta} \cap [0,1)^d$ . Equivalently, the nodesets of the integration lattice and shifted integration lattice may be defined respectively by the conditions

$$x, t \in P \implies x \pm t \pmod{1} \in P, \qquad P_{\Delta} = \{x + \Delta \pmod{1} : x \in P\}.$$

The dual lattice,  $L^{\perp}$ , corresponding to an integration lattice, L, is a subset of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  satisfying

$$\mathbf{k} \in L^{\perp} \iff \mathbf{k}^{T} \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in L.$$

Equivalently, one may replace  $x \in L$  by x in the node set of L.

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  denote the Banach space of real-valued functions defined on  $[0,1)^d$  with absolutely convergent Fourier series, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ f \in \mathcal{L}_{\infty}[0,1)^d : f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\boldsymbol{x}}, \text{ where } \left\| \hat{f} \right\|_{\ell_1} < \infty \right\}.$$

with the norm defined as  $||f||_{\mathcal{F}} = ||\hat{f}||_{\ell_1}$ . Note that the Fourier coefficients may be defined as

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) = \int_{[0,1)^d} f(\mathbf{x}) e^{-2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbf{k}^T\mathbf{x}} \,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}.$$

These Fourier coefficients, defined as linear functionals,  $f \mapsto \hat{f}(\mathbf{k})$ , are bounded under the norm. The problem is how to numerically estimate the integrals of functions in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Note that the integral is just one of the Fourier coefficients and is also a bounded linear functional on  $\mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\mu: f \mapsto \int_{[0,1)^d} f(\boldsymbol{x}) d\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \mu(f) = \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{0})$$

The problem of interest is how to numerically estimate the integrals of functions in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The integral is just one of the Fourier coefficients and thus also a bounded linear functional

on  $\mathcal{F}$ :

$$\mu: f \mapsto \int_{[0,1)^d} f(\boldsymbol{x}) d\boldsymbol{x}, \qquad \mu(f) = \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{0}).$$

Integrals are approximated by sample averages over node sets of integration lattices. For any set  $P \in [0,1)^d$ , this is defined as

$$A(\cdot, P): f \mapsto \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in P} f(\boldsymbol{x}),$$

where |P| denotes the cardinality of P. Note that  $A(\cdot, P)$  is also a bounded linear functional on  $\mathcal{F}$ . If  $P_{\Delta}$  is the node set of a shifted integration lattice, then the sample average may be written in terms of the Fourier coefficients as

$$A(f, P_{\Delta}) = \frac{1}{|P_{\Delta}|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in P_{\Delta}} f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in P} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T(\boldsymbol{x} + \Delta)}$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T \Delta} \left[ \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in P} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T \boldsymbol{x}} \right]$$
$$= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in L^{\perp}} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T \Delta} = T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f)),$$

where  $T_x: f \mapsto f(x)$  is the evaluation functional defined on  $\mathcal{F}$ , and  $S_{\mathcal{K}}: \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$  is a bounded linear operator that strips out all but the specified terms of the Fourier series of a function:

$$(S_{\mathcal{K}}f)(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}\in\mathcal{K}} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k})e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\boldsymbol{x}},$$

where  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ .

The error of a quasi-Monte Carlo method based on the design P is also a bounded linear functional,  $\operatorname{err}(f, P) = \mu(f) - A(f; P)$ . For shifted lattice rules the error may be written in terms of the Fourier coefficients as

$$\operatorname{err}(f, P) = \mu(f) - A(f; P) = \hat{f}(\mathbf{0}) - \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in L^{\perp}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbf{k}^{T}\Delta}$$
$$= -\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in L^{\perp}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{k}) e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\mathbf{k}^{T}\Delta} = -T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f)),$$

where  $L^{\perp\prime} = L^{\perp} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}.$ 

## 2. Error Estimates

Suppose that L is an integration lattice and  $\tilde{L}$  is a sub-lattice of L. Because lattices are subgroups of  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , then any shifted lattice  $L_{\Delta}$  can be written as a union of  $\tilde{L}_{\Delta}$  and a finite number of shifted counterparts (cosets) of  $\tilde{L}$ , i.e.,

$$L_{\Delta} = \tilde{L}_{\Delta + \widetilde{\Delta}_0} \cup \cdots \cup \tilde{L}_{\Delta + \widetilde{\Delta}_{M-1}}, \qquad \widetilde{\Delta}_i \in P = L \cap [0, 1)^d, \quad \widetilde{\Delta}_0 = \mathbf{0},$$

where P is the nodeset of L. Let  $P_{\Delta}$  denote the nodeset of  $L_{\Delta}$ , and  $\widetilde{P}_i$  denote the nodeset of  $\widetilde{L}_{\Delta+\widetilde{\Delta}_i}$ . It follows that  $P_{\Delta} = \widetilde{P}_0 \cup \cdots \cup \widetilde{P}_{M-1}$ . Moreover, the dual lattice,  $\widetilde{L}^{\perp}$  is the union of shifted copies of  $L^{\perp}$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{L}^{\perp} = L^{\perp}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_0} \cup \dots \cup L^{\perp}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}_{M-1}}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\nu}_i \in \tilde{L}^{\perp}, \quad \boldsymbol{\nu}_0 = \mathbf{0}.$$

Furthermore, this implies that

$$\tilde{L}^{\perp\prime} = L^{\perp\prime} \cup L^{\perp}_{\nu_1} \cup \cdots \cup L^{\perp}_{\nu_{M-1}}, \qquad \nu_i \in \tilde{L}^{\perp}, \quad \nu_0 = \mathbf{0}.$$

Note that

(1) 
$$\mathbf{k}^T \widetilde{\mathbf{\Delta}}_i \in \mathbb{Z} \qquad \forall \mathbf{k} \in L^{\perp},$$

by definition of the dual lattice. Letting  $1_A$  denote the characteristic function, note also that

$$1_{L^{\perp}}(\boldsymbol{k}) = \frac{1}{|P|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in P} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\boldsymbol{x}} = \frac{1}{|\widetilde{P}|M} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \widetilde{P}} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T(\boldsymbol{x} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\widetilde{P}|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \widetilde{P}} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\boldsymbol{x}} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i} = 1_{\widetilde{L}^{\perp}}(\boldsymbol{k}) \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i}$$

which implies that

(2) 
$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}\boldsymbol{k}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i} = 1_{\tilde{L}^{\perp} \setminus L^{\perp}}(\boldsymbol{k})$$

One possible upper bound for  $|\operatorname{err}(f, P_{\Delta})| = |T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f))|$  would be

$$\widehat{\text{err}}_0(f, P) = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| A(f, P_{\Delta}) - A(f, \widetilde{P}_0) \right|$$

where C > 0 is a fudge factor. That is, an upper bound on the error of numerical integration using the nodeset,  $P_{\Delta}$ , with the larger number of points is proportional to the difference between the integral approximation using the nodeset  $P_{\Delta}$  and the approximation using a subset of this nodeset, namely,  $\tilde{P}_0$ . This expression can be written in terms of the Fourier coefficients of the integrand

$$\widehat{\operatorname{err}}_{0}(f, P_{\Delta}) = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| A(f, P_{\Delta}) - A(f, \widetilde{P}_{0}) \right| = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| \operatorname{err}(f, P_{\Delta}) - \operatorname{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_{0}) \right|$$

$$= \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f)) - T_{\Delta}(S_{\widetilde{L}^{\perp}}(f)) \right|$$

$$= \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f) - S_{\widetilde{L}^{\perp}}(f)) \right| = \frac{\mathfrak{C}}{M-1} \left| T_{\Delta}(S_{\widetilde{L}^{\perp}}(L^{\perp}}(f)) \right|$$

$$= \mathfrak{C} \left| \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} T_{\Delta}(S_{L^{\perp}}(f)) \right|.$$

This error bound works well provided that the average of the  $T_{\Delta}(S_{L_{\nu_i}^{\perp}}(f))$  mimics  $T_{\Delta}(S_{L_{\nu_i}^{\perp}}(f))$ . However, a potential problem may arise if there is cancellation among the  $T_{\Delta}(S_{L_{\nu_i}^{\perp}}(f))$ , causing their average to severely underestimate  $T_{\Delta}(S_{L_{\nu_i}^{\perp}}(f))$ .

Another potential upper bound that mitigates against some of the cancellation takes the form of the quasi-standard error:

$$[\widehat{\operatorname{err}}(f, P_{\Delta})]^2 = \frac{\mathfrak{C}^2}{M(M-1)} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [A(f, \widetilde{P}_i) - A(f, P_{\Delta})]^2$$

which can also be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} [\widehat{\text{err}}(f, P_{\Delta})]^2 &= \frac{\mathfrak{C}^2}{M(M-1)} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [\text{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_i) - \text{err}(f, P_{\Delta})]^2 \\ &= \frac{\mathfrak{C}^2}{M(M-1)} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \left\{ [\text{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_i)]^2 - 2 \, \text{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_i) \, \text{err}(f, P_{\Delta}) + [\text{err}(f, P_{\Delta})]^2 \right\} \\ &= \frac{\mathfrak{C}^2}{M-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [\text{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_i)]^2 - [\text{err}(f, P_{\Delta})]^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the right hand side expression above may be simplified by applying the properties of the above lattices, including (1) and (2):

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [\operatorname{err}(f, \widetilde{P}_i)]^2 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} [T_{\boldsymbol{\Delta} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i}(S_{\widetilde{L}^{\perp \prime}}(f))]^2 \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{l} \in \widetilde{L}^{\perp \prime}} \left[ \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{f}^*(\boldsymbol{l}) \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{l})^T (\boldsymbol{\Delta} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \widetilde{L}^{\perp \prime}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{m} \in L^{\perp \prime}} \left[ \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{f}^*(\boldsymbol{m}) \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{m})^T (\boldsymbol{\Delta} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i)} \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \widetilde{L}^{\perp \prime}} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{m} \in L^{\perp}_{\nu_j}} \left[ \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{f}^*(\boldsymbol{m}) \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{m})^T (\boldsymbol{\Delta} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_i)} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{m} \in L^{\perp \prime}} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{f}^*(\boldsymbol{m}) e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{m})^T \boldsymbol{\Delta}} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}, \boldsymbol{m} \in L^{\perp}_{\nu_j}} \hat{f}(\boldsymbol{k}) \hat{f}^*(\boldsymbol{m}) e^{2\pi \sqrt{-1}(\boldsymbol{k} - \boldsymbol{m})^T \boldsymbol{\Delta}} \\ &= \left[ \operatorname{err}(f, P_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}) \right]^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} \left| T_{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}(S_{L^{\perp}_{\nu_j}}(f)) \right|^2. \end{split}$$

This implies that

(3) 
$$\widehat{\operatorname{err}}(f, P_{\Delta}) = \mathfrak{C}\sqrt{\frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} \left| T_{\Delta}(S_{L_{\nu_{j}}^{\perp}}(f)) \right|^{2}}.$$

References

Room E1-208, Department of Applied Mathematics, Illinois Institute of Technology, 10 W.  $32^{\text{ND}}$  St., Chicago, IL 60616

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou City, Gansu, China 730000