• In equation (1), change the boundary conditions to

$$a_x \le X(t) \le b_x$$
  
 $a_y \le Y(t) \le b_y$ 

Or change the boundary conditions in equation (3) to make the two equations consistent with each other.

- Delete  $0 < t' \le t$  below equation (2).
- Change equation (3) to

$$\frac{1}{dxdy} \Pr \left( \begin{array}{c} X(t) \in [x, x + dx), Y(t) \in [y, y + dy), \\ \min_{t' \in [0, t]} X(t') \ge a_x, \max_{t' \in [0, t]} X(t') \le b_x, \\ \min_{t' \in [0, t]} Y(t') \ge a_y, \max_{t' \in [0, t]} Y(t') \le b_y \end{array} \right) X(0) = x_0, Y(0) = y_0, \theta$$

- In equation (4), change to  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t'}$
- Change equation (6) to

$$\frac{\partial^4}{\partial a_x \partial b_x \partial a_y \partial b_y} q(x,y,t) = \text{density} \begin{pmatrix} X(t) = x, Y(t) = y, \\ \min_{t' \in [0,t]} X(t') = a_x, \max_{t' \in [0,t]} X(t') = b_x, \\ \min_{t' \in [0,t]} Y(t') = a_y, \max_{t' \in [0,t]} Y(t') = b_y \end{pmatrix} X(0) = x_0, Y(0) = y_0, \theta$$

- At the end of paragraph after equation (6), change to
  "... method necessary for carrying out inferential procedures with ..."
- In the last paragraph of page 1, change to

  " ... each eigenfunction of the differential operator is a product of two sine functions,
  one in each dimension ..."
- In the last paragraph of page 1 Use  $a_x, a_y$  instead of  $a_1, a_2$ Use  $b_x, b_y$  instead of  $b_1, b_2$

- In the last paragraph of page 1, change to

  "This, however, requires one to solve Fokker-Planck equation (4)-(5) accurately for at
  least 16 slightly different sets of boundaries and combine the results with numerical
  differentiation to evaluate the density function for a just single observation ..."
- At the beginning of first paragraph on page 2, add "for non-zero correlation,"

## Change to

"... where the eigenfunctions for the differential operator are approximated by the eigenvectors of a linear system obtained using a truncated expansion based on a set of separable basis function, each of which is a product of two sine functions (one in each dimension) satisfying the boundary conditions ..."

- In the middle of first paragraph on page , change to
  - "... makes the expansion a slow, if not unfeasible, solution."

Change to

- "... from either using a separable representation for the differential operator that is intrinsically correlated in the two dimensions (trigonometric series) or ... "
- At the beginning of second paragraph on page, change to

  "In this paper, we propose a robust and efficient solution to the general problem (4)-(5).

  The solution is obtained by combining a small-time analytic solution with a Galerkin discretization based on basis functions that are correlated."
- Change equation (9) to

$$p(x, y, t) = \sum_{v} h_v \phi_v(x, y) e^{-\lambda_v t}$$

where  $h_v$  is the coefficient of  $\phi_v(x,y)$  in the eigenfunction expansion of p(x,y,0).

• 4 lines below equation (9) on page 3, change to

"... we approximate the eigenfunction using a finite set of orthogonal basis functions satisfying boundary conditions, i.e., a finite sequence of sines, ... "

- The equation below equation (9) on page 3, make changes
  - 1. Each index should start at 1, not 0.
  - 2. Make the associated changes in the definition of  $\Psi(x,y)$  and  $c_v$ .
- In the paragraph below equation (10) on page 3, change to

  "... Applying L to the basis function expansion of  $\phi_v$  and again approximating the result using the finite set of basis functions yields"
- 4 lines below equation (10) on page 3, what is  $\tilde{\theta}$ ? This is the first time this parameter/quantity is mentioned.
- After  $\tilde{\theta}$  on page 3, add

  "In the last part of the equation above, we have truncated the infinite sine series expansion of  $L\psi_{l,m}(x,y)$ "
- 4 lines below equation (10) on page 3, delete the subscript outside the curly bracket it should be  $\{\psi_{l,m}(x,y)\}$ .
- 5 lines below equation (10) on page 3, change to " The dense structure of matrix A is caused by the mixing terms ..."
- 9 lines below equation (10) on page 3, change to " ... , we arrive at the matrix eigenvalue problem "
- Equation at the bottom of page 3, move  $\Psi(x,y)^T$  outside the summation and add the coefficient  $h_v$

It should be

$$p(x, y, t) \approx \Psi(x, y)^T \sum_{v} h_v c_v e^{-\lambda_v t}$$

• Page 4, line 7, change "such that ..." to

"The 4-th derivative of p with respect to the 4 boundaries is approximated as "

$$\frac{\partial^4}{\partial a_x \partial b_x \partial a_y \partial b_y} p(x, y, t)$$

$$\approx \frac{\sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 = \pm 1} c_{\{k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4\}} p(x, y, t | a_x + k_1 \varepsilon, b_x + k_2 \varepsilon, a_y + k_3 \varepsilon, b_y + k_4 \varepsilon)}{(2\varepsilon)^4}$$

- Page 4, line 9, change to
  - " ... requires many terms in the basis function expansions of the eigenfunctions, ..."
- Paragraph after equation (11) on page 4, change to
  " ... Here, c(t) is a vector consisting of values of the solution in (8) on a set of grid points over Ω at time t, ... "
- Line 6 below equation (11) on page 4, change to "For example, using  $c_{l,m}(t)$  to denote the approximation of the solution at grid point  $(x_l, y_m)$ , and assembling vector c(t) using the index scheme  $c_{l,m}(t) \to c_k(t)$  with k = (l-1)M + m, we can approximate the operator  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$  as
- Line 12 below equation (11) on page 4, change to
  " ... with a constant h independent of parameters is appealing ..."
- last sentence of page 4, delete the sentence since we are not discussing the approach in details. If we want to keep the sentence, we need to describe the approach in some details, including i) keeping  $\tau_x = 1$  and  $\tau_y = 1$ ; ii) keeping the 3 boundaries on grid points; iii) having to work with  $\Omega \neq$  a square; and iv) one side of boundaries not falling on grid points.
- Page 5, line 3, change to
  "..., h cannot be made too small because round-off error and the irregular part of the truncation error become an issue relatively quickly.
- Equations and text from line 6 of page 5 to the end of section 2, change to

$$p_{FD}(x, y, t | b) = p(x, y, t | b) + h^{2} F_{reg}(b) + h^{2} F_{irreg}(b) + \varepsilon_{mach} F_{round}(b)$$

where we have included parameter b explicitly as a simplified notation for  $[a_x, b_x]$  and  $[a_y, b_y]$  after shifting  $a_x$  and  $a_y$  to 0.

Note that when expressed using the chain rule, both  $\frac{\partial}{\partial a_x}$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial b_x}$  contain  $\frac{\partial}{\partial b}$ . As a result,  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial a_x \partial b_x}$  leads to  $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial b^2}$ . Although in the discussion below, for simplicity, we only illustrate the numerical differentiation on the first derivative, keep in mind that it is the second derivative that is more relevant in the calculation of  $\frac{\partial^4}{\partial a_x \partial b_x \partial a_y \partial b_y} p(x, y, t)$ . In the expression of finite difference solution above,  $h^2F_{reg}(b)$  is the regular part of the truncation error from discretizing the differential operator on the grid;  $h^2 F_{irreq}(b)$  is the irregular part of the truncation error from the interpolations invoked by  $\{x_0, y_0, x, y\}$ not being on grid points; and  $\varepsilon_{mach} F_{round}(b)$  is the effect of round-off errors with  $\varepsilon_{mach} \sim$  $10^{-16}$  denoting the machine epsilon for IEEE double precision system. The coefficient,  $F_{reg}(b)$ , of the regular part of truncation error is a smooth function of b with derivative = O(1). The coefficient,  $F_{round}(b)$ , in the effect of round-off errors, behaves virtually like a random variable, discontinuous in b. For the irregular part of truncation error, the coefficient  $F_{irreg}(b)$  in general is continuous in b but not smooth in b where the derivative has discontinuities of magnitude  $O\left(\frac{1}{h}\right)$ . For example, the error in a piecewise linear interpolation of a smooth function at position b using step h has the general form of

Interpolation error 
$$= O(h^2)(1 - \text{rem}(b/h, 1))\text{rem}(b/h, 1)$$

The coefficient part  $F_{irreg}(b) = (1 - \text{rem}(b/h, 1))\text{rem}(b/h, 1)$  is continuous in b but not differentiable. Its first derivative has the behavior of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial b}$$
F<sub>irreg</sub> $(b) = \frac{1}{h} (1 - 2\text{rem}(b/h, 1))$ 

Based on the expression we wrote out above for the finite difference solution, applying the numerical differentiation on t with step  $\varepsilon$  yields:

$$\frac{p_{FD}(x, y, t | b + \varepsilon) - p_{FD}(x, y, t | b - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} \\
= \frac{\partial}{\partial b} p(x, y, t | b) + O(\varepsilon^{2}) + h^{2} \frac{F_{reg}(b + \varepsilon) - F_{reg}(b - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} \\
+ h^{2} \frac{F_{irreg}(b + \varepsilon) - F_{irreg}(b - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} + \varepsilon_{mach} \frac{F_{round}(b + \varepsilon) - F_{round}(b - \varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon}$$

In the equation above, as the step in the numerical differentiation is refined, the first line of the RHS is well behaved, converging to the true value  $\frac{\partial}{\partial b}p(x,y,t|b)$  as  $\varepsilon \to 0$ .

The second line of RHS, however, is problematic. As  $\varepsilon \to 0$ , the contribution from round-off error blows up to infinity

$$\varepsilon_{mach} \frac{F_{round}(b+\varepsilon) - F_{round}(b-\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} = O\left(\frac{\varepsilon_{mach}}{\varepsilon}\right) \longrightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0$$

The contribution from the irregular part of truncation error is

$$h^{2} \frac{F_{irreg}(b+\varepsilon) - F_{irreg}(b-\varepsilon)}{2\varepsilon} = O\left(\frac{h^{2}}{\max(\varepsilon, h)}\right)$$

In the second order numerical differentiation, however, the contribution from the irregular part of truncation error behaves like

$$h^{2} \frac{F_{irreg}(b+\varepsilon) - 2F_{irreg}(b) + F_{irreg}(b-\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^{2}} = O\left(\frac{h^{2}}{\max(\varepsilon^{2}, h^{2})}\right)$$

## • Below are new in version 2

• The first equation in section 3, change to

$$p(x, y, t) = \sum_{v} h_v \phi_v(x, y) e^{-\lambda_v t}$$

where  $h_v$  is the coefficient of  $\phi_v(x,y)$  in the eigenfunction expansion of p(x,y,0). DONE

• Line 2 on page 6, change to

"... i.e.,  $\psi_i(x,y) \in W_2^2(\Omega)$  where  $\Omega = (0,1) \times (0,1)$  is the domain of the normalized problem."

**Question:** How about the derivatives with respect to parameters  $(\tau_x, \tau_y)$ ? These derivatives along with the derivatives with respect to (x, y) will affect the derivatives with respect to  $(a_x, b_x, a_y, b_y)$  in the original (unnormalized) problem. DONE

• Two lines below equation (14) on page 6,

" ... span of  $S_k$  ... "

Question: what is  $S_k$ ? You need to define it. Is it the set of basis functions  $\{\psi_i(x,y), 1 \le i \le k\}$ ? If it is already the space spanned by the set of basis functions  $\{\psi_i(x,y), 1 \le i \le k\}$ , then we just say

"... projection of p(x, y, 0) onto subspace  $S_k$ ." DONE

- Two lines below equation (14) on page 6, replace "... with elements" by ". Matrix M, matrix S and vector  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{0})$  are expressed in elements as: " DONE
- Line 2 from bottom of page 6,
  - " We can then find a small enough  $t_{\varepsilon}$  such that ... "

We also need to mention that we select the largest among all the time instances satisfying this condition. DONE

- Line 3 on page 7,
  - " so that the problem obeys the diffusion equation."

Do you mean the diffusion equation with  $\tau_x = 1$ ,  $\tau_y = 1$  and  $\rho = 0$ , obtained by a scaling and rotating transformation on equation (8)? DONE

- Line 8 on page 7,
  - " We define distance between  $\dots$  "

There are some minor problems with this definition when we look at the distances between the image of  $(\xi_0, \eta_0)$  and the 4 boundaries. How about defining the distance to each boundary as the shortest distance between  $(\xi_0, \eta_0)$  and the boundary segment? Note that the perpendicular intersection may not fall within the line segment when the 4 line segments form a very skewed diamond. When the 4 line segments do form a very skewed diamond and when  $(\xi_0, \eta_0)$  is close to a corner with angle larger than  $90^{\circ}$ , the image with respect to one side may well be very close in terms of perpendicular distance to the adjacent side. But the shortest distance to the line segment will be well behaved and the shorted distance is what matters since we only need to enforce the boundary condition over the line segment, not over the whole infinite line. DONE

• Line 4 in section 3.2 on page 7, change to

$$S_k = \{ \psi_i(x, y), 0 \le i \le k \}.$$

This is the first time  $S_k$  is defined. It needs to be defined earlier. DONE

• Line 4 of page 8, change to

" ... 
$$\{\psi_i(x,y|\tilde{\rho},\sigma)\}_{i=0}^k$$
 ... "

**Question:** What about the derivatives of  $c_i(t)$  with respect to parameters  $(\tau_x, \tau_y)$ ?

Since the basis functions  $\{\psi_i(x,y|\tilde{\rho},\sigma)\}_{i=0}^k$  are not explicitly dependent on  $(\tau_x,\tau_y)$ , derivatives of  $p^{(k)}(x,y,t)$  with respect to parameters  $(\tau_x,\tau_y)$  will mainly affected by those of  $c_i(t)$ . Correct?

**DONE Question:** How do you select the value of  $\sigma$ ?

• Second equation in section 3.3, page 8

Question: Should it be

$$...\lambda_j^2 \langle w, \phi_j \rangle^2$$

## DONE

The line below Equation (17) on page 8
Question/Comments: Do you mean "... h(k) is a decreasing function of h... "?
What is h(k)? DONE

• Equation (18) on page 8

**Question/Comments:** Do you mean " ... for  $t > t_{\varepsilon}$  ..."?

In equation (18), is coefficient C the same as that in equation (17)?

In equation (18), is h(k) the same as that in equation (17)?

If so, what/where is the contribution to global error from the discretization when the initial value at  $t = t_{\varepsilon}$  is represented exactly with no error? DONE

First equation in section 4 and the line above, change to
" ... an i.i.d set of samples (Z<sub>1</sub>,..., Z<sub>n</sub>) from random variable Z(t) at a given value of t in the process in (1)-(2). Specifically, Z(t) is formed as

$$Z(t) = (X(t), Y(t), m_x(t), M_x(t), m_y(t), M_y(t))$$

where

$$m_x(t) = \min_{0 \le t' \le t} X(t), \quad M_x(t) = \max_{0 \le t' \le t} X(t), \quad m_y(t) = \min_{0 \le t' \le t} Y(t), \quad M_y(t) = \max_{0 \le t' \le t} Y(t)$$

## DONE

• First equation in section 4

**Question:** Do we need to specify  $x0_0 = 0, y_0 = 0$ ? DONE

Second and third equations in section 4
 Question: What is F? density function? cumulative distribution function?
 The RHS of third equation looks like CDF but the LHS looks like PDF. DONE; I think this is standard notation

- Line 4 of page 9, change to
  " ... or use only some of it. " DONE
- The equation above section 4.1

  Question: What is the exact meaning of this equation? Is Pr() density function?

  CDF? Or do you mean the convergence is the sense of probability? DONE
- Equation (19) on page 9, Revise it according to the revision suggested for equation (6).
- Line 2 below equation (20) on page 9, change it to

  "...  $f^{(k)}(z)$  corresponds to the approximate solution  $q^{(k)}$  of the unnormalized equation obtained from the Galerkin approximation  $p^{(k)}$  of the normalized equation. DONE
- Line 1 of page 10, Question: What about the dependence of coefficients  $c_i(t)$  on  $(\tau_x, \tau_y)$ , and in turn, their dependence on  $(a_x, b_x, a_y, b_y)$ ?
- Line 3 from the bottom of page 10, change to

  "The second-order finite difference ..."

**Note:** This is the second order numerical differentiation. The first order one has 9 terms instead of 16. DONE

- Line 1 of page 11, change to" ... in the second-order finite difference ..." DONE
- Page 11, equation (24), change the last term to  $O(\varepsilon^6; a_x, b_x, a_y, b_y)$  DONE

- In the two equations after equation (24), All integration limits should be multiplied by  $\varepsilon$ . DONE