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## Motivation

- Two basic operations in scientific computation are differentiation and integration.
- Key, for example, for:

1. Equation solving.
2. Optimization (gradients, Hessians, Jacobians, ...).
3. ODEs and PDEs.
4. Statistics and econometrics.
5. Machine learning.

- Potentially costly operations because of their repetition.
- Not general algorithm for them. Instead, menu of options.


## Algorithms

- Differentiation:

1. Forward/backward/central differentiation.
2. Complex Step Differentiation.
3. Symbolic differentiation.
4. Automatic differentiation.

- Integration:

1. Quadrature methods.
2. Monte Carlo.
3. Quasi Monte Carlo.

# Numerical Differentiation 

## Forward differencing

- The derivative of a function $f(\cdot)$ is

$$
f^{\prime}(x)=\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(x+\varepsilon)-f(x)}{\varepsilon}
$$

- Thus, a natural approximation is "forward differencing" scheme:

$$
f^{\prime}(x) \approx \frac{f(x+h)-f(x)}{h}
$$

for a small $h>0$.

- Extension to multivariate functions is straightforward:

$$
\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{i}} \approx \frac{f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}+h_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)-f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)}{h}
$$

## Error

- For linear functions, a "forward differencing" scheme approximation is exact.
- For non-linear functions, recall that a Taylor expansion of $f(x+h)$ around $h=0$ is:

$$
f(x+h)=f(x)+f^{\prime}(x) h+\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)}{2} h^{2}, \quad \xi \in(x, x+h)
$$

- Then, we can derive an expression for the truncation error:

$$
f^{\prime}(x)=\frac{f(x+h)-f(x)}{h}+O(h)
$$

which is valid if $f(x)$ has two continuous derivatives.

- Which $h$ to pick?

$$
h=\max (|x|, 1) \sqrt{\epsilon}
$$

where $\epsilon$ is the machine precision (I am skipping proof, standard result).
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## Backward difference

- "Backward differencing" scheme

$$
f^{\prime}(x) \approx \frac{f(x)-f(x-h)}{h}
$$

- Extension to multivariate functions is:

$$
\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{i}} \approx \frac{f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)-f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}-h_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)}{h}
$$

- Also, an approximation error of order $h$. Same proof as before.
- Thus, in practice, one uses forward or backward differences depending on whether we care more about left or right derivative (kinks, finite difference solvers for ODEs, ...).


## Centered difference

- "Centered differencing" scheme

$$
f^{\prime}(x) \approx \frac{f(x+h)-f(x-h)}{2 h}
$$

- Extension to multivariate functions is:

$$
\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{i}} \approx \frac{f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}+h_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)-f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}-h_{i}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)}{h}
$$

- Rule for selecting $h$ :

$$
h=\max (|x|, 1) \sqrt[3]{\epsilon}
$$

This choice minimizes the sum of round-off and truncation error.

## Error with centered difference

- Truncation error can be found by subtracting Taylor expansions of $f(x+h)$ and $f(x-h)$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
f(x+h)-f(x-h)=2 f^{\prime}(x) h+\frac{\left(f^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(\xi_{1}\right)+f^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(\xi_{2}\right)\right)}{6} h^{3} \Rightarrow \\
f^{\prime}(x)=\frac{f(x+h)-f(x-h)}{2 h}+O\left(h^{2}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

- Centered differencing is more precise: truncation error of order $h^{2}$.
- Trade-off between accuracy and efficiency for functions of higher dimensions.
- Suppose $f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$, then computing the Jacobian matrix of $f$ requires $m(n+1)$ function evaluations using the forward differencing scheme and $2 m n$ evaluations using the centered differencing scheme, roughly twice as many when $n$ is large.


## Higher-order and cross-derivatives

- Numerical differentiation accumulates error.
- For second- and higher-order derivatives, and often, for cross-derivatives, the error can become substantial.
- We can improve upon the previous schemes: Richardson's extrapolation.
- Probably a good idea to search for alternatives:

1. Complex step differentiation.
2. Symbolic derivatives.
3. Automatic differentiation.

## Richardson's extrapolation

- Recall that centered differencing generates errors of order $O\left(h^{2}\right)$.
- We can increase the efficiency by using Richardson's extrapolation.
- However, we need to know also $f(x-2 h)$ and $f(x+2 h)$.
- We will skip the derivation (check any standard numerical analysis textbook).
- Result:

$$
f^{\prime}(x)=\frac{-f(x+2 h)+8 f(x+h)-8 f(x-h)+f(x-2 h)}{12 h}+O\left(h^{4}\right),
$$

a fourth-order approximation.

- Adjust $h$ accordingly.


## Complex step differentiation I

- Let $f(x)$ be an analytic function.
- Then:

$$
f(x+i h)=f(x)+f^{\prime}(x) i h+\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)}{2} h^{2}+\ldots
$$

- Take imaginary part on both sides of the expression:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Im}(f(x+i h)) & =\operatorname{Im}\left(f(x)+f^{\prime}(x) i h+\frac{f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)}{2} h^{2}+\ldots\right) \\
& =f^{\prime}(x) h+\ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

- Dividing by $h$ and reordering:

$$
f^{\prime}(x)=\frac{\operatorname{lm}(f(x+i h))}{h}+O\left(h^{2}\right)
$$

## Complex step differentiation II

- Following the same logic, we can get second derivative:

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(x)=\frac{2}{h^{2}} *(f(x)-\operatorname{Real}(f(x+i h))
$$

- Similar formulae apply for Jacobians and Hessians.
- This algorithm depends on the ability of your programming language to deal efficient and accurately with complex arithmetic.


## Symbolic differentiation

- Many programming languages have symbolic math packages/toolboxes.

1. $\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{+}: \mathrm{GiNaC}$.
2. Python: SymPy.
3. Julia: SymPy.jl.
4. R: Racayas.
5. Matlab: Symbolic Math Toolbox.

- Disadvantages:

1. Performance penalty.
2. Limitations in abstractions.

## Automatic differentiation

## Definition

Set of techniques designed to numerically evaluate the derivative of a function while minimizing the amount of arithmetic operations.

- Automatic differentiation divides the function to derivate into small parts and then applies the chain rule to solve for the derivative.
- Example:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x y^{2}+\log x \\
= & w_{1}\left(w_{2}\right)^{2}+\log w_{1} \\
= & w_{3}+w_{4} \\
= & w_{5}
\end{aligned}
$$

- We want to compute the derivative of this function with respect to $x$.


## Example

$$
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text { Operations to compute value } & \text { Operations to compute derivative } \\
\hline w_{1}=x & w_{1}^{\prime}=1(\mathrm{seed}) \\
w_{2}=y & w_{2}^{\prime}=0(\mathrm{seed}) \\
w_{3}=w_{1}\left(w_{2}\right)^{2} & w_{3}^{\prime}=w_{1}^{\prime}\left(w_{2}\right)^{2}+2 w_{1} w_{2}^{\prime} \\
w_{4}=\log w_{1} & w_{4}^{\prime}=\frac{w_{1}^{\prime}}{w_{1}} \\
w_{5}=w_{3}+w_{4} & w_{5}^{\prime}=w_{3}^{\prime}+w_{4}^{\prime}
\end{array}
$$

- We get:

$$
\begin{aligned}
w_{5}^{\prime} & =w_{3}^{\prime}+w_{4}^{\prime} \\
& =w_{1}^{\prime}\left(w_{2}\right)^{2}+2 w_{1} w_{2}^{\prime}+\frac{w_{1}^{\prime}}{w_{1}} \\
& =\left(w_{2}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{w_{1}} \\
& =y^{2}+\frac{1}{x}
\end{aligned}
$$

- How do you implement it in the computer?


## Quadrature Integration

## Overview

## Quadrature

Method of solving an integral numerically by exploiting the definition of the integral.

- Trade-offs between accuracy, coding time, and running time.
- There are several quadrature methods, each evaluating the integral at different points and using the evaluations differently.

1. Newton-Coates.
2. Gaussian.
3. Clenshaw-Curtis.

- Some methods are more general, but slower, whereas others can be more restrictive and complicated, but have faster running time.


## Newton-Cotes: overview

- Evaluate $f$ at a finite number of points to create a piecewise-polynomial function.
- Then, integrate this approximation of $f$ to approximate:

$$
\int_{D} f(x) d x
$$

- All Newton-Cotes rules are of the form:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)
$$

for some quadrature nodes $x_{i} \in[a, b]$ and quadrature weights $\omega_{i}$.


## Midpoint rule

- Simplest (open) rule with one interval:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x=\underbrace{(b-a) f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right)}_{\text {Integration rule }}+\underbrace{\frac{(b-a)^{3}}{24} f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)}_{\text {Error term }}
$$

where $\xi \in[a, b]$.

- Proof is application of Taylor' theorem and intermediate value theorem.
- With $n>1$ intervals and $h=\frac{b-a}{n}$ step size, the composite midpoint rule is:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x \approx h \sum_{j=1}^{n} f\left(a+\left(j-\frac{1}{2}\right) h\right)+\frac{h^{2} \cdot(b-a)}{24} f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)
$$

for some $\xi \in[a, b]$.

- Note quadratic convergence: doubling intervals, reduces error $\approx 75 \%$.
- We can define irregularly-spaced step sizes if additional information about $f(\cdot)$ is available.



## Trapezoid rule

- The trapezoid (close) rule uses a linear approximation of $f$ along with the values of $f$ at the endpoints:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x=(b-a) \frac{f(a)+f(b)}{2}-\frac{(b-a)^{3}}{12} f^{\prime \prime}(\xi)
$$

where $\xi \in[a, b]$.

- We can define the composite trapezoid rule as we did with the composite midpoint rule:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x \approx \frac{b-a}{n}\left(\frac{f(a)}{2}+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} f\left(a+\left(j \frac{b-a}{2}\right)\right)+\frac{f(a)}{2}\right)
$$

- Again, we can have irregularly-spaced steps.



## Simpson rule

- The Simpson rule uses a piecewise-quadratic approximation of $f$ along with the values of $f$ at the endpoints and the midpoint.

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x=\frac{b-a}{6}\left[f(a)+4 f\left(\frac{b+a}{2}\right)+f(b)\right]-\frac{(b-a)^{5}}{2880} f^{(4)}(\xi)
$$

where $\xi \in[a, b]$.

- Analogous composite rule with $n \geq 2$ intervals, $h=\frac{(b-a)}{n}$ and $x_{j}=a+j h$, is defined as

$$
S_{n}(f)=\frac{h}{3}\left[f_{0}+4 f_{1}+2 f_{2}+4 f_{3}+\ldots+4 f_{n-1}+f_{n}\right]-\frac{h^{4}(b-a)}{180} f^{(4)}(\xi)
$$

where $\xi \in[a, b]$

- Other rules: Simpson's $3 / 8$ rule and Boole's rule.
- Also, we can implement change of variables.



## Gaussian: overview

- For any fixed non-negative weighting function $w(x)$ Gaussian quadrature creates approximation of the form:

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) w(x) d x \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)
$$

for some nodes $x_{i} \in[a, b]$, and positive weights $w_{i}$.

- Gaussian quadrature builds on orthogonal Legendre polynomials approximations.
- In general, more efficient than Newton-Cotes. Why?
- Often, computing the nodes and weights is not required, as the more useful Gaussian quadrature nodes and weights can be found in tables.


## Chebyshev quadrature

- Used for integrals of the form:

$$
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x) \underbrace{\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}_{\text {Weighting fun }} d x
$$

- Gauss-Chebyshev quadrature formula:

$$
\int_{-1}^{1} f(x)\left(1-x^{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} d x=\frac{\pi}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(x_{i}\right)+\frac{\pi}{2^{2 n-1}} \frac{f^{(2 n)}(\xi)}{(2 n)!}
$$

for some $\xi \in[-1,1]$ where the quadrature nodes are $x_{i}=\cos \left(\frac{2 i-1}{2 n} \pi\right)$ with $i=1, \ldots, n$.

- Change of variables to accommodate different intervals.
- Constant weight $\frac{\pi}{n}$ for each node and quadrature nodes that are easy to compute.


## Hermite quadrature

- Used for integrals of the form

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) \underbrace{e^{-x^{2}}}_{\text {Weighting fun }} d x
$$

where the function is evaluated at the Hermite polynomial roots.

- For a random variable $Y$ with distribution $\mathcal{N}\left(\mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$, a linear change of variables gives

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y) e^{-\frac{(\underline{\mu \mu})^{2}}{2 \sigma^{2}}} d y=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\sqrt{2} \sigma x+\mu) e^{-x^{2}} \sqrt{2} \sigma d x
$$

- Useful for economics due to the common use of normally distributed random variables, especially in macro and finance.


## Interpolatory rules

- Interpolatory quadrature rules involves using derivatives of $f(x)$ to approximate the integral $\int_{a}^{b} f(x) d x$.

$$
\int_{a}^{b} f(x) w(x) d x \approx \sum_{i=i}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \omega_{i j} f^{(j)}\left(x_{i}\right)
$$

where once again the $x_{i}$ are nodes and the $\omega_{i}$ are weights.

- It often involves substantial extra calculation due to evaluating the derivatives.


## Newton-Cotes vs. Gaussian

- In Newton-Cotes formulas, the $x_{i}$ points are chosen arbitrarily, ususally uniformly spaced on $[a, b]$ whereas in the Gaussian formulas, both the nodes and weights are chosen efficiently.
- Efficiency is measured using the exact integration for finite-dimensional collection of functions.
- While Gaussian may have a time advantage over Newton-Cotes, this comes at the cost of having to perform complex calculations to find the weights and nodes.
- Clenshaw-Curtis quadrature -based on an expansion of the integrand in terms of Chebyshev polynomials- is often a good intermediate compromise.


## Multidimensional quadrature

- One approach to deal with multidimensional integrals is to directly extend the one-dimensional methods via product rules.
- However:
- The algebra becomes very challenging.
- There is no guarantee of a solution and if there is a solution, then there will be multiple and it is possible that they will have negative weights.
- The curse of dimensionality is acute.
- We will revisit Smolyak grids when we talk about projection methods.
- The main practice used to extend to higher dimensions is Monte Carlo integration.


# Monte Carlo Integration 

## A bit of historical background and intuition

- Metropolis and Ulam (1949) and Von Neuman (1951)
- Why the name "Monte Carlo"?
- Two silly examples:

1. Probability of getting a total of six points when rolling two (fair) dices.
2. Throwing darts at a graph.

## Overview

- This method can handle problems of far greater complexity and size than most other methods.
- As well, Monte Carlo methods can deliver accurate results using moderate number of points (which are randomly selected).
- Some strengths of this method are its robustness and simplicity.
- It is based on the law of large numbers and the central limit theorem.
- Monte Carlo produces a random approximation, which puts structure on the error term.
- For an approximation $\hat{l}_{f}$ the variance will be

$$
\sigma_{\hat{\imath}_{f}}^{2}=\frac{1}{N} \int_{0}^{1}\left(f(x)-I_{f}\right)^{2} d x=\frac{1}{N} \sigma_{f}^{2}
$$

## Crude method

- A crude Monte Carlo estimate of $E[f(X)]=\int_{0}^{1} f(x) d x$ is calculated by generating $N$ draws from $U[0,1],\left\{x_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$ and takes the form

$$
\hat{l}_{f}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} f\left(x_{i}\right)
$$

where $\hat{l}_{f}$ is also a random variable.

- Although this estimator is unbiased, it is not commonly used, because of its large variance.
- There are variety of simple techniques that can reduce the variance, but retain its unbiasedness.


## Randomness in computation

## Von Neumann (1951)

Anyone who considers arithmetical methods of producing random digits is, of course, in a state of $\sin$.

- Let's us do a simple experiment.
- Let's us start Matlab, type format long, type rand.
- Did we get 0.8147 ?
- This does not look terribly random.
- Why is this number appearing?
- Matlab uses highly non-linear iterative algorithms that "look like" random.
- That is why sometimes we talk of pseudo-random number generators.


## How do we generate random numbers?

- Large literature on random number generation.
- Most basic algorithms draw from a uniform distribution.
- Other (standard and nonstandard) distributions come from manipulations of the uniform.
- Two good surveys:

1. Luc Devroye: Non-Uniform Random Variate Generation, Springer-Verlag, 1986.

Available for free at: http://www.nrbook.com/devroye/.
2. Christian Robert and George Casella, Monte Carlo Statistical Methods, 2nd ed, Springer-Verlag, 2004.

- Use state-of-art random number generators. It matters!


## Stratefied sampling

- This sampling method exploits the fact that there will be subintervals with lower variance.
- Suppose that we divide $[0,1]$ into $[0, \alpha]$ and $[\alpha, 1]$, then if we have $N$ points in each interval we can form the estimate

$$
\hat{\iota}_{f}=\frac{\alpha}{N} \sum_{i} f\left(x_{1 i}\right)+\frac{1-\alpha}{N} \sum_{i} f\left(x_{2 i}\right)
$$

where $x_{1 i} \in[0, \alpha]$ and $x_{2 i} \in[\alpha, 1]$.

- Its variance is

$$
\sigma_{\hat{I}_{f}}^{2}=\frac{\alpha}{N} \int_{0}^{\alpha} f^{2}+\frac{1-\alpha}{N} \int_{\alpha}^{1} f^{2}-\frac{\alpha}{N}\left(\int_{0}^{\alpha} f\right)^{2}-\frac{1-\alpha}{N}\left(\int_{\alpha}^{1} f\right)^{2}
$$
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## Importance sampling

- The idea of the method is that we sample more intensively where $f$ is large, which is where $f$ is making the greatest contribution to $\int f(x) d x$.
- If $p(x)>0$, and $\int_{0}^{1} p(x) d x=1$, then $p(x)$ is a density and

$$
I_{f}=\int_{0}^{1} f(x) d x=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{f(x)}{p(x)} p(x) d x
$$

- Therefore, if $x_{i}$ is drawn with density $p(x)$, then the following is an unbiased estimator of $I$

$$
\hat{l}_{f}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f\left(x_{i}\right)}{p\left(x_{i}\right)}
$$

and its variance has decreased.


## Comparison: 1 dimension

$$
\text { Calculate } \int_{0}^{1} e^{x} d x
$$

| Approximation Error |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N | Midpoint | Trapezoid | Simpson's | Monte Carlo |
| 10 | -0.00071574 | 0.00143166 | 0.00000006 | 0.09523842 |
| 100 | -0.00000716 | 0.00001432 | 0.00000000 | 0.01416057 |
| 1000 | -0.00000007 | 0.00000014 | -0.00000000 | -0.00515829 |
| 5000 | -0.00000000 | 0.00000001 | 0.00000000 | 0.00359500 |


| Computation Time (sec.) |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N | Midpoint | Trapezoid | Simpson's | Monte Carlo |
| 10 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| 100 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| 1000 | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| 5000 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.01 |

## Comparison: 2 dimensions

$$
\text { Calculate } \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} e^{x} e^{y} d x d y
$$

| Approximation Error |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N | Midpoint | Monte Carlo |
| 10 | -0.00245918 | 0.33897914 |
| 100 | -0.00002460 | 0.03021147 |
| 1000 | -0.00000025 | -0.05486922 |
| 5000 | -0.00000001 | 0.01183325 |
| Computation Time (sec.) |  |  |
| N | Midpoint | Monte Carlo |
| 10 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| 100 | 0.11 | 0.01 |
| 1000 | 9.18 | 0.01 |
| 5000 | 229.14 | 0.02 |

## More Monte Carlo draws

| N | Approximation Error | Computation Time |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 | 0.33897914 | 0.00 |
| 100 | 0.03021147 | 0.00 |
| 1000 | -0.05486922 | 0.00 |
| 10000 | 0.00365290 | 0.00 |
| 100000 | -0.00177819 | 0.03 |
| 1000000 | -0.00177012 | 0.25 |
| 10000000 | 0.00065619 | 3.39 |
| 100000000 | -0.00007068 | 24.94 |

# Quasi Monte Carlo Integration 

## General idea

- Similar to Monte Carlo.
- Rely on ideas from number theory and Fourier analysis.
- Main difference: use low-discrepancy sequences instead of pseudo-random sequences.
- Low-discrepancy sequence: a sequence with the property that for all values of $N$, its subsequence $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N}$ has a low discrepancy with respect to interval $[a, b]$ :

$$
D_{N}=\sup _{a \leq c \leq d \leq b}\left|\frac{\#\left|\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{N}\right\} \cap[c, d]\right|}{N}-\frac{d-c}{b-a}\right|
$$

- Compare with equidistributed sequence (which we cannot use).
- Intuition.


## More resources

- Better behavior than Monte Carlo.
- But often difficult to apply.
- Main choices: Halton sequence, Sobol sequence, and Faure sequence.
- Check:

1. http://mikejuniperhill.blogspot.com/2014/03/using-c-nag-random-numbers-in-excel.html
2. https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/randtoolbox/versions/1.17/topics/quasiRNG

## Sobol vs. pseudorandom



