Séminaire de Mathématiques Appliquées du CERMICS



A least-squares Monte-Carlo approach to rare events simulation

Carsten Hartmann (BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg)

27 novembre 2018

A least-squares Monte-Carlo approach to rare events simulation

Carsten Hartmann (BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg), with Omar Kebiri, Lara Neureither and Lorenz Richter

CERMICS Applied Mathematics Seminar École des Ponts Paris Tech, 27 November 2018

Protein folding

[Noé et al, PNAS, 2009]



[Noé et al, PNAS, 2009]

Given a Markov process $X = (X_t)_{t \ge 0}$, discrete or continuous in time, we want to estimate probabilities $p \ll 1$, such as

$$p = P(\tau < T),$$

or rates

$$k = (\mathbb{E}[\tau])^{-1}$$

with τ some random first passage time and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ the expectation with respect to the probability *P*.

More specifically, we want to estimate free energies

$$F = -\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-W}],$$

where W is some functional of X.

For example, with $W = \alpha \tau$ and sufficiently small $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$-\alpha^{-1}F = \mathbb{E}[\tau] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$$

Illustrative example: bistable system

 Overdamped Langevin equation
 dX_t = −∇V(X_t)dt + √2ϵdB_t.

 MC estimator of ψ = E[e^{−ατ_C}]

$$\hat{\psi}_{\epsilon}^{\mathsf{N}} = rac{1}{\mathsf{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathsf{N}} e^{-lpha au_{c}^{i}}$$

Small noise asymptotics (Kramers)

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\epsilon\log\mathbb{E}[\tau_C]=\Delta V\,.$$



[Freidlin & Wentzell, 1984], [Berglund, Markov Processes Relat Fields 2013]

Illustrative example, cont'd

Relative error of the MC estimator

$$\delta_{\epsilon} = \frac{\sqrt{\mathsf{Var}[\hat{\psi}_{N}^{\epsilon}]}}{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_{N}^{\epsilon}]}$$

Varadhan's large deviations principle

 $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\psi}_{\epsilon}^{N})^{2}] \gg (\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_{\epsilon}^{N}])^{2}, \ \epsilon \text{ small.}$

• Unbounded relative error as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \delta_\epsilon = \infty$$



[Dupuis & Ellis, 1997]

Outline

Importance sampling of rare events

Duality of estimation and control

Least-squares regression

Numerical examples



Optimal change of measure: zero variance

Pick another probability measure Q with likelihood ratio

$$arphi = rac{dQ}{dP} > 0 \,,$$

under which the rare event is no longer rare, such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\alpha\tau_{\mathcal{C}})] = \mathbb{E}_{Q}\left[\exp(-\alpha\tau_{\mathcal{C}})\varphi^{-1}\right].$$

Zero-variance change of measure exists and is given by

$$\varphi^* = \frac{dQ^*}{dP} = \frac{\exp(-\alpha\tau_{\mathcal{C}})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\alpha\tau_{\mathcal{C}})]},$$

but it depends on the quantity of interest, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(-\alpha \tau_C)]$.

Approaching zero variance (non-exhaustive list)

Exponential tilting based on large deviations statistics:

$$dQ^* pprox \exp(\gamma - lpha au_{\mathcal{C}}) dP$$
 as ϵo 0,

where γ is related to the large deviations rate function. Siegmund, Glasserman & Kou, Dupuis & Wang, Vanden-Eijnden & Weare, Spiliopoulos, ...

Kullback-Leibler or cross-entropy minimisation:

$$Q^* pprox \operatorname*{argmin}_{Q \in \mathcal{M}} \mathit{KL}(Q, Q^*),$$

with Q from some suitable ansatz space \mathcal{M} .

Rubinstein & Kroese, Zhang & H, Kappen & Ruiz, Opper, Quer, ...

Mean square and work-normalised variance minimisation

Glynn & Whitt, Jourdain & Lelong, Su & Fu, Vázquez-Abad & Dufresne, ...

Another idea . . .

Exponential tilting from nonequilibrium forcing



Single molecule pulling experiments, figure courtesy of G. Hummer, MPI Frankfurt

In vitro/in silico free energy calculation from forcing:

$$F = -\log \mathbb{E}[e^{-W}]$$

Forcing generates a "nonequilibrium" path space measure Q with typically suboptimal likelihood quotient $\varphi = dQ/dP$.

[Schlitter, J Mol Graph, 1994], [Hummer & Szabo, PNAS, 2001], Schulten & Park, JCP, 2004], ...



Least-squares regression

10000

Numerical examples

Variational characterization of free energy

Theorem (Gibbs, Donsker & Varadhan, ...) For any bounded and measurable function W it holds

$$-\log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-W}\right] = \min_{Q \ll P} \left\{\mathbb{E}_{Q}[W] + KL(Q, P)\right\}$$

where $KL(Q, P) \ge 0$ is the **relative entropy** between Q and P:

$$KL(Q, P) = \begin{cases} \int \log\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right) dQ & \text{if } Q \ll P \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Sketch of proof: Let $\varphi = dQ/dP$. Then

$$-\log \int e^{-W} dP = -\log \int e^{-W - \log \varphi} dQ \le \int (W + \log \varphi) dQ$$

[Boué & Dupuis, LCDS Report #95-7, 1995], [Dai Pra et al, Math Control Signals Systems, 1996]

Same same, but different...

Set-up: uncontrolled ("equilibrium") diffusion process

Let $X = (X_s)_{s \ge 0}$ be a **diffusion process** on \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$dX_s = b(X_s)ds + \sigma(X_s)dB_s, \quad X_0 = x,$$

and

$$W(X) = \int_0^\tau f(X_s) \, ds + g(X_\tau) \, ,$$

for suitable functions f, g and a **a.s. finite stopping time** $\tau < \infty$.

Aim: Estimate the path functional

$$\psi(x) = \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-W(X)}\big]$$

Set-up: controlled ("nonequilibrium") diffusion process

Now given a controlled diffusion process $X^u = (X^u_s)_{s \ge 0}$,

$$dX_s^u = (b(X_s^u) + \sigma(X_s^u)u_s)ds + \sigma(X_s^u)dB_s, \quad X_0^u = x,$$

and a probability $Q \ll P$ on $C([0,\infty))$ with likelihood ratio

$$\varphi(X^u) = \frac{dQ}{dP}\Big|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau}} = \exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau} u_s \cdot dB_s - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau} |u_s|^2 ds\right) \,.$$

Now: Estimate the reweigthed path functional

$$\mathbb{E}\big[e^{-W(X)}\big] = \mathbb{E}\big[e^{-W(X^u)}(\varphi(X^u))^{-1}\big]$$

Variational characterization of free energies, cont'd

Theorem (H, 2012/2017)

Technical details aside, let u^* be a minimiser of the cost functional

$$J(u) = \mathbb{E}\bigg[W(X^u) + rac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau |u_s|^2 ds\bigg]$$

under the controlled dynamics

$$dX_s^u = (b(X_s^u) + \sigma(X_s^u)u_s)ds + \sigma(X_s^u)dB_s, \quad X_0^u = x.$$

The minimiser is unique with $J(u^*) = -\log \psi$. Moreover,

$$\psi(x) = e^{-W(X^{u^*})} (\varphi(X^{u^*}))^{-1}$$
 (a.s.).

[H & Schütte, JSTAT, 2012], [H et al, Entropy, 2017]

Illustrative example, cont'd

• Exit problem:
$$f = \alpha$$
, $g = 0$, $\tau = \tau_C$:

$$J(u^*) = \min_{u} \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha \tau_{C}^{u} + \frac{1}{4\epsilon} \int_{0}^{\tau_{C}^{u}} |u_{s}|^{2} ds\right],$$

under the tilted dynamics

$$dX_t^u = (u_t - \nabla V(X_t^u)) dt + \sqrt{2\epsilon} dB_t$$

Optimally tilted potential

$$U^*(x,t) = V(x) - u_t^* x$$

with stationary feedback $u_t^* = c(X_t^{u^*})$.





Sketch of proof: Fleming's log transformation

By the Feynman-Kac theorem,

$$\psi(x) = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\int_0^{\tau} f(X_t)dt - g(X_{\tau})\right) \middle| X_0 = x\right]$$

solves a linear BVP on an open and bounded set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(\mathcal{L} - f)\psi = 0$$
, $\psi|_{\partial\Omega_+} = \exp(-g)$ (\mathcal{L} generator)

The corresponding semilinear BVP for $F = -\log \psi$ reads

$$\mathcal{L}F - rac{1}{2} |
abla F|_a^2 + f = 0, \quad F|_{\partial\Omega_+} = g \qquad ext{with} \quad a = \sigma \sigma^T$$

[H et al, JSTAT, 2012]; cf. [Fleming, SIAM J Control, 1978], [Boué & Dupuis, Ann Probab., 1998]

Sketch of proof, cont'd

The semilinear Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellmann PDE

$$\mathcal{L}F - \frac{1}{2} |\nabla F|^2_{a} + f = 0, \quad F|_{\partial\Omega_+} = g \qquad (a = \sigma \sigma^T)$$

is the **dynamic programming equation** for our stochastic control problem; it solution is the value function

$$F(x) = \min\{J(u) \colon X_0^u = x\}$$

If $F \in C^2(O) \cap C(\overline{O})$, the optimal control has gradient form, i.e.

$$u_t^* = -\sigma(X_t^{u^*})^T \nabla F(X_t^{u^*}),$$

Generalizations: degenerate diffusions, Markov chains,

[Schütte et al, Math Prog, 2012], [Banisch & Hartmann, MCRF, 2016], [H et al, Entropy, 2017]



From dynamic programming to a pair of SDE

The semilinear HJB equation

$$\mathcal{L}F + h(x, F, \sigma^T \nabla F) = 0, \ F|_{\partial \Omega_+} = g$$

is equivalent to the uncoupled forward-backward SDE

$$dX_s = b(X_s)ds + \sigma(X_s)dB_s, X_t = x$$

$$dY_s = -h(X_s, Y_s, Z_s)ds + Z_s \cdot dB_s, Y_\tau = g(X_\tau),$$

on a random time horizon $[0, \tau] \subset [0, \infty)$ where

$$Y_s = F(X_s), \quad Z_s = \sigma(X_s)^T \nabla F(X_s).$$

Formal derivation: Itô's Lemma

[Pardoux & Peng, LNCIS 176, 1992], [Kobylanski, Ann Probab, 2000]

Some remarks

The solution of the forward-backward SDE (FBSDE)

$$dX_s = b(X_s)ds + \sigma(X_s)dB_s, X_0 = x$$

$$dY_s = -h(X_s, Y_s, Z_s)ds + Z_s \cdot dB_s, Y_\tau = g(X_\tau),$$

is a **triplet** (X, Y, Z) where (Y_s, Z_s) is adapted to $(X_u)_{u \leq s}$.

Hence Y₀ = F(x) is a deterministic function of the initial data X₀ = x, and Z controls this property.



Existence and uniqueness of (Y, Z) is guaranteed for terminal conditions g that are bounded & Lipschitz.

[Pardoux & Peng, LNCIS 176, 1992], [Kobylanski, Ann Probab, 2000]

Some remarks, cont'd

A BSDE is not a time-reversed SDE; for example, the SDE

$$dY_s = Z_s \cdot dB_s \,, \quad Y_T = X_T$$

has two possible formal solutions

$$(Y_s, Z_s) = (X_s, 1)$$
 and $(\tilde{Y}_s, \tilde{Z}_s) = (X_T, 0)$,

only one of which is adapted, namely (Y_s, Z_s) .

• A fix: project \tilde{Y}_s onto the filtration generated by $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$,

$$Y_s = \mathbb{E}[X_T | \mathcal{F}_s].$$

► Then, by the martingale representation theorem, there is a unique, predictable process Z ∈ L² such that

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}[X_T] + \int_0^t Z_s \cdot dB_s \implies Y_t = X_T - \int_t^t Z_s \cdot dB_s.$$

Numerical discretisation of FBSDE

The FBSDE is decoupled and an explicit scheme can be based on

$$\hat{X}_{n+1} = \hat{X}_n + \Delta t \, b(\hat{X}_n) + \sqrt{\Delta t} \, \sigma(\hat{X}_n) \xi_{n+1}$$
$$\hat{Y}_{n+1} = \hat{Y}_n - \Delta t \, h(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n, \hat{Z}_n) + \sqrt{\Delta t} \, \hat{Z}_n \cdot \xi_{n+1}$$

with boundary values

$$\hat{X}_0 = x, \quad \hat{Y}_{n_\tau} = g(\hat{X}_{n_\tau})$$

Solution to stochastic two-point boundary value problem:

- least-squares Monte Carlo Gobet & Turkedjev, Bender et al.
- deep neural network approach E, Han & Jentzen

Solution by least-squares Monte-Carlo

Numerical discretisation of FBSDE, con't

Since \hat{Y}_n is adapted we have $\hat{Y}_n = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_n | \mathcal{F}_n]$ and thus $\hat{Y}_n = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_{n+1} + \Delta t h(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_n, \hat{Z}_n) | \mathcal{F}_n]$ $\approx \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}_{n+1} + \Delta t h(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_{n+1}, \hat{Z}_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n]$

where $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\hat{X}_0, \dots, \hat{X}_n)$ using that \hat{Z}_n is independent of ξ_{n+1} .

The conditional expectation

$$\hat{Y}_n := \mathbb{E}\big[\hat{Y}_{n+1} + \Delta t h(\hat{X}_n, \hat{Y}_{n+1}, \hat{Z}_{n+1}) | \mathcal{F}_n\big]$$

can be computed by least-squares:

$$\mathbb{E}ig[S|\mathcal{F}_nig] = rgmin_{Y\in L^2,\,\mathcal{F}_n ext{-measurable}} \mathbb{E}[|Y-S|^2]$$
 .

[Gobet et al, AAP, 2005], [Bender & Steiner, Num Meth F, 2012], [Kebiri et al, Proc IHP, 2018]

Deep learning based approximation

Numerical discretisation of FBSDE, con't

Now consider the forward iteration

$$\mathcal{Y}_{n+1} = \mathcal{Y}_n - \Delta t h(\hat{X}_n, \mathcal{Y}_n, \mathcal{Z}_n) + \sqrt{\Delta t} \, \mathcal{Z}_n \cdot \xi_{n+1} \, ,$$

with $\mathcal{Y}_n = \mathcal{Y}_n(x; \theta)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_n = \mathcal{Z}_n(\hat{X}_n; \theta)$ being the (non-adapted?) **deep neural net approximation** of (\hat{Y}_n, \hat{Z}_n) , so that

$$\mathcal{Y}_0 \approx F(x), \quad \mathcal{Z}_n \approx (\sigma^T \nabla F)(\hat{X}_n)$$

The corresponding loss function is given by

$$\ell(\theta) = \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{Y}_{n_{\tau}} - g(\hat{X}_{n_{\tau}})|^2]$$

(Note that $\mathbb{E} \big[|\mathcal{Y}_{ au} - g(X_{ au})|^2 \big] = 0$ for the exact solution.)

[E et al, Commun Math Stat, 2017], [H. et al, Preprint, 2018]

More remarks

- The LSMC scheme is strongly convergent of order 1/2 in Δt → 0 as M, K → ∞ (M: sample size, K: # basis fcts.).
- A zero-variance change of measure is given by

$$\left. \frac{dQ}{dP} \right|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau}} = \exp\left(\int_0^{\tau} Z_s \cdot dB_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau} |Z_s|^2 \, ds \right) \,,$$

for $\tau < \infty$ (a.s.) and the discretisation bias can be further reduced by using **importance sampling**.

- Under mild assumptions, the variance of the importance sampling estimator is no worse than for crude MC.
- Generalisations include bounded & deterministic τ, singular terminal condition, least-squares w/ change of drift.

Importance sampling of rare events

Duality of estimation and control

east-squares regression

Numerical examples

Example I: hitting probabilities

Probability of **hitting the set** $C \subset \mathbb{R}$ before time T:

$$-\log \mathbb{P}(au \leq T) = \min_{u} \mathbb{E} igg[rac{1}{4} \int_{0}^{ au \wedge T} |u_t|^2 \, dt - \log \mathbf{1}_{\partial C}(X^u_{ au \wedge T}) igg] \, ,$$

with τ denoting the first hitting time of C under the dynamics

$$dX_t^u = (u_t -
abla V(X_t^u)) \, dt + \sqrt{2\epsilon} \, dB_t$$



[Zhang et al, SISC, 2014], [Richter, MSc thesis, 2016], [H et al, Nonlinearity, 2016]

Example I, cont'd

Probability of **hitting** $C \subset \mathbb{R}$ before time *T*, starting from x = -1:

$$-\log \mathbb{P}(\tau \leq T) = \min_{u} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{4} \int_{0}^{\tau \wedge T} |u_{t}|^{2} dt - \log \mathbf{1}_{\partial C}(X_{\tau \wedge T}^{u})\right],$$

(BSDE with singular terminal condition and random stopping time)

Simulation parameters	$F_{ref}^{\epsilon}(0, x)$	$\bar{F}^{\epsilon}(0, x)$	Var
$K = 8, M = 300, T = 5, \Delta t = 10^{-3}, \epsilon = 1$	0.3949	0.3748	10^{-3}
$K = 5, M = 300, T = 1, \Delta t = 10^{-3}, \epsilon = 1$	1.7450	1.6446	0.0248
$K = 5, M = 400, T = 1, \Delta t = 10^{-4}, \epsilon = 0.6$	4.3030	4.5779	10^{-3}
$K = 6, M = 450, T = 1, \Delta t = 10^{-4}, \epsilon = 0.5$	4.5793	4.6044	$5 \cdot 10^{-4}$

with K the number of Gaussians and M the number of realisations of the forward SDE.

[Ankirchner et al, SICON, 2014], [Kruse & Popier, SPA, 2016], [Kebiri et al, Proc IHP, 2018]

Example II: High-dimensional PDE

First exit time of a **Brownian motion** from an *n*-sphere of radius *r*:

$$\tau = \inf\{t > 0 \colon x + B_t \notin S_r^n\}$$

Cumulant generating function of first exit time satisfies

$$-\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(-\alpha \tau)] = \min_{u} \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha \tau^{u} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\tau^{u}} |u_{t}| dt\right]$$

- BSDE on random time horizon with homogeneous terminal condition
- mean first exit time $\mathbb{E}[\tau] = \frac{r^2 |x|^2}{n}$
- Least-squares MC w/ $K=3, M\sim 10^2$

	<i>n</i> = 3	n = 10	n = 100	n = 1000
exact	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
CMC	0.98	0.99	1.08	1.04
LSMC	0.99	1.01	0.96	0.98



[Kebiri & H, Preprint, 2018]

Discussion: Markovian approximations

- The fact that the FBSDE is uncoupled implies that every approximation of X gives rise to an approximation of (Y, Z).
- Slow-fast systems: Strong error bound for limit BSDE

$$\sup\{|Y_t^{\delta} - \bar{Y}_t| \colon 0 \le t \le T\} \le C\sqrt{\delta} \quad \delta = \frac{\tau_{\mathsf{fast}}}{\tau_{\mathsf{slow}}}$$

as $\delta \to 0$, analogously for Z_t^{δ} (implies IS error bound).

Reversible metastable systems: Approximation of X by s-state Markov jump process (j_t)_{t>0} implies that

$$\|\psi - \bar{\psi}\|_2 \le C \inf_{v \in H} \|\psi - v\|_2$$

with $C \approx 1$ and basis dependent best-approximation error.

[Banisch & H, MCRF, 2016], [H et al, PTRF, 2018], [Kebiri & H, Proc IHP, 2018]

Discussion: approximation by DNN



[H et al, Preprint, 2018]

Conclusions & outlook

- Adaptive importance sampling scheme based on dual variational formulation; resulting control problem features short trajectories with minimum variance estimators.
- Variational problem boils down to an uncoupled FBSDE with only one additional spatial dimension.
- Error analysis for unbounded stopping time & singular terminal condition is open, least-squares algorithm requires some fine-tuning (ansatz functions, change of drift, ...).
- Clever choice of ansatz functions should be combined with dimension reduction (cf. results for slow-fast systems).

Thank you for your attention!

Acknowledgement:

Ralf Banisch Omar Kebiri Lara Neurither Jannes Quer Lorenz Richter Christof Schütte Wei Zhang

German Science Foundation (DFG) Einstein Center for Mathematics Berlin (ECMath)