

Introduction to Simulation Methods,

Michelle Sovinsky Goeree

University of Zuerich

October 17, 2011

Outline

- ▶ Generating Random Variables
- ▶ Simulation of Integrals
- ▶ Variance Reduction
- ▶ Simulation in Estimation

- ▶ Simulation methods can be used for demand estimation, option pricing, risk , econometrics, etc.
- ▶ Naive Monte Carlo may be too slow in some practical situations.
- ▶ Many special techniques for variance reduction: antithetic variables, importance sampling, etc.

- ▶ Simulation methods can be used for demand estimation, option pricing, risk , econometrics, etc.
- ▶ Naive Monte Carlo may be too slow in some practical situations.
- ▶ Many special techniques for variance reduction: antithetic variables, importance sampling, etc.

- ▶ Simulation methods can be used for demand estimation, option pricing, risk , econometrics, etc.
- ▶ Naive Monte Carlo may be too slow in some practical situations.
- ▶ Many special techniques for variance reduction: antithetic variables, importance sampling, etc.

The Basics

- ▶ Consider the basic problem of computing an expectation

$$\theta = E[f(X)], \quad X \sim pdf(X)$$

- ▶ Monte Carlo simulation approach specifies generating N independent draws from the distribution $pdf(X)$, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N , and approximating

$$E[f(X)] \approx \hat{\theta}_N \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X_i)$$

- ▶ By Law of Large Numbers, the approximation $\hat{\theta}_N$ converges to the true value as N increases to infinity.

The Basics

- ▶ Consider the basic problem of computing an expectation

$$\theta = E[f(X)], \quad X \sim pdf(X)$$

- ▶ Monte Carlo simulation approach specifies generating N independent draws from the distribution $pdf(X)$, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N , and approximating

$$E[f(X)] \approx \hat{\theta}_N \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X_i)$$

- ▶ By Law of Large Numbers, the approximation $\hat{\theta}_N$ converges to the true value as N increases to infinity.

The Basics

- ▶ Consider the basic problem of computing an expectation

$$\theta = E[f(X)], \quad X \sim pdf(X)$$

- ▶ Monte Carlo simulation approach specifies generating N independent draws from the distribution $pdf(X)$, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N , and approximating

$$E[f(X)] \approx \hat{\theta}_N \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X_i)$$

- ▶ By Law of Large Numbers, the approximation $\hat{\theta}_N$ converges to the true value as N increases to infinity.

The Basics

- ▶ Monte Carlo estimate $\hat{\theta}_N$ is unbiased:

$$E[\hat{\theta}_N] = \theta$$

- ▶ By Central Limit Theorem

$$\sqrt{N} \frac{\hat{\theta}_N - \theta}{\sigma} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \sigma^2 = \text{Var}[f(X)]$$

The Basics

- ▶ Monte Carlo estimate $\hat{\theta}_N$ is unbiased:

$$E[\hat{\theta}_N] = \theta$$

- ▶ By Central Limit Theorem

$$\sqrt{N} \frac{\hat{\theta}_N - \theta}{\sigma} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \sigma^2 = \text{Var}[f(X)]$$

- ▶ Pseudo random number generators produce deterministic sequences of numbers that appear stochastic, and match closely the desired probability distribution.
- ▶ For some standard distributions, e.g., uniform and Normal, MATLAB® provides built-in random number generators.
- ▶ Sometimes it is necessary to simulate from other distributions, not covered by the standard software.
- ▶ Then apply one of the basic methods for generating random variables from a specified distribution.

- ▶ Pseudo random number generators produce deterministic sequences of numbers that appear stochastic, and match closely the desired probability distribution.
- ▶ For some standard distributions, e.g., uniform and Normal, MATLAB® provides built-in random number generators.
- ▶ Sometimes it is necessary to simulate from other distributions, not covered by the standard software.
- ▶ Then apply one of the basic methods for generating random variables from a specified distribution.

- ▶ Pseudo random number generators produce deterministic sequences of numbers that appear stochastic, and match closely the desired probability distribution.
- ▶ For some standard distributions, e.g., uniform and Normal, MATLAB® provides built-in random number generators.
- ▶ Sometimes it is necessary to simulate from other distributions, not covered by the standard software.
- ▶ Then apply one of the basic methods for generating random variables from a specified distribution.

The Inverse Transform Method

- ▶ Consider a random variable X with a continuous, strictly increasing CDF function $F(x)$.
- ▶ We can simulate X according to

$$X = F^{-1}(U), \quad U \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$$

- ▶ This works because

$$\Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) = \Pr(U \leq F(x)) = F(x)$$

- ▶ If $F(x)$ has jumps or flat sections, generalize the above rule to

$$X = \min(x : F(x) \geq U)$$

The Inverse Transform Method

- ▶ Consider a random variable X with a continuous, strictly increasing CDF function $F(x)$.
- ▶ We can simulate X according to

$$X = F^{-1}(U), \quad U \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$$

- ▶ This works because

$$\Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) = \Pr(U \leq F(x)) = F(x)$$

- ▶ If $F(x)$ has jumps or flat sections, generalize the above rule to

$$X = \min(x : F(x) \geq U)$$

The Inverse Transform Method

- ▶ Consider a random variable X with a continuous, strictly increasing CDF function $F(x)$.
- ▶ We can simulate X according to

$$X = F^{-1}(U), \quad U \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$$

- ▶ This works because

$$\Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) = \Pr(U \leq F(x)) = F(x)$$

- ▶ If $F(x)$ has jumps or flat sections, generalize the above rule to

$$X = \min(x : F(x) \geq U)$$

The Inverse Transform Method

- ▶ Consider a random variable X with a continuous, strictly increasing CDF function $F(x)$.
- ▶ We can simulate X according to

$$X = F^{-1}(U), \quad U \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$$

- ▶ This works because

$$\Pr(X \leq x) = \Pr(F^{-1}(U) \leq x) = \Pr(U \leq F(x)) = F(x)$$

- ▶ If $F(x)$ has jumps or flat sections, generalize the above rule to

$$X = \min(x : F(x) \geq U)$$

Example: The Exponential Distribution

- ▶ Consider an exponentially-distributed random variable, characterized by a CDF

$$F(x) = U = 1 - e^{-x\theta}$$

- ▶ Compute $F^{-1}(U)$

$$e^{-x\theta} = 1 - U \Rightarrow \ln(1 - U) = -x\theta$$

- ▶ So

$$X = \frac{-\ln(1 - U)}{\theta} \sim \frac{-\ln(U)}{\theta}$$

Example: The Exponential Distribution

- ▶ Consider an exponentially-distributed random variable, characterized by a CDF

$$F(x) = U = 1 - e^{-x\theta}$$

- ▶ Compute $F^{-1}(U)$

$$e^{-x\theta} = 1 - U \Rightarrow \ln(1 - U) = -x\theta$$

- ▶ So

$$X = \frac{-\ln(1 - U)}{\theta} \sim \frac{-\ln(U)}{\theta}$$

Example: Normal Distribution

$$X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

$$F(x) = U = \Phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$\sigma\Phi^{-1}(U) + \mu = X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

Example: Normal Distribution

$$X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

$$F(x) = U = \Phi\left(\frac{x - \mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$\sigma\Phi^{-1}(U) + \mu = X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

Example: Discrete Distribution

- ▶ Consider a discrete random variable X with values

$$c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_n$$

$$\Pr(X = c_i) = p$$

- ▶ Define cumulative probabilities

$$F(c_i) = q_i = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$$

- ▶ Can simulate X as follows:

1. Generate $U \sim Unif[0, 1]$
2. Find $K \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $q_{K-1} \leq U \leq q_K$
3. Set $X = c_K$

Example: Discrete Distribution

- ▶ Consider a discrete random variable X with values

$$c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_n$$

$$\Pr(X = c_i) = p$$

- ▶ Define cumulative probabilities

$$F(c_i) = q_i = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$$

- ▶ Can simulate X as follows:

1. Generate $U \sim Unif[0, 1]$
2. Find $K \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $q_{K-1} \leq U \leq q_K$
3. Set $X = c_K$

Example: Discrete Distribution

- ▶ Consider a discrete random variable X with values

$$c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_n$$

$$\Pr(X = c_i) = p$$

- ▶ Define cumulative probabilities

$$F(c_i) = q_i = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i$$

- ▶ Can simulate X as follows:

1. Generate $U \sim Unif[0, 1]$
2. Find $K \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $q_{K-1} \leq U \leq q_K$
3. Set $X = c_K$

Examples

- ▶ Bernouli where $X = 1$ with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$

$$X = 1(U < p)$$

- ▶ Binomial

$$X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N 1(U_i < p)$$

Examples

- ▶ Bernoulli where $X = 1$ with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$

$$X = 1(U < p)$$

- ▶ Binomial

$$X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N 1(U_i < p)$$

Examples

- ▶ Bernoulli where $X = 1$ with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$

$$X = 1(U < p)$$

- ▶ Binomial

$$X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N 1(U_i < p)$$

Examples

- ▶ Bernoulli where $X = 1$ with probability p and 0 with probability $1 - p$

$$X = 1(U < p)$$

- ▶ Binomial

$$X \sim \text{Bin}(N, p)$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N 1(U_i < p)$$

Examples

► Chi-Square

$$X \sim \chi_n^2$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N [\Phi^{-1}(U)]^2$$

Examples

► Chi-Square

$$X \sim \chi_n^2$$

1.

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

2.

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^N [\Phi^{-1}(U)]^2$$

The Acceptance-Rejection Method

- ▶ Generate samples with probability density $f(x)$
- ▶ The acceptance-rejection method can be used for multivariate problems as well
- ▶ Suppose we know how to generate samples from the distribution with pdf $g(x)$ such that $f(x) \leq cg(x)$
- ▶ Follow the algorithm
 1. Generate X from the distribution $g(x)$
 2. Generate U from $Unif[0, 1]$
 3. If $U \leq f(x)/[cg(X)]$, return X , otherwise go to step 1
- ▶ Probability of acceptance on each attempt is $1/c$. Want c close to 1

The Acceptance-Rejection Method

- ▶ Generate samples with probability density $f(x)$
- ▶ The acceptance-rejection method can be used for multivariate problems as well
- ▶ Suppose we know how to generate samples from the distribution with pdf $g(x)$ such that $f(x) \leq cg(x)$
- ▶ Follow the algorithm
 1. Generate X from the distribution $g(x)$
 2. Generate U from $Unif[0, 1]$
 3. If $U \leq f(x)/[cg(X)]$, return X , otherwise go to step 1
- ▶ Probability of acceptance on each attempt is $1/c$. Want c close to 1

The Acceptance-Rejection Method

- ▶ Generate samples with probability density $f(x)$
- ▶ The acceptance-rejection method can be used for multivariate problems as well
- ▶ Suppose we know how to generate samples from the distribution with pdf $g(x)$ such that $f(x) \leq cg(x)$
- ▶ Follow the algorithm
 1. Generate X from the distribution $g(x)$
 2. Generate U from $Unif[0, 1]$
 3. If $U \leq f(x)/[cg(X)]$, return X , otherwise go to step 1
- ▶ Probability of acceptance on each attempt is $1/c$. Want c close to 1

Example: Truncated Random Variables

$$X \sim F : a < X < b$$

1. Acceptance-Rejection

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

Keep if $a < X < b$ otherwise try again

2.

$$U = \frac{F(X) - F(a)}{F(b) - F(a)}$$

$$F^{-1}\{[F(b) - F(a)]U + F(a)\} = X$$

Example: Truncated Random Variables

$$X \sim F : a < X < b$$

1. Acceptance-Rejection

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

Keep if $a < X < b$ otherwise try again

2.

$$U = \frac{F(X) - F(a)}{F(b) - F(a)}$$

$$F^{-1}\{[F(b) - F(a)]U + F(a)\} = X$$

Example: Truncated Random Variables

$$X \sim F : a < X < b$$

1. Acceptance-Rejection

$$X = F^{-1}(U)$$

Keep if $a < X < b$ otherwise try again

2.

$$U = \frac{F(X) - F(a)}{F(b) - F(a)}$$

$$F^{-1}\{[F(b) - F(a)]U + F(a)\} = X$$

Example: Truncated Random Variables

- ▶ Consider the problem of computing

$$Eh(U) = \int h(u)dF(u)$$

- ▶ Moments in 'Method of Moments' Estimation
- ▶ Probabilities in discrete choice models

Example: Truncated Random Variables

- ▶ Consider the problem of computing

$$Eh(U) = \int h(u)dF(u)$$

- ▶ Moments in 'Method of Moments' Estimation
- ▶ Probabilities in discrete choice models

Prototypical Example

$$y_{ij}^* = X_i \beta_j + u_{ij}$$
$$u_i \sim iidF$$

Prototypical Example

$$y_{ij}^* = X_i \beta_j + u_{ij}$$

$$u_{ij} \sim iidF$$

- $u_{ij} \sim iidEV \Rightarrow$ Multinomial Logit w/ benefits and disadvantages

Prototypical Example

$$y_{ij}^* = X_i \beta_j + u_{ij}$$

$$u_i \sim iidF$$

- $u_{ij} \sim iidEV \Rightarrow$ Multinomial Logit w/ benefits and disadvantages
- $u_i \sim iidN(0, \Omega) \Rightarrow$ Multinomial Probit w/ benefits and disadvantages

Prototypical Example

$$y_{ij}^* = X_i \beta_j + u_{ij}$$

$$u_i \sim iidF$$

- $u_{ij} \sim iidEV \Rightarrow$ Multinomial Logit w/ benefits and disadvantages
- $u_i \sim iidN(0, \Omega) \Rightarrow$ Multinomial Probit w/ benefits and disadvantages

$$U \sim N(\mu, \Omega)$$
$$\Pr[U < v]$$

Basic Method

$$Z = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r)$$
$$u^r \sim F$$

Basic Method

$$EZ = E \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right]$$

Basic Method

$$\begin{aligned}EZ &= E \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R Eh(u^r)\end{aligned}$$

Basic Method

$$\begin{aligned}EZ &= E \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R Eh(u^r) \\ &= \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R Eh(U) = Eh(U)\end{aligned}$$

Basic Method

$$\text{Var}Z = \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right]$$

Basic Method

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}Z &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{r=1}^R \text{Var} [h(u^r)] \end{aligned}$$

Basic Method

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}Z &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R h(u^r) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{r=1}^R \text{Var} [h(u^r)] \\ &= \frac{1}{R^2} \sum_{r=1}^R \text{Var} [h(U)] = \frac{\text{Var} [h(U)]}{R} \end{aligned}$$

Basic Method for Multivariate Normal Probability

$$X \sim N(\mu, \Omega)$$
$$\Pr[X < v]$$

Basic Method for Multivariate Normal Probability

$$X \sim N(\mu, \Omega)$$
$$\Pr[X < v]$$

$$h(X) = \mathbf{1}(X < v)$$

Basic Method for Multivariate Normal Probability

$$X \sim N(\mu, \Omega)$$
$$\Pr[X < v]$$

$$h(X) = \mathbf{1}(X < v)$$

$$Eh(X) = \int \mathbf{1}(x < v) d\Phi(x; \mu, \Omega)$$

Basic Method for Multivariate Normal Probability

$$X \sim N(\mu, \Omega)$$
$$\Pr[X < v]$$

$$h(X) = 1(X < v)$$

$$Eh(X) = \int 1(x < v) d\Phi(x; \mu, \Omega)$$

Frequency Method (Lerman & Manski)

$$Z = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R 1(x^r < v)$$
$$x^r \sim iidN(\mu, \Omega)$$

Problems w Frequency Method

- 1 Not continuous in v

Problems w Frequency Method

- 1 Not continuous in v
- 2 Not bounded away from zero and one [problems for MLE]

Problems w Frequency Method

- 1 Not continuous in v
- 2 Not bounded away from zero and one [problems for MLE]
- 3 Unnecessarily large variance

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$Eh(U) = \int h(u) f(u) du$$

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$Eh(U) = \int h(u) f(u) du$$

$$= \int \frac{h(u) f(u)}{g(u)} g(u) du$$

$$= E_g \left[\frac{h(U) f(U)}{g(U)} \right]$$

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} E h(U) &= \int h(u) f(u) du \\ &= \int \frac{h(u) f(u)}{g(u)} g(u) du \\ &= E_g \left[\frac{h(U) f(U)}{g(U)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Properties of a Good Importance Sampler

- 1 Support of $G = \text{support of } F$

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(U) &= \int h(u) f(u) du \\ &= \int \frac{h(u) f(u)}{g(u)} g(u) du \\ &= E_g \left[\frac{h(U) f(U)}{g(U)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Properties of a Good Importance Sampler

- 1 Support of $G = \text{support of } F$
- 2 Easy to simulate from G

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} E h(U) &= \int h(u) f(u) du \\ &= \int \frac{h(u) f(u)}{g(u)} g(u) du \\ &= E_g \left[\frac{h(U) f(U)}{g(U)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Properties of a Good Importance Sampler

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F
- 2 Easy to simulate from G
- 3 $\frac{h(U)f(U)}{g(U)}$ does not vary as much as $h(U)$

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(U) &= \int \mathbf{1}(u < v) f(u) du \\ &= \int_{u < v} f(u) du \end{aligned}$$

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} E h(U) &= \int 1(u < v) f(u) du \\ &= \int_{u < v} f(u) du \end{aligned}$$

Let G be independent truncated normals

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(U) &= \int 1(u < v) f(u) du \\ &= \int_{u < v} f(u) du \end{aligned}$$

Let G be independent truncated normals

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(U) &= \int 1(u < v) f(u) du \\ &= \int_{u < v} f(u) du \end{aligned}$$

Let G be independent truncated normals

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F
- 2 Easy to simulate from G

Improvements

Importance Sampling

$$\begin{aligned} Eh(U) &= \int \mathbf{1}(u < v) f(u) du \\ &= \int_{u < v} f(u) du \end{aligned}$$

Let G be independent truncated normals

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F
- 2 Easy to simulate from G
- 3 $\frac{h(U)f(U)}{g(U)}$ is unbounded

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$
- 3 Simulate $U_1^r \mid U_1^r < v_1$

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$
- 3 Simulate $U_1^r \mid U_1^r < v_1$
- 4 Initialize $i = 1$
- 5 Update $i \leftarrow i + 1$

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$
- 3 Simulate $U_1^r \mid U_1^r < v_1$
- 4 Initialize $i = 1$
- 5 Update $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 6 Compute density of $U_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r$

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$
- 3 Simulate $U_1^r \mid U_1^r < v_1$
- 4 Initialize $i = 1$
- 5 Update $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 6 Compute density of $U_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r$
- 7 Compute $\Pr(U_i < v_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_i < v_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r)$

Improvements

GHK

Algorithm

- 1 Initialize $P = 1$
- 2 Compute $\Pr(U_1 < v_1)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_1 < v_1)$
- 3 Simulate $U_1^r \mid U_1^r < v_1$
- 4 Initialize $i = 1$
- 5 Update $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 6 Compute density of $U_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r$
- 7 Compute $\Pr(U_i < v_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r)$, and update $P = P * \Pr(U_i < v_i \mid U_1^r, U_2^r, \dots, U_{i-1}^r)$
- 8 Return to (5) until done

Improvements

GHK

① Support of $G = \text{support of } F$

Improvements

GHK

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F
- 2 Easy to simulate from G

Improvements

GHK

- 1 Support of $G =$ support of F
- 2 Easy to simulate from G
- 3 Simulator is bounded away from zero and one, and variance is smaller than frequency simulator

Anithetic Acceleration

- ▶ Attempt to reduce variance due to simulation
- ▶ Introduce negative dependence between pairs of replications

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

Let $U \sim U(0, 1)$, and consider as a simulator for $Eh(U)$,

$$S = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} h(u^r)$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

Let $U \sim U(0, 1)$, and consider as a simulator for $Eh(U)$,

$$S = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} h(u^r)$$

Now compare it to

$$AS = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [h(u^r) + h(1 - u^r)]$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

Let $U \sim U(0, 1)$, and consider as a simulator for $Eh(U)$,

$$S = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} h(u^r)$$

Now compare it to

$$AS = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [h(u^r) + h(1 - u^r)]$$

$$\begin{aligned} E(AS) &= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [Eh(u^r) + Eh(1 - u^r)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [Eh(U) + Eh(1 - U)] \end{aligned}$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

Let $U \sim U(0, 1)$, and consider as a simulator for $Eh(U)$,

$$S = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} h(u^r)$$

Now compare it to

$$AS = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [h(u^r) + h(1 - u^r)]$$

$$E(AS) = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [Eh(u^r) + Eh(1 - u^r)]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [Eh(U) + Eh(1 - U)]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [Eh(U) + Eh(U)] = Eh(U)$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(AS) &= \frac{1}{4R^2} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} \text{Var}[h(u^r) + h(1 - u^r)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4R^2} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(u^r)) + \text{Var}(h(1 - u^r)) \\ &\quad + 2\text{Cov}(h(u^r), h(1 - u^r))] \end{aligned}$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(AS) &= \frac{1}{4R^2} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} \text{Var}[h(u^r) + h(1 - u^r)] \\ &= \frac{1}{4R^2} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(u^r)) + \text{Var}(h(1 - u^r)) \\ &\quad + 2\text{Cov}(h(u^r), h(1 - u^r))] \\ &= \frac{1}{4R^2} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Var}(h(1 - U)) \\ &\quad + 2\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1 - U))] \\ &= \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Cov}(h(U), h(1 - U))] \end{aligned}$$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\text{Var}(AS) = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U))]$$

- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) = 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) = \text{Var}(S)$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\text{Var}(AS) = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U))]$$

- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) = 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) = \text{Var}(S)$
- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) < 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) < \text{Var}(S)$

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\text{Var}(AS) = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U))]$$

- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) = 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) = \text{Var}(S)$
- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) < 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) < \text{Var}(S)$
[A sufficient condition is $h(\cdot)$ is monotone]

Improvements

Antithetic Acceleration

$$\text{Var}(AS) = \frac{1}{2R} \sum_{r=1}^{2R} [\text{Var}(h(U)) + \text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U))]$$

- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) = 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) = \text{Var}(S)$
- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) < 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) < \text{Var}(S)$
[A sufficient condition is $h(\cdot)$ is monotone]
- If $\text{Cov}(h(U), h(1-U)) > 0$, then $\text{Var}(AS) > \text{Var}(S)$

Many estimation problems can be framed as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i \left(\hat{\theta}_{MOM} \right) = 0$$

$$e_i(\theta) = y_i - E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$$

Many estimation problems can be framed as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i \left(\hat{\theta}_{MOM} \right) = 0$$

$$e_i(\theta) = y_i - E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$$

Sometimes it is difficult to evaluate $E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$ while it is not difficult to simulate $E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$

Many estimation problems can be framed as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i \left(\hat{\theta}_{MOM} \right) = 0$$
$$e_i(\theta) = y_i - E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$$

Sometimes it is difficult to evaluate $E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$ while it is not difficult to simulate $E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i \left(\hat{\theta}_{MSM} \right) = 0$$
$$e_i(\theta) = y_i - \tilde{E}[y_i | X_i, \theta]$$

where $\tilde{E}[y_i | X_i, \theta]$ is an unbiased simulator of $E[y_i | X_i, \theta]$

MSM

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{e}_i(\theta) &= e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i \\ E\zeta_i &= 0\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{e}_i(\theta) &= e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i \\ E\zeta_i &= 0\end{aligned}$$

$$plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' \tilde{e}_i(\theta) \right] = plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' (e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{e}_i(\theta) &= e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i \\ E\zeta_i &= 0\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' \tilde{e}_i(\theta) \right] &= plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' (e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i) \right] \\ &= plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i(\theta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' \zeta_i \right]\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{e}_i(\theta) &= e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i \\ E\zeta_i &= 0\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' \tilde{e}_i(\theta) \right] &= plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' (e_i(\theta) + \zeta_i) \right] \\ &= plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i(\theta) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' \zeta_i \right] \\ &= plim \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i' e_i(\theta) \right]\end{aligned}$$

- Loss in efficiency depends on properties of ξ_i

- Loss in efficiency depends on properties of $\tilde{\zeta}_i$
- In worst case, $Var(\tilde{\zeta}_i) = \frac{1}{R} Var(e_i)$

- Loss in efficiency depends on properties of $\tilde{\zeta}_i$
- In worst case, $Var(\tilde{\zeta}_i) = \frac{1}{R} Var(e_i)$
- If $e_i(\cdot)$ is monotone and one uses antithetic acceleration, the the variance due to simulation is $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$

MSM

- Loss in efficiency depends on properties of $\tilde{\zeta}_i$
- In worst case, $Var(\tilde{\zeta}_i) = \frac{1}{R} Var(e_i)$
- If $e_i(\cdot)$ is monotone and one uses antithetic acceleration, the the variance due to simulation is $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$
- Note that MSM relies only on using an unbiased simulator

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.
- However, even if the simulator of $L_i(\theta)$ is unbiased, the simulator of $\log L_i(\theta)$ may have bad properties

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.
- However, even if the simulator of $L_i(\theta)$ is unbiased, the simulator of $\log L_i(\theta)$ may have bad properties (eg. MNP with frequency simulator)

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.
- However, even if the simulator of $L_i(\theta)$ is unbiased, the simulator of $\log L_i(\theta)$ may have bad properties (eg. MNP with frequency simulator)
- Consistency requires that $R \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.
- However, even if the simulator of $L_i(\theta)$ is unbiased, the simulator of $\log L_i(\theta)$ may have bad properties (eg. MNP with frequency simulator)
- Consistency requires that $R \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [compare to MSM]
- Borsch-Supan and Hajivassiliou showed, using Monte Carlo methods, that MSL has small asymptotic bias and, in fact, usually behaves better than MSM as long as one uses a simulator with good properties (eg, GHK)

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log L_i(\theta)$$

- In some problems (e.g., MNP), while we cannot evaluate $L_i(\theta)$ easily because it involves high-dimensional integrals, we can simulate it easily.
- However, even if the simulator of $L_i(\theta)$ is unbiased, the simulator of $\log L_i(\theta)$ may have bad properties (eg. MNP with frequency simulator)
- Consistency requires that $R \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [compare to MSM]
- Borsch-Supan and Hajivassiliou showed, using Monte Carlo methods, that MSL has small asymptotic bias and, in fact, usually behaves better than MSM as long as one uses a simulator with good properties (eg, GHK)
- Antithetic acceleration result

Other Topics

- MSS
- MCMC Methods
- Monte Carlo tests
- Parametric Bootstraps
- Distributions of Test Statistics
- Simulation inside of expected values (eg, value function approximation)