

# Some old and new results on Information-Based Complexity

part two

Erich Novak

Friedrich-Schiller University Jena

INI February 2019

## Second talk: Complexity results for integration

- For a  $d$ -variate function  $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , approximate the integral

$$S_d(f) = \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x) dx.$$

- **Problem instances:** functions  $f$  from a function class  $F_d$  of  $d$ -variate functions; often we have an initial error

$$\max_{f \in F_d} |S_d(f)| = 1.$$

- **Algorithms:** deterministic or randomized algorithms using  $n$  function values.

## The problem

- **Information complexity:**  $n(\varepsilon, F_d)$  is the minimal number of function values needed by an optimal algorithm to approximate  $S_d$  up to error  $\varepsilon < 1$  for all  $f \in F_d$ .
- **Optimal error bounds:** Sometimes more convenient:

$$e(n, F_d) = \inf_{A_n} \sup_{f \in F_d} |S_d(f) - A_n(f)|$$

= minimal error achievable with  $n$  function values.

**What is known about the numbers  $n(\varepsilon, F_d)$  or  $e(n, F_d)$ ?**

# Plan for the talk

- Some classical results ( $\leq 1971$ )
- Randomized algorithms
- Tensor product problems, tractability, weighted spaces
- Curse of dimensionality for  $C^k$  functions

# Classical results

- Optimality of linear algorithms
- Optimal order for  $C^k$  functions
- Lipschitz functions and the curse of dimensionality

# Optimality of linear algorithms

Smolyak 1965 and Bakhvalov 1971

## Theorem

*Assume that  $F_d$  is convex and symmetric. Then non-linear or adaptive algorithms cannot be better than linear algorithms*

$$A_n(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(x_i)$$

and

$$e(n, F_d) = \inf_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \sup_{f \in F_d, f(x_i)=0} S_d(f).$$

See Hickernell, Plaskota, Wasilkowski and others for different  $F_d$ .

## Smooth functions

$$F_d = C_d^k = \{f \in C^k([0, 1]^d) \mid \|D^\beta f\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ for all } \|\beta\|_1 \leq k\}$$

Theorem (Bakhvalov 1959)

$$e(n, C_d^k) \asymp n^{-k/d}$$

or: for all  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$

$$a_{d,k} \varepsilon^{-d/k} \leq n(\varepsilon, C_d^k) \leq b_{d,k} \varepsilon^{-d/k}.$$

Lower bound trivial for fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  and large  $d$ .

Arbitrary Lipschitz domains: N. and Triebel 2006.

Fractals: Dereich, Müller-Gronbach 2014.

## Lipschitz functions

$$F_d = \{f \in C([0, 1]^d) \mid |f(x) - f(y)| \leq \|x - y\|_\infty\}$$

Theorem (Maung Zho Newn and Sharygin 1971)

$$e(n, F_d) = \frac{d}{2d + 2} \cdot n^{-1/d}$$

for  $n = m^d$  with  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Observe that

$$e(2^d, F_d) = \frac{1}{2} e(1, F_d).$$

Curse of dimension.

Similar results: Babenko, Sukharev, Chernaya



# Randomized algorithms

- Optimal algorithm for  $L_p$ ,  $p \geq 2$
- Optimal order for  $C^k$  functions

## Optimal algorithm for $L_p$ , $p \geq 2$

Error of  $A_n$  now

$$e(A_n) = \sup_{f \in F_d} (\mathbf{E}(S(f) - A_n(f))^2)^{1/2},$$

numbers  $n^{\text{ran}}(\varepsilon, F_d)$  and  $e^{\text{ran}}(n, F_d)$  defined as before.

Let  $F_d$  be the unit ball of  $L_p([0, 1]^d)$  with  $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ .

Theorem (Mathé 1995)

$$e^{\text{ran}}(n, F_d) = \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{n}}$$

and  $A_n(f) = \frac{1}{n + \sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i)$  with i.i.d.  $X_i$  is optimal.

## Smooth functions

$$F_d = C_d^k = \{f \in C^k([0, 1]^d) \mid \|D^\beta f\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ for all } \|\beta\|_1 \leq k\}$$

Theorem (Bakhvalov 1959)

$$e^{\text{ran}}(n, C_d^k) \asymp n^{-k/d-1/2}$$

Algorithm:

- 1) For  $n = 2m$ , use  $m$  values for a good  $L_2$ -approximation  $f_m$ .
- 2) Compute integral of  $f - f_m$  by simple Monte Carlo.

Advantages: Small error, even deterministic. Good error control, unbiased estimator.

# Tensor product problems, tractability, weighted spaces

- Optimal order for  $W_p^{k,\text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$
- Smolyak algorithm
- Tractability
- Tractability for unweighted problems
- QMC for RKHS and weighted spaces
- Decomposable kernels and lower bounds

## Optimal order for $W_p^{k,\text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$

$1 < p < \infty$  and  $k, d \in \mathbb{N}$  fixed.  $\|D^\alpha f\|_p \leq 1$  for  $\|\alpha\|_\infty \leq k$ .

Theorem (upper bound: Frolov 1976, Skriganov 1994,  
lower bound: Roth 1954, Bykovskii 1985, Temlyakov 1990)

$$e(n, W_p^{k,\text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)) \asymp n^{-k} (\log n)^{(d-1)/2}.$$

First step: cubature formulas of the form

$$A_n(f) = \frac{|\det A|}{a^d} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f\left(\frac{Am}{a}\right)$$

for functions with compact support;  $A$  does not depend on  $k$ .

Second step: transformation for the general case.

## Smolyak algorithm / sparse grids

### Theorem

*Upper bounds for  $W_p^{k,\text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$  and the Smolyak algorithm are almost optimal, but not quite.*

Smolyak 1963 and many others.

Dinh Dũng, Tino Ullrich 2014:  $n^{-k}(\log n)^{(d-1)(k+1/2)}$  for  $p = 2$ .

# Tractability

A problem is **strongly polynomially tractable** iff

$$n(\varepsilon, d) \leq C \varepsilon^{-p} \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

A problem is **polynomially tractable** iff

$$n(\varepsilon, d) \leq C d^q \varepsilon^{-p} \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1), \quad d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

A problem is **weakly tractable** iff

$$\lim_{\varepsilon^{-1} + d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln n(\varepsilon, d)}{\varepsilon^{-1} + d} = 0.$$

Introduced by Woźniakowski, 2 papers in 1994.

## Tractability by smoothness assumptions?

Usually, we cannot obtain tractability even by strong smoothness assumptions.

Sometimes: yes.

- Tractability of star discrepancy



## Star-discrepancy

For  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in [0, 1]^d$  defined by

$$D_{\infty}^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]^d} \left| t_1 \cdots t_d - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{[0, t)}(x_i) \right|$$

**Sobolev space** (or functions with bounded variation)

$$F_1 = \{f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f(1) = 0, f' \in L_1\},$$

$$\|f\| = \|f'\|_{L_1} \quad \text{and} \quad F_d = F_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes F_1.$$

**Hlawka-Zaremba-equality** yields

$$D_{\infty}^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sup_{\|f\| \leq 1} |S_d(f) - Q_n(f)|,$$

$$\text{where } Q_n(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i).$$

# The star-discrepancy is tractable

## Theorem

- *Heinrich, N., Wasilkowski, Woźniakowski 2001:*

$$n(\varepsilon, F_d) \leq C d \varepsilon^{-2}.$$

- *Hinrichs 2004:*  $n(\varepsilon, F_d) \geq c d \varepsilon^{-1}$  for  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ .
- *Aistleitner 2011:*  $C = 100$ .
- *Doerr 2014:*

$$\mathbb{E}(D_{\infty}^*(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \asymp \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} \quad \text{for } n \geq d.$$

Further results by Dick, Gnewuch, Larcher, Pillichshammer ...

## Weighted Sobolev spaces and QMC

Inner product for  $d = 1$  is

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{1, \gamma} = \int_0^1 f \, dx \int_0^1 g \, dx + \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_0^1 f'(x)g'(x) \, dx,$$

tensor products for  $d > 1$  and  $\gamma_i$ .

**Theorem (Sloan, Woźniakowski 1998)**

*There exist points  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  for a QMC rule such that the problem is strongly polynomially tractable iff  $\sum \gamma_i < \infty$ .*

Compute the mean of the quadratic error of QMC algorithms over all  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^{nd}$  and obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \left( \int_{[0,1]^d} K(x, x) \, dx - \int_{[0,1]^{2d}} K(x, y) \, dx \, dy \right).$$

# Weighted Sobolev spaces and constructions

Sloan and Woźniakowski 1998 was continued in many directions.

- General weights, different Hilbert spaces.
- Lower bounds for arbitrary algorithms: decomposable kernels (N. and Woźniakowski 2001, NW2010 Ch. 11).
- Construction of good QMC methods: . . .

Books and survey papers: Dick, Kuo, Sloan 2013, Dick and Pillichshammer 2010, 2014, N. and Woźniakowski 2008, 2010, 2012.

# Curse of dimensionality for $C^k$ functions. With Aicke Hinrichs,

Mario Ullrich and Henryk Woźniakowski 2017

$$F_d = C_d^k = \{f \in C^k([0, 1]^d) \mid \|D^\beta f\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ for all } \|\beta\|_1 \leq k\}$$

## Theorem

*For all  $k$  there exist  $c_k$  and  $\check{c}_k$  such that for all  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n = m^d$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we have*

$$\min(1/2, c_k d n^{-k/d}) \leq e(n, C_d^k) \leq \min(1, \check{c}_k d n^{-k/d}).$$

*The complexity is roughly  $(d/\varepsilon)^{d/k}$ , super-exponential in  $d$ .*

# Summary

Numerical integration is intractable in the worst case setting for classical function spaces, like  $C^k([0, 1]^d)$ .

## Remedies:

- Weighted spaces, problems with a structure
- Randomized algorithms

## More on the integration problem

- For a  $d$ -variate function  $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , approximate the integral

$$S_d(f) = \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x) dx.$$

- **Problem instances:** functions  $f$  from a function class  $F_d$  of  $d$ -variate functions; often we have an initial error

$$\max_{f \in F_d} |S_d(f)| = 1.$$

- **Algorithms:** deterministic or randomized algorithms using  $n$  function values.

# Curse of dimensionality for $C^k$ functions. With Aicke Hinrichs,

Mario Ullrich and Henryk Woźniakowski 2017

$$F_d = C_d^k = \{f \in C^k([0, 1]^d) \mid \|D^\beta f\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ for all } \|\beta\|_1 \leq k\}$$

## Theorem

*For all  $k$  there exist  $c_k$  and  $\check{c}_k$  such that for all  $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n = m^d$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  we have*

$$\min(1/2, c_k d n^{-k/d}) \leq e(n, C_d^k) \leq \min(1, \check{c}_k d n^{-k/d}).$$

*The complexity is roughly  $(d/\varepsilon)^{d/k}$ , super-exponential in  $d$ .*



## Periodic functions

To simplify some statements, we consider periodic functions:

$$\mathcal{C}_d^k = \left\{ f \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^d) : f \text{ is 1-periodic, } \|f\|_{\mathcal{C}_d^k} \leq 1 \right\}$$

with the norm  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{C}_d^k} := \max_{\beta: |\beta|_1 \leq k} \|D^\beta f\|_\infty$ .

## Upper bound, product rule

Haber 1970: For the product rule

$$Q_m^d(f) = \sum_{i_1=0}^{m-1} \cdots \sum_{i_d=0}^{m-1} a_{i_1} \cdots a_{i_d} \cdot f(t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_d}),$$

based on the one-dimensional quadrature rule

$$Q_m(f) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i f(t_i)$$

we have

$$e(Q_m^d, C_d^k) \leq \left( \sum_{\ell=0}^{d-1} A^\ell \right) \cdot e(Q_m, C_1^k),$$

where  $A = \sum_{i=1}^m |a_i|$ .

## Proof of the lower bound

For an arbitrary set  $\mathcal{P} \subset [0, 1]^d$  with  $\#\mathcal{P} = n$  we will define a *fooling function*  $f$ , i.e., a function with  $f(x) = 0$  for  $x \in \mathcal{P}$ , and large integral.

For  $r > 0$  we first define the initial function

$$h_r(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \min_{y \in \mathcal{P}_n} \|x - y\|_1 \leq r, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly,

$$\int_{[0,1]^d} h_r(x) dx = 1 - \text{vol}_d(\mathcal{P}_r) \geq 1 - n \text{vol}_d(rB_1^d) = 1 - n \frac{(2r)^d}{d!}.$$

## Smoothing the function

The initial function  $h_r$  is not in  $C_d^k$ . We use convolution to make it differentiable.

Let

$$g_{r,k}(x) = \frac{1}{\text{vol}_d(\varrho_r B_1^d)} \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \|x\|_1 \leq \frac{r}{k+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and define the fooling function

$$f_r := h_r * \underbrace{g_{r,k} * \cdots * g_{r,k}}_{(k+1)\text{-fold}}.$$

We have  $f_r(x) = 0$  for  $x \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\int f_r dx = \int h_r dx$ .

## Bounding the derivatives

For a continuous function  $f$  it is easy to prove that

$$\|D^{e_i}[f * g_{r,k}]\|_\infty \leq \frac{d(k+1)}{r} \|f\|_\infty$$

Inductively, we obtain

$$\|f_r\|_{C_d^k} \leq \max \left\{ 1, r^{-k} (d(k+1))^{k-1} \right\}$$

## Finishing the proof

We define

$$f_r^* = \frac{f_r}{\|f_r\|_{C_d^k}} \in C_d^k.$$

Using

$$\int_{[0,1]^d} f_r(x) dx = 1 - n \frac{(2r)^d}{d!} > 1 - n \left( \frac{4er}{d} \right)^d$$

we obtain that  $\int_{[0,1]^d} f_r^*(x) dx \leq \varepsilon$  implies that

$$n \geq \left( 1 - \varepsilon \cdot \|f_r\|_{C_d^k} \right) \left( \frac{d}{4er} \right)^d.$$

## Finishing the proof

$$n \geq \left(1 - \varepsilon \cdot \|f_r\|_{\mathcal{C}_d^k}\right) \left(\frac{d}{4er}\right)^d.$$

---

Now we choose

$$r = (2\varepsilon)^{1/r} (d(k+1))^{1-1/k}$$

to obtain

$$\|f_r\|_{\mathcal{C}_d^k} \leq \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}$$

and

$$n(\varepsilon, \mathcal{C}_d^k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_k d}{\varepsilon}\right)^{d/r}$$

with  $c_k = 1/((4e)^k (k+1)^{k-1})$ .

Compute the integral  $I_d(f) = \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x) dx$  by an “optimal” algorithm

$$A_n(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f(x_i).$$

We consider the spaces  $H^s([0, 1]^d)$  and  $H^{r, \text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$ .

$H^s([0, 1]^d)$  contains all  $f$  such that  $D^\alpha f \in L_2$  for  $\|\alpha\|_1 \leq s$ .

$H^{r, \text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$  contains all  $f$  such that  $D^\alpha f \in L_2$  for  $\|\alpha\|_\infty \leq r$ .



## Results of Bakhvalov (1959) and Frolov (1976)

**Bakhvalov 1959:** For  $H^s([0, 1]^d)$  with  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s > d/2$  the optimal rate is

$$|I_d(f) - A_n(f)| \leq c n^{-s/d} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

**Frolov 1976:** For  $H^{r, \text{mix}}([0, 1]^d)$  with  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  the optimal rate is

$$|I_d(f) - A_n(f)| \leq c n^{-r} (\log n)^{(d-1)/2} \|f\|_{H^{r, \text{mix}}}.$$

### Questions:

- randomized unbiased algorithms?
- universality, same algorithm for all function spaces?

## Property P1 of a dream algorithm: unbiased and positive

The algorithm  $A_n$  should be an unbiased randomized algorithm,

$$\mathbf{E}(A_n(f)) = I_d(f)$$

for  $f \in L_1$ .

It is also good if  $a_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$  (stability).

## Property P2 of a dream algorithm: small worst case error

The worst case error  $\sup_{\omega} (|I_d(f) - A_n^\omega(f)|)$  should be small for “many” classes  $F$  of functions. For all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sup_{\omega} (|I_d(f) - A_n^\omega(f)|) \leq c n^{-r} (\log n)^{(d-1)/2} \|f\|_{H^{r, \text{mix}}},$$

for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $s > d/2$

$$\sup_{\omega} (|I_d(f) - A_n^\omega(f)|) \leq c n^{-s/d} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

## Property P3 of a dream algorithm: small randomized error

The randomized error  $\mathbf{IE}(|I_d(f) - A_n(f)|)$  should be small for “many” classes  $F$  of functions. For all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathbf{IE}(|I_d(f) - A_n(f)|) \leq c n^{-r-1/2} \|f\|_{H^{r,\text{mix}}},$$

for all  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $s > d/2$

$$\mathbf{IE}(|I_d(f) - A_n(f)|) \leq c n^{-s/d-1/2} \|f\|_{H^s}.$$

## P4 tractability properties; P5 easy to implement

Two more properties that we do not discuss here:

P4: The algorithm should have good tractability properties.

P5: The algorithm should be easy to implement.

Let  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \cdot d}$  be an invertible matrix and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We define

$$Q_{B,v}(f) = \frac{1}{|\det B|} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(B^{-t}(m + v)).$$

Then, for  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$|I_d(f) - Q_{B,v}(f)| \leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} |\hat{f}(Bm)|.$$

Important assumption for the following (“Frolov property”):

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^d (Bm)_j \right| \geq 1$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ .

For a Frolov matrix  $B$  and  $a > 0$  the randomized Frolov algorithm  $M_{a,B}$  is the algorithm  $Q_{aUB,v}$  as before with independent random vectors  $u$  and  $v$ , uniformly distributed in  $[1, 2^{1/d}]^d$  and  $[0, 1]^d$ , respectively and  $U = \text{diag}(u_1, \dots, u_d)$ .

Then  $M_{a,B}$  is unbiased on  $L_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $n \asymp a^d$ .

Main error bound:

$$\mathbf{E}|I_d(f) - M_{a,B}(f)| \leq c a^{-d} \int_{D_a} |\hat{f}(x)| dx,$$

for  $f \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , where  $D_a$  is the set of all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\prod_{j=1}^d |x_j| \geq a^d$ .

## Final Algorithm

The algorithm  $M_{a,B}$  fulfills all the error bounds from P2 and P3 for functions with compact support in  $(0, 1)^d$ .

Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a monotone  $C^\infty$ -function with  $\psi(x) = 0$  for  $x \leq 0$  and  $\psi(x) = 1$  for  $x \geq 1$  and  $\psi$  is a diffeomorphism on  $(0, 1)$ .

Furthermore,  $\Psi(x) = (\psi(x_1), \dots, \psi(x_d))$ .

For  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and an invertible  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \cdot d}$  let

$$\tilde{Q}_{B,v}(f) = \frac{1}{|\det B|} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(\Psi(B^{-t}(m + v))) \cdot |\det D\Psi(B^{-t}(m + v))|.$$

Final Algorithm for  $f : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ : For a Frolov matrix  $B$  and  $a > 0$  consider  $\tilde{Q}_{aUB,v}$  with independent  $u$  and  $v$ , uniformly distributed on  $[1, 2^{1/d}]^d$  and  $[0, 1]^d$ , respectively.



## Main Result

This “final algorithm” is unbiased, the weights are positive, and all error bounds from P2 and P3 hold.