

UTHEP-99-10-01

Foam: Multi-dimensional General Purpose Monte Carlo Generator With Self-adapting Symplectic Grid[†]

S. Jadach

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1200,
DESY, Theory Group, Notkestrasse 85, D-22603 Hamburg, Germany
and
Institute of Nuclear Physics, ul. Kawiory 26a, Kraków, Poland*

Abstract

A new general purpose Monte Carlo event generator with self-adapting grid consisting of simplices is described. In the process of initialization, the simplex-shaped cells divide into daughter subcells in such a way that: (a) cell density is biggest in areas where integrand is peaked, (b) cells elongate themselves along hyperspaces where integrand is enhanced/singular. The grid is anisotropic, i.e. memory of the axes directions of the primary reference frame is lost. In particular, the algorithm is capable of dealing with distributions featuring strong correlation among variables (like ridge along diagonal). The presented algorithm is complementary to others known and commonly used in the Monte Carlo event generators. It is, in principle, more effective than any other one for distributions with very complicated patterns of singularities – the price to pay is that it is memory-hungry. It is therefore aimed at a small number of integration dimensions (< 10). It should be combined with other methods for higher dimension. The source code in Fortran77 is available from <http://home.cern.ch/~jadach>.

To be submitted to Comput. Phys. Commun.

[†] Work supported in part by Polish Government grants KBN 2P03B08414, KBN 2P03B14715, the US DoE contracts DE-FG05-91ER40627 and DE-AC03-76SF00515, the Maria Skłodowska-Curie Joint Fund II PAA/DOE-97-316, and the Polish-French Collaboration within IN2P3 through LAPP Annecy.

UTHEP-99-10-01
October 1999

1 Introduction

Generation of artificial random events within multidimensional (phase) space according to a positive probability distribution defined by a theoretical model is a standard exercise in the particle physics, and in many areas of research. The above is usually called “Monte Carlo simulation” or generation of unweighted (weight equal one) events, while more modest task of calculating the integral only, using weighted events is usually termed “Monte Carlo integration”. In this work, primary interest is in the Monte Carlo (MC) simulation, which is a more difficult problem than MC integration. A computer MC program doing this is usually called a “MC event generator”.

With the advent of ever faster computers, one is able to perform Monte Carlo simulation or integration in more dimensions and for more and more complicated distributions. All MC methods/algorithms for the efficient, i.e. fast, MC simulation/integration can be reduced to a surprisingly small number of the basic methods, see e.g. ref. [1,2], that is to mapping variables into more natural ones, weighting/rejecting and splitting the probability distribution into sum of simpler ones (branching). For MC event generators which are used widely it is worth the effort to develop very efficient algorithm of MC generation, custom-made for the individual problem. There is no better guide for constructing an efficient custom-made MC generation algorithm than insight into the physics of the process to be simulated. There are many examples of very efficient MC event generators of the custom-made type.

On the other hand, it is often necessary to perform quickly “brute force” MC integration or generate events according to a probability density with strong peaks (singularities) spanned along complicated hyperspaces of not very well known shape, or in the case when the change of input data induces not very well controlled variations in the structure of the singularities. In all such cases it would be highly desirable to have at our disposal a numerical tool (program) with a MC generation algorithm featuring built-in capability of adjusting automatically the generation procedure to an arbitrary pattern of singularities in the probability distribution. Such a general-purpose tool was always a dream of people using MC methods. This is an utopian dream in the sense that we shall never get an ideal tool of this kind, i.e. working for an arbitrary distribution. Nevertheless, we may hope to develop a MC tool with an algorithm which is fairly efficient for a relatively wide range of multidimensional probability distributions. In reality, for each such method it is possible to find a distribution for which the particular general-purpose MC method (tool) fails badly. A similar situation exists for the problem of finding the absolute minimum of a multi-parameter function or in many other numerical problems.

The best known and widely used general-purpose algorithm for the Monte Carlo *integration* of an arbitrary density function in n -dimensions is probably that of Lepage described in ref. [3], and embodied in the widely used Fortran code VEGAS. In this classical algorithm, the integrand function in n dimensions is assumed to be fairly well approximated by a product of functions, each one depending just on one variable. The integration range of each variable is divided into k bins of unequal width, with binning (bin sizes) different for each variable. The entire integration domain, that is an n -dimensional

rectangle, is divided into k^n sub-rectangles. The whole structure is explored by means of the MC generation of random points within each sub-rectangle, with a uniform distribution. The result of repeated MC exploration runs is used to improve the binning. The binning is adjusted iteratively, such that the minimum value of the ratio of the dispersion to the average weight is achieved. In this way VEGAS is able to do MC *integration* quite efficiently. The original VEGAS was not really aimed for MC *generation*, but with a little bit off effort, it can be adapted to MC generation, as seen below.

As we see, the generation technique of VEGAS is essentially an example of a multi-branching method with each branch corresponding to one of k^n rectangles. In many practical applications (maybe even a majority) the assumption of factorizability of the integrand function is not violated too strongly and the VEGAS algorithm works fine. As expected, it fails when singularities tend to follow diagonal of the rectangle, i.e. variables are strongly correlated, also on the case of big voids, singularities on thin hyperspaces etc. In such cases VEGAS algorithm fails badly, and increasing the number of bins k , or number of iterations, does not help to reduce weight dispersion σ at all. The only method to improve the integration precision is the brute force method of increasing the number of MC points N , leading to a slow decrease of statistical error $\sim \sigma/\sqrt{N}$, or changing analytically integration variables (mapping).

As already stressed, our primarily interest is in MC simulation. The VEGAS algorithm with almost no modification can produce MC weighted events. A little bit more effort is required to produce constant weight events, by means of additional rejection, knowing the maximum weight. This can be done by recording during the last iteration, for each integration variable, a maximum weight in each of the n bins. The multichannel generation of the sub-rectangles is then done using not the probability related to the average weight or its dispersion but instead using the maximum weight (product of them). This simple recipe works fairly well for an almost factorizable distribution. It fails really very badly for an integrand departing from the factorizability assumption, much worse then for the task of the MC integration only. Essentially, the VEGAS algorithm has no means to reduce the ratio of the maximum weight to average weight below a certain value, for a given integrand. The only way out is then to apply mapping from the actual variables to new ones, in which the integrand hopefully factorizes much better. This requires detailed knowledge of the integrand distribution – it means going back to a labor-hungry custom-made MC.

There were several efforts to improve on the shortcomings of the VEGAS method, still assuming no detailed knowledge about the structure of singularities in the integrand. For example, in ref. [4], several improvements are done. The most important one is adding the possibility of treating a subgroup of variables (wild) which cause strong variation in the integrand, while the other ones (mild) are “averaged over”. This is particularly useful for problems with many variables ~ 100 , of which only some are “trouble-makers” and require special treatment.

Another improvement is described in ref. [5], where the VEGAS algorithm is upgraded with the possibility of approximating the wild integrand not with one product of n functions, each for one dimension, but with a sum of such products, with automatic

adjustments of the relative importance of the component products. It is essentially an application of the ideas of ref. [6] to the VEGAS algorithm. The modified algorithm should be efficient for a wider class of probability distributions.

In this note, I describe an independent effort which is not rooted in VEGAS algorithm, but rather in the algorithm used in subprogram VESKO2 of MC generator LESKOF for deep inelastic scattering published in ref. [7] (in fact it was already used in the much older LESKOC MC). In VESKO2 the 2-dimensional integration area is divided into rectangular cells which gradually were subdivided by half along x or y direction (the choice of the division direction was random). The division was always performed for the cell which contained the biggest value of the integrand. Note that this algorithm does not require factorizability of the integrand – it is not very efficient, but numerically rather stable. Obviously, the rule of division by half is rather primitive, one could do it better. The random (or arbitrary) choice of division line (along x or y) could be replaced by a better rule of dividing along the maximum gradient of the function. However, from inspection of the way the grid of cells evolves, it was obvious that this algorithm has the following intrinsic problem, even if such improvements were implemented: the edges of the cells are always parallel to the axes. Consider, for instance, a narrow diagonal “ridge” along $x = y$ line. Of course, the algorithm of VESKO2 is obviously superior to VEGAS, because cells multiply and concentrate along the diagonal. However, the adjustment of the cells would be much faster if cells could turn themselves to be parallel to the “ridge”. The self-suggesting solution is the replacement of rectangular cells with the triangular ones. Then, hopefully in the process of subdivision, the cells could align along singular lines, if the division rule was defined in an intelligent way. In n -dimensions the generalization of triangular plaquette is simplex-shaped cell. In the following, I shall present certain variant of such a method to which we refer as a “Foam” algorithm.

After completing the essential part of this work, I have found in ref. [8] a description of a similar algorithm¹; see last section for more comments.

The outline of the paper is the following: Section 1 describes the Foam algorithm, Section 2 its implementation, Section 4 the usage of the program, and Section 5 presents results of numerical tests.

2 The Foam algorithm

Let me define the aims which I have in mind with the new Foam algorithm:

- The algorithm is thought to be in the future a part of a bigger algorithm and it is supposed to take care of several (< 10) “wildest variables”, i.e. variables with the strongest singularities, while the other variables I imagine are dealt with the VEGAS method, or are “averaged over” like in BASES of ref. [4]
- I assume that the integrand is completely arbitrary, in particular singularities may lie on arbitrarily shaped hyperspaces. (For extremely narrow peaks, it always make

¹I would like to thank Viacheslav Ilyin for bringing my attention to this work.

sense to map variables.) In particular the algorithm should be able to deal with singularity along diagonals, with big voids and along “thin” hypersurfaces like surfaces of the cube, sphere etc.

- I imagine that in the algorithm a grid of vertices forming a “foam of cells” is built, which adapts automatically to the integrand in such a way that the resulting ratio of average weight to maximum weight, i.e. efficiency, is *arbitrarily* good. In the subsequent MC generation the foam of cells is used to generate one cell and a point within this cell.
- For strong peaks the foam of cells may develop into a wrong direction, not knowing at the early stage of the development the positions of the sharp peaks containing most of the integral. I therefore require that the algorithm has a built-in capacity to “collapse” (recess) i.e. possibility of removing a part of the foam (returning to a coarser granularity in some region). The iterative succession of “grow” and “collapse” should be available as an option, in order to stabilize the final optimal foam of cells.
- The integrand should be positive and integrable. Weak integrable singularities of the type \sqrt{x} or $\ln(1/x)$ are allowed. Such singularities are typically on the edges of the integration domain – so there should be an option to include or not the vertices at the corners of the simplex cell in the evaluation of the integral over the cell.

2.1 Data structures

The basic data structure is the *foam* being a linked list of *cells*. A simplex cell is defined by its *vertices*. Each cell has also many other attributes such as pointers to parent and daughter cells, its volume, an estimate of the integral over the cell which I call *the proper integral*, average weight, maximum weight etc. Cells actually contain only pointers to vertices, while n -component vectors defining vertices are in a separate list of all vertices. This organization is well justified, because one vertex may enter into several cells. The foam is in fact a hierarchical list of cells organized into one big tree. There are two kinds of cells, *inactive cells* which underwent division and got split into daughter cells and *active cells* (with no daughter). Active cells actually cover the entire integration area. In the MC simulation one active cell is chosen randomly according to its *crude integral* which is usually bigger than its proper integral. For the relation between crude and proper integral see below. Each inactive cell knows the sum of crude integrals of all active cells it contains (all its daughter and granddaughter cells). It is done in such a way in order to make generation of the active cell as natural and simple as possible. In fact, generation starts with inactive *root* cell at the top of the tree – one of the daughter cells is chosen randomly according to its crude integral. This process continues down the tree until an active cell (with no daughters) is randomly chosen. The root cell is the entire integration region, being a cube of unit size. In present algorithm, the root cell is the only one which

has more than 2 daughters. It splits into $n!$ simplices².

2.2 Initialization: growth and collapse of the foam

The foam structure described in previous section is constructed during the *initialization* phase. It consists of subsequent *growths* and *collapses* of the foam. Let me first describe the phase of the growth. The initial cube is divided into $n!$ equal simplices, daughter cells, and each daughter cell immediately subjected to an *MC exploration* procedure, eg. a certain number of MC events is generated within the cell in order to calculate the average weight, dispersion, maximum weight, minimum weight, proper integral (MC estimator) and more. In the rest of the *growth* phase each cell has a chance to get divided into 2 daughters. In present version of the program two options of choosing cell for division are implemented: In the first method, the active cell picked up for division is always this one which actually contains the biggest crude integral. In the second method, the choice of the (active) cell for division is done randomly, with probability proportional to its crude integral. The user may check empirically which option fits better his integrand. This division process continues until the memory buffer reserved for the foam fills up³. The active cell chosen for division, is tagged as inactive and divided into 2 daughter cells (active) and each daughter cell undergoes MC exploration. The recipe for the cell division is the most important part of the algorithm; see below for its detailed description. The division of a cell into two daughter cells involves a creating new vertex. The new vertex is added to the list of vertices. The sum of crude integrals calculated for the new two daughters is not necessarily equal to the crude of the parent – in order to maintain our algorithm of picking randomly the active cell following the tree, the crude integral of the divided cell and of all parent cells is corrected up to the root cell, in such a way that the crude integral of parent is always equal to sum of crude integrals of the daughters. In particular the root cell contains always the crude integrals of all active cells, i.e. the total crude integral.

As already indicated, in the case of a strongly peaked distribution, growth may go into a “wrong area”, so one is interested in a possibility of trimming/downsizing the foam, which is termed the *collapse* of the foam. The algorithm of the collapse is very simple and intuitively understandable. When growth is stopped by the buffer limits, the maximum value I_{\max}^C of the crude in all active cells is determined. Next, *all inactive* cells are checked, starting from the top cell, looking for cells which have crude integral smaller than I_{\max}^C times some adjustable factor close to one (default is one, the user may reset it easily). Every such inactive cell is reset as *active* and all its daughters, down to the bottom of the tree, are tagged for removal. Finally, the removal of the tagged cells is done, releasing free space in the buffer. All vertices are also checked, to see if they are

²This already shows why we are limited to $n < 10$. N.B. I do not favour the other possible solution in which the unit cube is mapped into single simplex, because such a transformation is “singular” at certain vertices.

³In fact, the user may only request for a maximum number of cells in the foam smaller than the total length of the entire buffer. For the moment, there is no dynamical memory allocation in the program.

members of any cell, and the orphan vertices are also removed. In this way, the entire “un-successful” branches are eliminated from the tree of cells, or, in other words, several cells which are product of the division get replaced by the single (parent) cell, just like in the real foam! Typically, about half of the cells are eliminated in this way, and one may start another phase of the growth. Note that after reviving an inactive cell, one needs to attribute to it the original (uncorrected) crude integral. This original crude integral from first exploration is memorized as one of attributes of the cell, and is therefore available. In tests I have found out that the collapse and subsequent growth usually leads to the same or very similar foam. The above option is useful only for very sharply peaked distributions. It is switched on only on explicit request of the user.

2.3 Division of the cell

Each newly created cell undergoes exploration, just after its creation, in order to determine its proper crude integral and the other weight parameters. The division of the symplectic cell is the essence of the algorithm. Let me therefore describe it in a more detail. The division procedure is defined in a maximally simple way. A simplex of $n + 1$ vertices $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}$ has $n(n + 1)/2$ edge lines joining every possible pair of vertices of a given cell. In our division algorithm, one such edge between x_i and x_j is chosen and a new vertex Y is put somewhere on the line

$$Y = \lambda x_i + (1 - \lambda)x_j$$

where $0 < \lambda < 1$. The two daughter simplices are defined with two new list of vertices:

$$\begin{aligned} &(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, Y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}), \\ &(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{j-1}, Y, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

At this stage, it has do be determined which (i, j) pair and which value of λ to choose. The aim is generally to make this choice in such a way that the function *varies the most strongly* in the direction of the edge defined by the (i, j) pair of vertices. How to find it out? To this end, the information from the relatively short sample of the MC events (100-1000) generated inside the cell, during its MC exploration is exploited. First of all, from geometrical considerations which I omit, one is able to “project” each MC point X into a point Y on a given edge $(i, j), i \neq j$:

$$Y = \lambda_{ij} x_i + (1 - \lambda_{ij})x_j$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{ij}(X) &= \frac{|\text{Det}_i|}{|\text{Det}_i| + |\text{Det}_j|}, \\ \text{Det}_i &= \text{Det}(r_1, \dots, r_{i-1}, r_{i+1}, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}), \\ \text{Det}_j &= \text{Det}(r_1, \dots, r_{j-1}, r_{j+1}, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}), \\ r_k &= x_k - X, \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{Det}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is the standard determinant. The condition $0 < \lambda_{i,j}(X) < 1$ is obviously fulfilled. With help of the MC series of vectors X (from MC exploration of the cell) we determine for each edge (i, j) the MC distribution of the variable $\langle \lambda_{i,j} \rangle$, the average $\langle \lambda_{i,j} \rangle$, its variance $\sigma(\lambda_{i,j})$ etc. For the division procedure I am looking for an edge (i, j) along which the integrand is varying most rapidly. How do I quantify the the “rapidness” of the distribution of $\lambda_{i,j}$ within its domain (0,1)? For instance, I could use the ratio of the dispersion to the average $\sigma / \langle w \rangle$ of $\lambda_{i,j}$. This would work if the distribution of $\lambda_{i,j}$ had a single maximum, in the middle of the (0,1) interval, or at one of its ends $\lambda_{i,j} = 0, 1$. This criterium of the “rapidness” of the distribution of $\lambda_{i,j}$ would fail, however, if the distribution of $\lambda_{i,j}$ had two or more maxima within (0,1) interval. It would be an annoying failure in many practical cases like a double ridge or closed hyperspaces (like sphere). A more sophisticated measure of the “rapidness” of the distribution of $\lambda_{i,j}$ is therefore used in the algorithm. For each (i, j) the full distribution $dN/d\lambda$ is recorded (histogrammed) and the value of the integral

$$R_{i,j} = \int |dN d\lambda_{i,j} - N| d\lambda_{i,j}$$

is calculated. The edge (i, j) with the biggest $R_{i,j}$ is chosen for the cell division. As easily seen, the $R_{i,j}$ is close to zero for flat (uniform) $dN/d\lambda_{i,j}$ and has high value, $\sim N$, if $dN/d\lambda_{i,j}$ has one or multiple narrow peaks. As a value λ for the division $\lambda = \langle \lambda_{i,j} \rangle$ is taken. In this way one makes attempt to divide the cell in such a way that two daughters cells contain roughly half of the parent integral (as in VESKO2). In the MC exploration of the new cell, the index of the (optimal) edge (i, j) and its $\langle \lambda_{i,j} \rangle$ are readily determined and memorized for future use – when later on, an active cell is picked up for division, the division direction (i, j) and its ratio $\langle \lambda_{i,j} \rangle$ is already predetermined.

Let me finally comment on the weight normalization, and the related question of reduction of the variance and/or maximum weight. Before I enter details it is very important to remember that my final aim and highest priority is to generate events with the weight equal one i.e. unweighted events. This is a much harder task than generate the variable weight events. As usual, one may produce variable weight events and turn them into unweighted events by means of rejection. However, one cannot do it efficiently if one does not control very strictly the maximum weight for weighted events. Weighted events (without strict control of maximum weight) are good enough for evaluating the value of the integral. In this less interesting case, the appropriate choice of the foam of cells, can minimize the variance of the weight. Our primary aim is, however, to construct the foam of cells which will allow us to control the maximum of the weight, while decent variance of the weight is of secondary importance.

In the initialization phase, the basic weight is defined $w = f(x)V_{Cart}$ where f is integrand function, and V_{Cart} is Cartesian volume of the cell. The above weight is therefore normalized such that the proper integral is equal the average weight, i.e., for infinite number of MC events $\langle w \rangle$ is just equal to the integral over the cell.

In order to gain good control over the maximum of the weight (and/or its variance) I introduce the *crude integral* of the cell, which is typically an overestimated integral over

the cell. In the subsequent MC generation, the MC weight w_{MC} will compensate for the fact that *crude integral* is not equal the true value of the integral over the cell. Since the control of the maximum weight is our main priority, in the *default* case, the crude integral of the cell is chosen

$$I_{crude} = w_{\max} = V_{Cart} \text{Max}_X f(X),$$

i.e. it is equal the maximum value of the integrand function times the volume of the cell. Of course, the true maximum of the integrand function is not know, and instead, one employs its estimate obtained in the course of the MC exploration of the cell. This above choice ensures that the condition $w_{MC} \leq 1$, essential for turning weighted events into $w_{MC} = 1$ events by means of the rejection, will not be violated too often.

Note that if one is interested only in the variable weight events, for instance for calculating the integral, then a more economical choice of the crude integral of the cell would be

$$I_{crude} = \sqrt{\langle w \rangle^2 + \sigma^2} = \sqrt{\langle w^2 \rangle},$$

i.e. this quantity is either the average weight $\langle w \rangle$ or its variance σ , depending which one is bigger, see also discussion in refs. [3,6]. This would provide a reasonable reduction of the variance by populating more densely cells which have bigger ratio of the proper variance to proper average weight $\sigma(w)/\langle w \rangle$, and therefore reducing the overall $\sigma(w)/\langle w \rangle$. The above choice of the crude integral is also optionally available in the program.

In any case, the compensating weight for the MC generation is always the same:

$$w_{MC} = f(x)V_{Cart}/I_{crude}.$$

3 Program structure

The program consists of one source file and one header file. It is written in Fortran77 with the popular extensions like long variable names, long source lines, etc., which are available on all platforms. In the *makefile* there is a collections of f77 compilation flags, for Linux, AIX HPUX and ALPHA compilers which should be used to activate these extensions. The program is written in such a way that its translation to c++ or Java should be not too difficult. In fact the program has structure of the c++ class as much as it is possible to do it within f77. Below I characterize the rules according to which program was written. Variables obey the following rules:

- There is only one common block `/c_FoamA/` which contains all class member variables, which is placed in the header file `FoamA.h`. Each subroutine in `FoamA.f` source file includes an `INCLUDE 'FoamA.h'` statement. The outside programs should never include directly `/c_FoamA/`. All input/output communication is done with the help of dedicated, easy to use, subroutines.

- Variables in `/c_FoamA/` are *class members* and all have special prefix “m_” in their name, for example `m_Iterat` is number of iterations.
- User has access to some class members through “getters” and “setters”; see below.
- Strong typing is imposed with help of `IMPLICIT NONE`.

Subprograms in the class are loosely organized in several categories:

- Constructor with name `FoamA_PreInitialize` which pre-sets default values of many variables, including input variables. It is invoked automatically.
- Initializator with name `FoamA_Initialize`, which performs initialization of the foam grid.
- Finalizator with name `FoamA_Finalize`, which summarizes the whole run, sets output values in `/c_FoamA/`, prints output etc.
- Maker with the name `FoamA_MakeSomething` or similar a one, which does the essential part of job, in our case a maker `FoamA_MakeEvent` generates single MC event.
- Setter with the name `FoamA_SetVariable`, is called from the outside world to set `m_Variable` in `/c_FoamA/`. For example `CALL FoamA_SetIterat(5)` sets variable `m_Iterat=5`. Only certain privileged variables have a right to be served by their own setter, the other ones are in principle “private”. Most of setters should be called before initialization.
- Getter with the name `FoamA_GetVariable`, is called from the outside world to get `m_Variable` from `/c_FoamA/`. It is a preferred way of sending output information to outside world. For example, with `CALL FoamA_GetMCwt(MCwt)` one gets MC weight `MCwt` in the user program.

The full list of class member variables in `/c_FoamA/` is shown in the Appendix A. Additional information on all subprograms of the Foam package can be found in Tables 1 and 2, where I list all subprograms with short descriptions of their role.

| Subprogram | description |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Initialization of the foam grid | |
| FoamA_PreInitialize | Pre-initialization, set all default values (constructor) |
| FoamA_Initialize(FunW) | Initialization of the grid etc. |
| FoamA_InitVertices | Initializes first vertices of the basic cube |
| FoamA_InitCells | Initializes first n-factorial cells inside original cube |
| FoamA_DefCell | Creates new (daughter) cell and append at end of the buffer |
| FoamA_SetVertex(iVe,k1,k2,k3) | Helps to define vertex |
| FoamA_Explore(iCell,funW) | Short MC sampling in iCell, determine $\langle wt \rangle$, wt_{\max} etc. |
| FoamA_RanDiscr(Crud,nTot,Pow,iRnd) | Random choice of cell division direction |
| FoamA_MakeLambda(Lambda) | Auxiliary procedure for FoamA_Explore |
| FoamA_Determinant(R,Det) | Determinant of matrix R |
| FoamA_Det2Lapl(R,i1,i2) | Laplace formula for 2-dim. determinant |
| FoamA_Det3Lapl(R,i1,i2,i3) | Laplace formula for 3-dim. determinant |
| FoamA_Det4Lapl(R,i1,i2,i3,i4) | Laplace formula for 4-dim. determinant |
| FoamA_Det5Lapl(R,i1,i2,i3,i4,i5) | Laplace formula for 5-dim. determinant |
| FoamA_Grow(funW) | Grow cells until buffer is full |
| FoamA_PeekMax(iCell) | Choose randomly one cell, used also in MC generation |
| FoamA_Peek(iCell) | Generates randomly pointer iCell of (active) cell |
| FoamA_Divide(iCell,funW,RC) | Divide iCell into two daughters; iCell tagged as inactive |
| FoamA_Collapse | Finds and removes some cells, revives some nonactive cells |
| Generation | |
| FoamA_MakeEvent(funW) | Generates point/vector Xrand with the weight MCwt |
| FoamA_GetMCvector(MCvector) | Provides point/vector MCvector generated by MakeEvent |
| FoamA_GetMCwt(MCwt) | Provides MC weight MCwt calculated by MakeEvent |
| FoamA_MCgenerate(funW,X,MCwt) | Alternative entry, Generates point X with the weight MCwt |
| Finalization | |
| FoamA_Finalize(MCresult,MCErrror) | Calculates integral and its error after MC run |
| FoamA_GetIntegral(MCresult,MCErrror) | Integral estimate from MC generation |

Table 1: List of all subprograms with short description.

| Subprogram | description |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Other Getters and Setters | |
| FoamA_GetCrude(Crude) | Provides Crude used in MC generation |
| FoamA_SetNdim(Ndim) | Sets Ndim= no. of dimensions (called before Initialize) |
| FoamA_GetNdim(Ndim) | Provides Ndim, miscellaneous, for tests |
| FoamA_SetnBuf(nBuf) | Sets nBuf, length of working area in the buffer |
| FoamA_SetIterat(Iterat) | Sets Iterat= no. of iterations (called before Initialize) |
| FoamA_SetOut(Out) | Sets output unit number |
| FoamA_SetChat(Chat) | Sets chat level Chat=0,1,2 in the output, Chat=1 normal |
| FoamA_SetnSampl(nSampl) | Sets nSampl; No of MC sampling before dividing cell |
| FoamA_SetOptCrude(OptCrude) | Sets OptCrude; type of Crude =0,1,2. |
| FoamA_SetOptBeta(OptBeta) | Sets type of method in cell division |
| FoamA_SetOptPeek | Sets type of method in cell division |
| FoamA_SetOptEdge(OptEdge) | Sets OptEdge; (inclusion of vertices in the cell exploration) |
| FoamA_SetKillFac(KillFac) | Sets KillFac; threshold factor for collapse procedure |
| Debugging and miscellaneous | |
| FoamA_Check(mout,level) | Checks all pointers (after compression) debugging! |
| FoamA_ActUpda | Miscellaneous, Creates list of active cells (pointers) |
| FoamA_BufPrint(mout) | Prints all cells, debugging |
| FoamA_BufActPrint(mout) | Prints all active cells, debugging |
| FoamA_VertPrint(mout) | Prints all vertices, debugging |
| FoamA_PltBegin | Plotting 2-dim. cells and vertices |
| FoamA_PltVert(mout) | Plotting 2-dim. cells and vertices |
| FoamA_PltCell(mout) | Plotting 2-dim. cells and vertices |
| FoamA_PltEnd | Plotting 2-dim. cells and vertices |

Table 2: List of all subprograms with short description, continuation.

| Parameter | Meaning |
|------------|--|
| m_nDim | Number of dimensions. |
| m_nBuf | Actual dynamic length of the buffer $m_nBuf < m_nBufMax$. Larger m_nBuf has to be used for higher dimensions and for strongly singular integrand. For larger m_nBuf the CPU time of the initialisation will increase but the total CPU time of the event generation will be shorter because the acceptance rate $\langle w \rangle / w_{max}$ will improve. Default is $m_nBuf=1000$. |
| m_nSampl | Number of MC sampling per cell in the MC <i>exploration</i> of the new cell daughter cell. The MC efficiency $\langle w \rangle / w_{max}$ seems to depend weakly on m_nSampl . However, if one cannot increase m_nBuf any more then enlarging m_nSampl may still help a little bit. Default is $m_nSampl=200$. |
| m_Iterat | No of iterations in the initialization of the grid, $m_Iterat=0$ is the lowest possible value. In most cases it is enough. Each iteration consists of the grow and collapse of the grid. Several iterations are recommended for very strongly peaked distributions. |
| m_KillFac | threshold factor for reviving inactive cells in the “collapse” procedure of the iteration. Its change seems to be without much effect. May be in some rare cases the user will find profitable to readjust it. Default is $m_KillFac=1$. |
| m_OptCrude | Type of the crude integral used for the MC generation of the active cell. For $OptCrude=0$ estimator of the “true” integral in the cell is take as crude, for $OptCrude=1$ the value of $\sqrt{\langle w^2 \rangle}$ and for $OptCrude=2$ the maximum weight w_{max} . Default is $m_OptCrude=2$. |
| m_OptEdge | Option parameter deciding whether vertices are included in the MC exploration of the cell. For $m_OptEdge=0$ they are not included and for $m_OptEdge=1$ they are included. Generally it is good to include vertices, but if there are some weak singularities or numerical instabilities of the integrand close to boundary of the integration domain, then it better to set $m_OptEdge=0$. Default is $m_OptEdge=1$. |
| m_OptPeek | Option parameter deciding method of selecting the cell for division. $OptPeek=0$ cell with maximum crude (default), $OptPeek=1$ randomly. |
| m_OptBeta | Type of choice of the edge in the division of the cell, Default $OptBeta=0$ described in the text, $OptBeta=1$, $OptBeta=2$ for tests. |
| m_Out | Output unit number. For redirecting output from Foam to separate disk file. Default is $m_Out=6$. |
| m_Chat | $Chat=0,1,2$ increasing chat level in the output unit, $Chat=1$ is the default normal level |

Table 3: Important input parameters of the Foam. They are listed in the order of their importance.

4 Program usage, input parameters

Basic input variables are listed in in Table (3) together with their explanation. Typical user program using Foam package may look as follows:

```

*-----
DOUBLE PRECISION  Density
EXTERNAL          Density
CALL FoamA_SetNdim(      3) ! number of dimensions
CALL FoamA_SetnBuf(    2000) ! length of buffer
CALL FoamA_SetIterat(   1) ! number of iterations
CALL FoamA_SetnSampl(  500) ! no. of MC events/cell (initialization)
CALL FoamA_SetOptCrude(  2) ! type of crude, =2 is default anyway
CALL FoamA_SetOptEdge(  1) ! edge point are included, (=0 excluded)
CALL FoamA_SetChat(     1) ! printout level
CALL FoamA_Initialize(Density) ! initialize foam grid
DO loop = 1, 200000
  CALL FoamA_MakeEvent(Density)      ! generate MC event
  CALL FoamA_GetMCvector(MCvector)  ! get MC event, vector
  CALL FoamA_GetMCwt(MCwt)          ! get MC weight
  CALL GLK_Fill(1000, MCwt,1d0)     ! users histogramming
ENDDO
CALL FoamA_Finalize(MCresult,MCerror) ! printouts, get integral & error
CALL FindWtLimit(1000)              ! users routine, check on MC efficiency
*-----

```

In fact user has to set only the number of dimensions Ndim. The other input variables nBuf, Iterat, nSampl, OptCrude, OptEdge, Chat are already preset for the user thus calling setters for them is optional. User needs to provide his own integrand function which in the example is Density. Below is an example of a simple integrand function (3-dim. sphere).

```

*-----
      DOUBLE PRECISION FUNCTION Density(X)
*//////////
**// 3-dimensional testing function, Thin sphere centred at (A1,A2,A3) **
**// with Radius and Thickness defined below                               **
*//////////
      IMPLICIT NONE
      DOUBLE PRECISION  X(*)
      DOUBLE PRECISION  Radius,Thickness,A1,A2,A3,R
      DATA  A1,A2,A3  / 0.25, 0.40, 0.50 / ! centre of sphere
      DATA  Radius    / 0.35 /           ! radius of sphere
      DATA  Thickness / 0.020 /         ! thickness of sphere
*-----
      R  = SQRT( (x(1)-A1)**2 +(x(2)-A2)**2 +(x(3)-A3)**2 )
      Density = Thickness/( (R-Radius)**2 + Thickness**2)
      END
*-----

```

5 Numerical tests

A minimum of testing was done. It is even more important that the program was already tested in a *real practical application*. The present version of Foam is implemented as a part of KK Monte Carlo event generator [9] for the up to 3-dimensional problem of the simulation of the initial state photon radiation (ISR) and beamstrahlung for future Linear Colliders⁴.

In the following I present the comparisons of the Foam program with VEGAS [3] for $n = 2, 3$. For $n = 2$ I use three testing functions:

$$\begin{aligned} f_a(x_1, x_2) &= 1 - \Theta(0.5 - |x_1 - 0.5| - \gamma) \Theta(0.5 - |x_1 - 0.5 - \gamma|), \quad \gamma = 0.05, \\ f_b(x_1, x_2) &= 1/4\pi R^2 \gamma \pi [(R - \sqrt{(x_1 - 0.25)^2 + (x_2 - 0.40)^2} + \gamma^2)], \quad \gamma = 0.02, R = 0.35 \\ f_c(x_1, x_2) &= \gamma \pi [(x_1 + x_2)^2 + \gamma^2], \quad \gamma = 0.02. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

All above functions are defined within unit square $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$. The first density function is peaked along one of diagonals of the square, the second one is peaked along a 2% wide ring centered at (0.25,0.40) of radius 0.25, and the last one represents 5% wide band along four edges of the square.

In Fig. 1 the resulting 2-dimensional foam of cells is plotted. In each case, the foam consists of about 75 active cells and the exploration of the single cell in the initialization was based on 1000 MC events per cell. Only active cells are plotted. As expected, cells of the foam concentrate in the areas of the enhancement of the integrand functions. They clearly try tend to elongate along the lines of the “ridges” in the integrand functions.

| Functions | Foam | VEGAS |
|----------------------------------|------|-------|
| $f_a(x_1, x_2)$ (diagonal ridge) | 0.94 | 0.05 |
| $f_b(x_1, x_2)$ (circular ridge) | 0.83 | 0.15 |
| $f_c(x_1, x_2)$ (edge of square) | 0.57 | 0.53 |

Table 4: Efficiency w_{\max}^ε , for $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, of Foam and VEGAS for 3 examples of the 2-dimensional integrand function defined in eq. (1). After initialization, efficiency was determined from sample of 10^6 MC events. Results from Foam are for 5000 cells (about 2500 active cells) and cell exploration was based on 200 MC events per cell.

The three test functions of eq. (1) are intended to be of the “non-factorizable” type, such that Foam should be more efficient than VEGAS. *I definitely want to adjusted the concept of “efficiency” of the MC to the task of MC generation of weight one events.* (It should not be confused with the statistical error of the integral.) Generally, I define efficiency as the ratio of the average weight to maximum weight $\langle w \rangle / w_{\max}$, such that it is equal to the rejection rate in the process of turning variable-weight events into $w = 1$ events. In practice, however, w_{\max} has to be defined unambiguously and in a numerically stable way. The straightforward definition of w_{\max} as a maximum weight determined empirically in the MC test run, or during the initialization of the grid, can be prone to large fluctuation. For practical reasons I do not want to exclude from our considerations the case of the weak integrable singularities in the integrand function like, for instance, $x^{-1/10}$ which may lead to a tail in the weight distribution.

⁴It this practical application Foam is more efficient than VEGAS by factor of order 100.




Figure 1: Two dimensional foam of the cells for three density functions f_a , f_b and f_c defined in eq. (1). For f_a the boundary of the nonzero integrand is marked with a dashed line.

(numerical instabilities due to rounding errors may produce similar effect.) Quite often, such a tail will not influence the average weight $\langle w \rangle$ and the MC estimate of the integral at all. It will, however, render w_{\max} ill-defined, that is dependent on the number of the events in the MC sample and/or wildly fluctuating. In order to avoid such a problem, in all presented tests, the following alternative definition of the w_{\max} is applied: For a given precision level $\varepsilon \ll 1$ w_{\max} is determined from the weight distribution in such a way that the contribution to $\langle w \rangle$ (that is to total integral) from “under-rejected” (“over-weighted”) events with $w > w_{\max}$ is equal ε .

Such a quantity is referred to as w_{\max}^ε ⁵. In practice it is a little bit of effort to determine w_{\max}^ε from the weight distribution. One has to create a histogram of the weight with at least ~ 1000 bins, in order to determine w_{\max}^ε with 2 digit precision.

In order to understand correctly the following comparisons of the Foam and VEGAS, it is important to remember that for Foam the efficiency $\langle w \rangle / w_{\max}^\varepsilon$ can be improved by means of a brute force increase of the number of cells and/or manipulating its other input parameters while for VEGAS it is not possible. More precisely in practical applications one has to face the following fundamental deficiency of the VEGAS (from the point of view of the MC simulation): For a given type of the integrand function, its efficiency is limited in a rigid way – the increase of function calls and/or number of iteration in VEGAS cannot improve the efficiency $\langle w \rangle / w_{\max}^\varepsilon$ beyond certain asymptotic value which I call *asymptotic efficiency*. This annoying feature is excluding VEGAS from many practical MC applications. In order to improve efficiency of VEGAS beyond the above asymptotic value, it is necessary to map the integration variables or employ other MC techniques like branching etc. However, this is exactly contrary to the spirit of a general purpose MC tool like VEGAS or Foam.

In Tab. 4 the MC efficiency of Foam and VEGAS is compared for three testing integrand functions of eq. (1). As expected, Foam is significantly more efficient for f_a and f_b which clearly do not comply with the factorizability assumption. The case of f_b is a little bit more complicated; see below. Tab. 4 shows the asymptotic efficiencies for VEGAS, that is the best possible one. Even worse, for functions f_a and f_b these asymptotic efficiencies of VEGAS are of $\mathcal{O}(\gamma)$ and can be even worse for sharper singularities in test functions (smaller γ parameter). As indicated, the case of f_c is more involved. Although at first sight f_c looks clearly a non-factorizable, however, it is well approximated by the product of two functions and its asymptotic efficiency is equal $1/2 + \mathcal{O}(\gamma)$. Even more interestingly, although for the Foam algorithm there is no limiting asymptotic efficiency (its asymptotic efficiency for large number of cells is arbitrarily close one), nevertheless the increase of number of cells for f_c does lead to rather slow increase of its efficiency. This phenomenon is also seen in Fig. 1(c) where the foam of cells fits visually the shape of f_c worse than in other two cases⁶. The amount of CPU time necessary for producing the results in Tab. 4 was about the same for the Foam and VEGAS programs.

| Functions | Foam | VEGAS |
|-----------------------------------|------|-------|
| $f_a(x_1, x_2)$ (thin diagonal) | 0.67 | 0.04 |
| $f_b(x_1, x_2)$ (thin sphere) | 0.36 | 0.10 |
| $f_c(x_1, x_2)$ (surface of cube) | 0.37 | 0.33 |

Table 5: Efficiency w_{\max}^ε , for $\varepsilon = 10^{-4}$, of Foam and VEGAS for 3 examples of the 3-dimensional integrand functions, the analogs of the integrand of eq. (1). After initialization, efficiency was determined from sample of 10^6 MC events. Results from Foam are for 5000 cells (about 2500 active cells) and cell exploration was based on 200 MC events per cell.

In Tab. 5 results of comparison of Foam and VEGAS are shown for 3 dimensional integrands being straightforward extension to 3 dimensions of the functions of eq. (1). Again Foam is clearly superior, and again the efficiency of VEGAS already is at its limiting/asymptotic value while the

⁵The concept of such a maximum weight was already used in BHLUMI MC [10].

⁶Apparently, a grid with rectangular cells would do better in this case.

efficiency of Foam can be still improved by adding more cells in the initialization phase. In this 3-dimensional case the CPU time consumption of Foam is noticeably smaller than of VEGAS.

As it was already discussed in the description of the Foam algorithm, the actual implementation has several operational modes corresponding to several variants of the algorithm. The user may switch to one of them by changing input parameters/switches. All these operational modes were tested and the default configuration corresponds to a mode which is the best, according to our present knowledge. One disappointing result of these tests of various operational modes is that the iterative grow/collapse of the foam does not really improve the grid. Nevertheless I leave this option in the actual program, because it might be a useful as a starting point for some fresh idea in the future development of the algorithm.

Concerning similar algorithms proposed in ref. [8] it may be noted that the algorithm presented here is defined more narrowly but it is defined very clearly, while in ref. [8] authors propose the whole family of algorithms exploiting the idea of symplectic grid, without going much into details. In particular they contemplate an interesting possibility of adapting the grid to the integrand, by moving vertices and deforming cells. It is an attractive idea, but it is difficult to judge how difficult it would be to implement it and how important a gain would be in the efficiency, without defining fine details of the algorithm. The other idea in ref. [8] is that of division of a cell in several cells, while I deliberately limited ourselves to division into only two cells. Even the division into two cells can be realized in several ways, and I have realized two scenarios with the resulting efficiency being quite different. Without a clear guiding idea, entering into a game of multi-division of cells looks like taking risk of getting lost in hundreds of options and scenarios. It is also important to remember that the main concern in the present work is MC simulation with constant weight events, while ref. [8] is rather aiming at the easier task of the MC integration with weighted events. This pre-determines the priorities in the construction of the algorithm very strongly and differently.

6 Conclusions

A new general purpose Monte Carlo tool based on a symplectic self-adapting grid is available. Numerical tests show that for non-factorizable integrand functions it is more effective than the classical VEGAS solution. The first real application to beamstrahlung and ISR in KK the Monte Carlo confirms maturity of the solution. The main limitation is that program is adapted for relatively small dimensions, $n < 8$. The algorithm and the program should not be treated as a final solution – it is rather a beginning of a new development direction in MC methods.

Acknowledgements

Most of this work was done during my visit in DESY – I am greatly indebted to DESY Directorate for its generous support. I am also thankful for support of the Physics Department of the University of Tennessee, where the final touches on this work were done. I would like to thank W. Płaczek, F. Tkachov and S. Yost for reading the manuscript and useful comments.

7 Appendix A

Below the entire “class common block” of the Foam class is show explicitly.

```
COMMON /c_FoamA/
$ m_CeStat(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: status=0 inactive, =1 active
$ m_CePare(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: parent cell pointer
$ m_CeDau1(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: daughter1 cell pointer
$ m_CeDau2(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: daughter2 cell pointer
$ m_CeVert(m_nBufMax,m_NdiMax+1),! Cell member: vertex pointers
$ m_CeIntg(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: integral estimator
$ m_CeCrud(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: Crude integral estimate
$ m_CeVolu(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: Cartesian volume
$ m_CeXave(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: Average best X
$ m_CeBest(m_nBufMax),           ! Cell member: Best pair of vertices, pointer
$ m_CeSum( m_nBufMax,m_sMax),     ! Cell member: weight summaries
$ m_VerX( m_vMax, m_NdiMax), ! List of all VERTEX positions
$ m_ActC(m_cMax),                 ! List of all pointers to ACTIVE cells
$ m_VolTot,                       ! Estimate of Volume total, without error
$ m_Crude,                         ! M.C. generation Crude value of integral
$ m_SumWt,                         ! M.C. generation sum of Wt
$ m_SumWt2,                        ! M.C. generation sum of Wt**2
$ m_NevGen,                        ! M.C. generation sum of 1d0
$ m_WtMax,                         ! M.C. generation maximum wt
$ m_WtMin,                         ! M.C. generation minimum wt
$ m_MCresult,                      ! M.C. generation Final value of ITEGRAL
$ m_MCerror,                       ! M.C. generation Final walue of ERROR
$ m_MCwt,                          ! M.C. generation current event weight
$ m_MCvector(m_NdiMax),! M.C. generated vector
$ m_KillFac,                       ! Threshold factor for collapse of cells
$ m_Ndim,                          ! dimension of the problem
$ m_nBuf,                          ! Actual dynamic lenth of the buffer m_nBuf<m_nBufMax
$ m_LastVe,                        ! Last vertex
$ m_LastAc,                        ! Last active cell
$ m_LastCe,                        ! Last cell in buffer
$ m_nSampl,                        ! No. of sampling when dividing cell
$ m_Iterat,                        ! No. of iterations in consolidation process
$ m_Ncalls,                        ! No. of function calls, total
$ m_OptCrude,                      ! type of Crude =0,1,2 for TrueVol,Sigma,WtMax
$ m_OptEdge,                      ! decides whether vertices are included in the sampling
$ m_Chat,                          ! Chat level in output, Chat=1 normal level
$ m_Out                            ! Output unit
```

References

- [1] S. Jadach, Practical guide to Monte Carlo, 1999, e-print physics/9906056, also available from <http://home.cern.ch/~jadach> (unpublished).
- [2] S. Jadach, Acta Phys. Polon. **B16**, 1007 (1985).
- [3] G. P. Lepage, J. Comput. Phys. **27**, 192 (1978).
- [4] S. Kawabata, Comp. Phys. Commun. **88**, 309 (1995).
- [5] T. Ohl, Vegas revisited: Adaptive Monte Carlo integration beyond factorization, 1998, eprint: hep-ph/9806432.
- [6] R. Kleiss and R. Pittau, Comput. Phys. Commun. **83**, 141 (1994).
- [7] S. Jadach and W. Placzek, Comput. Phys. Commun. **72**, 221 (1992).
- [8] G. I. Manankova, A. F. Tatarchenko, and F. V. Tkachev, MILXy way: How much better than VEGAS can one integrate in many dimensions?, 1995, a Contribution to AINHEP-95, Pisa, Italy, Apr 3-8, 1995 (extended version).
- [9] S. Jadach, Z. Wąs, and B. F. L. Ward, The Precision Monte Carlo Event Generator \mathcal{KK} For Two-Fermion Final States In e^+e^- Collisions, To be submitted to Computer Physics Communications, 1999, preprint DESY-99-106, CERN-TH/99-235,UTHEP-99-08-01.
- [10] S. Jadach, E. Richter-Wąs, B. F. L. Ward, and Z. Wąs, Comput. Phys. Commun. **70**, 305 (1992).