



Simulation and numerical analysis of stochastic differential systems : a review

Denis Talay

► To cite this version:

Denis Talay. Simulation and numerical analysis of stochastic differential systems : a review. [Research Report] RR-1313, INRIA. 1990, pp.51. inria-00075246

HAL Id: inria-00075246

<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00075246>

Submitted on 24 May 2006

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

IRIA

UNITÉ DE RECHERCHE
IRIA-SOPHIA ANTIPOLIS

Institut National
de Recherche
en Informatique
et en Automatique

Domaine de Voluceau
Rocquencourt
B.P.105
78153 Le Chesnay Cedex
France
Tél.: (1) 39 63 55 11

Rapports de Recherche

N° 1313

*Programme 5
Automatique, Productique,
Traitement du Signal et des Données*


SIMULATION AND NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS : A REVIEW

Denis TALAY

Octobre 1990



★ R R - 1 3 1 3 ★



SIMULATION AND NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS :A REVIEW *

(Simulation et analyse numérique de
Systèmes Différentiels Stochastiques)

Denis TALAY

INRIA
Avenue Emile Hugues
Sophia Antipolis
F-06565 Valbonne (France)

Abstract

We present methods of approximating quantities related to the solutions of stochastic differential systems, based on the simulation of time-discrete Markov chains. The motivations come from random Mechanics and the numerical integration of certain deterministic P.D.E.'s by probabilistic algorithms.

We state theoretical results concerning the rates of convergence of these methods. We give results of numerical tests, and we describe an application of this approach to an engineering problem (the study of stability of the motion of a helicopter blade).

Résumé

On présente des méthodes d'approximation de quantités liées aux solutions de systèmes différentiels stochastiques, fondées sur la simulation de chaînes de Markov à temps discret. Les motivations viennent de la Mécanique aléatoire et l'intégration numérique de certaines Equations aux Dérivées Partielles déterministes par des algorithmes probabilistes.

Nous énonçons des résultats théoriques sur la vitesse de convergence de ces méthodes. Nous donnons aussi les résultats de tests numériques, et décrivons l'application de cette approche à un problème industriel (l'étude de stabilité du mouvement d'une pale d'hélicoptère).

*This review paper has been asked by P.KREE (University Paris VI) and W.WEDIG (Karlsruhe University) for the European action "Effective Stochastic Analysis".

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Examples of applications and objectives	6
2.1	Preliminaries	6
2.2	Simulation of trajectories	8
2.3	Computation of statistics of $(X(t))$ on a finite time interval	9
2.4	Asymptotic behaviour of $(X(t))$, Lyapunov exponents	10
2.5	Computation of the stationary law	11
2.6	Remark	11
3	Discretization methods	12
3.1	Introduction to the Milshtein scheme	12
3.2	The multi-dimensional Milshtein scheme	13
3.3	Mean-square approximation and Taylor formula	13
3.4	The commutativity condition	14
4	Almost sure and pathwise approximation	16
4.1	Statement of the problems	16
4.2	Example	17
4.3	Main results	17
4.4	Numerical example	18
5	Computation of $Ef(X(t))$	20
5.1	Methodology	20
5.2	Second-order schemes	21
5.3	Two examples of efficient second-order schemes	22
5.4	Remarks	25
5.5	Numerical experiments	25
5.6	Expansion of the error	29
5.7	Romberg extrapolations	30
5.8	High order schemes	31

6	Computation of Lyapunov exponents, study of stability	32
6.1	An engineering stability problem	32
6.2	Numerical tests	33
6.3	Algorithm for the helicopter problem	35
6.4	Choice of the integration time	37
6.5	Algorithm for the wideband noise case	38
6.6	Remarks	40
6.7	Convergence rate	40
7	Computation of the invariant law	42
7.1	Position of the problem	42
7.2	Second-order schemes	42
7.3	Numerical experiments	43
8	PRESTO : a generator of Fortran programs	45
8.1	A brief presentation	45
8.2	An example of PRESTO session	45
8.3	The internal mechanism of PRESTO	46
9	Conclusion	48

1 Introduction

Let us consider a differential system in \mathbb{R}^d excited by a r -dimensional multiplicative random noise $(\xi(t, \omega))$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}X(t, \omega) = b_0(X(t, \omega)) + \sigma(X(t, \omega))\xi(t, \omega) \quad (1)$$

where $b_0(\cdot)$ is an application from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^d , $\sigma(\cdot)$ is an application from \mathbb{R}^d to the space of $d \times r$ -matrices, and ω denotes the random parameter (in the sequel, we will omit it).

The characteristics of the random noise (bandwidth, energy, law, ...) depend on the modeled physical problem.

Here we are essentially interested in the white-noise case, which is a limit case of systems with "physically realizable" random perturbations (cf. Kushner [15] e.g.) ; in the Section devoted to the computation of Lyapunov exponents, we will examine also systems with coloured noises.

The aim of this paper is to present efficient numerical methods to compute certain quantities depending on the unknown process $(X(t))$, with algorithms based on simulations on a computer of other processes.

We will try to justify this approach (at least, to explain why it may be interesting), we also will underline its limitations ; we will estimate the theoretical errors of our approximations, and we will give the results of some illustrative numerical experiments ; we will describe an application to an engineering problem (a study of stability for the motion of a helicopter blade) and, finally, we will describe PRESTO, a system of automatic generation of Fortran programs corresponding to the different problems and methods presented in the sequel.

Before going on, it must be emphasized that the numerical analysis of stochastic differential systems is at its very beginning : at our knowledge, at the present time only a few algorithms have been proposed (some of them unrealistic ...), and only a few systematic numerical investigations have been pursued. Besides, the theoretical results are not very numerous. Nevertheless, it already appears that this field is not at all a direct continuation of what has been done for the numerical solving of ordinary differential equations. For example, we will underline that **it is often unuseful and even clumsy to try to approximate the diffusion process on the space of trajectories, when one wants to compute a quantity which depends on its law** : efficient approximate processes to be simulated do not converge almost surely to the considered diffusion process.

In any case, this paper treats a very few approximation problems, and we have chosen to present only algorithms which have been studied from a theoretical **and** numerical point of view. Therefore, this paper must be read as a subjective description of the present state of a new art, and also as a hope that numerical problems which can be efficiently solved by probabilistic algorithms (in particular, coming from random mechanics or related to the

numerical integration of certain deterministic P.D.E.'s by stochastic particles methods) will justify and cause new developments. Some works in progress in these directions tend to show that the mathematical or numerical techniques developed to establish some of the results stated below may be useful also in other contexts.

2 Examples of applications and objectives

2.1 Preliminaries

For the theoretical prerequisites, we refer to the basic book of Arnold [1], or the book of Ikeda-Watanabe [14] for example. Here we will just briefly introduce some very elementary concepts, which explain the construction of the discretization schemes.

From a mathematical point of view, one must first give a sense to the limit system of systems of type (1) when $(\xi(t))$ tends to become a white noise. The right approach is provided by the stochastic integration ; as already mentioned, the limit system (in a sense we do not precise here) is a stochastic differential system in the Stratonovich sense (cf. Kushner [15]).

Let us consider r independent Wiener processes, $(W^i(t))$, i.e of gaussian processes with almost surely continuous trajectories, such that :

$$\begin{aligned} E(W^i(t)) &= 0 \\ E(W^i(s)W^j(t)) &= \delta_{ij} \inf(s, t) \end{aligned}$$

The limit system is written in the Stratonovich sense as follows :

$$dX(t) = b_0(X(t))dt + \sigma(X(t)) \circ dW(t) \quad (2)$$

equivalent to the "integral" formulation :

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t b_0(X(s))ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) \circ dW(s)$$

Almost surely, the trajectories of the Wiener process have unbounded variations on each finite time interval (this implies that they are nowhere differentiable), therefore the integral $\int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) \circ dW(s)$ cannot be defined as a Stieljes integral. Let us give indications on its construction.

A process $(Y(t))$ is said adapted to the filtration generated by the Wiener process $(W(t))$ (we will also simply say "adapted") if, for each t , $Y(t)$ is measurable w.r.t. the σ -field generated by $(W(s), s \leq t)$; in particular, $Y(t)$ is independent of all the

$$(W(t_1) - W(t), W(t_2) - W(t_1), \dots, W(t_n) - W(t_{n-1}))$$

for any n and $t < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$.

Let us consider a one-dimensional Wiener process $(B(t))$. For the class \mathcal{Q} of real continuous adapted (to the filtration generated by $(B(t))$) processes $(Y(t))$ which can be represented as $Y(t) = Y(0) + M(t) + A(t)$, where $Y(0)$ is a r.v., $(M(t))$ is a continuous locally square integrable martingale relative to the previous filtration, and $(A(t))$ is a

continuous adapted process of bounded variation on every finite time interval, one can show that for any $T > 0$, the following limit in probability exists :

$$\lim_{|\Delta| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y(t_i) + Y(t_{i-1})}{2} (B(t_i) - B(t_{i-1})) \quad (3)$$

where Δ denotes a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = T$, and $|\Delta|$ denotes $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (t_i - t_{i-1})$.

This limit is called the Stratonovich integral of $(Y(t))$ w.r.t. $(B(t))$ on $[0, T]$ and denoted $\int_0^T Y(s) \circ dB(s)$. If $(Y(t))$ is a matrix-valued process, and the Wiener process multi-dimensional, the integral is defined coordinate by coordinate.

If b_0 and σ are continuous functions such that each component is twice continuously differentiable with bounded derivatives of first and second orders, then, for each Borel probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d , there exists a process $(X(t))$ in \mathcal{Q} , satisfying (2) and such that the law of $X(0)$ coincides with μ , unique in the sense that, if $(Y(t))$ is another solution with $Y(0) = X(0)$ a.s., then, for each t , $X(t) = Y(t)$ a.s..

We will see that the discretization of a Stratonovich integral leads to some difficulties, which do not exist for another stochastic integral, the Ito stochastic integral.

To simplify, we restrict ourselves to consider those of the previous processes $(Y(t))$ which also satisfy :

$$\forall t \in \mathbb{R} \quad , \quad E \left[\int_0^t |Y(s)|^2 ds \right] < \infty$$

One can show that the following limit exists in the space of the square integrable random variables :

$$\lim_{|\Delta| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n Y(t_i) (B(t_i) - B(t_{i-1}))$$

where Δ denotes a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = t$, and $|\Delta|$ denotes $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (t_i - t_{i-1})$.

This limit is called the Ito integral of $(Y(t))$ w.r.t. $(B(t))$, and is denoted by $\int_0^t Y(s) dB(s)$. Under our hypothesis on $(Y(t))$, the process $(\int_0^t Y(s) dB(s))$ is a square integrable martingale, which is often used in the proofs of most approximation Theorems stated below.

Moreover, under the above assumptions on $b_0(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$, one can also show that the solution of the Stratonovich system (2) is the unique solution of :

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t b(X(s)) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) dW(s)$$

where, if σ_j denotes the j^{th} column of σ and $\partial \sigma_j$ the matrix whose element of the i^{th} row and k^{th} column is $\partial_k \sigma_j^i$:

$$b(\cdot) = b_0(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \partial \sigma_j(\cdot) \sigma_j(\cdot)$$

In differential notations, the previous equation is written under the form of an Ito stochastic differential system :

$$dX(t) = b(X(t))dt + \sigma(X(t))dW(t) \quad (4)$$

As a consequence of the definition of the Ito integral, it appears that the differential chain rule is different from the deterministic case : for any real function of class \mathcal{C}^2 , we have the following formula (the Ito formula) :

$$df(X(t)) = Lf(X(t))dt + \sigma(X(t))\nabla f(X(t))dW(t) \quad (5)$$

where, if the matrix a is $a = \sigma\sigma^*$, L is the following differential operator :

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^d b^i(x)\partial_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_{ij}^i(x)\partial_{ij} \quad (6)$$

Let us now briefly present the situations that we will treat.

2.2 Simulation of trajectories

We are supposed to have at our disposal exact or approximate trajectories of the Wiener process ($W(t)$), and we want to “see” corresponding approximate trajectories of ($X(t)$). As we will show later on, when the dimension of the noise is larger than 1 and only approximate trajectories of ($W(t)$) are available, this problem has a signification under a stringent condition which must be fulfilled by $\sigma(\cdot)$ and will be called in the sequel “commutativity condition” (its precise formulation will be given below).

Let us give 2 examples of situations where one may wish to get trajectories of the solution of a S.D.F.

First, let us suppose that the process ($X(t)$) depends on a parameter θ , that one wants to estimate from a unique observation of ($X(t)$) during a time interval $[0, T]$.

In order to test the quality of different estimators, one may choose a particular value for θ , simulate a few trajectories of the corresponding process ($X(t)$), and then apply the estimators on these simulated trajectories.

A less elementary example is the filtering situation, where ($X(t)$) is a non observed process solution of (2), whereas one observes realizations of a process ($Y(t)$) satisfying :

$$dY(t) = g(X(t))dt + \alpha dW(t) + \beta dV(t)$$

where ($V(t)$) is a Wiener process independent of ($W(t)$) ; one wants to get the conditional law of ($X(t)$), given the observations ($Y(s), 0 \leq s \leq t$). In the non-linear case, under some regularity assumptions on the functions b_0, σ, g , the answer is given by the so-called

Zakai equation satisfied by $p(t, x_1, \dots, x_d)$, the unnormalized density of this conditional law :

$$dq(t) = Aq(t)dt + B_0q(t)dt + B_1q(t)dt + C_0q(t) \circ dY(t) + C_1q(t) \circ dY(t)$$

where A is a second-order operator, B_1 and C_1 are first-order operators, B_0 and C_0 are zero order operators.

The previous equation is a stochastic partial differential equation. To solve it numerically. Florchinger and LeGland [11] propose the following algorithm.

Let (t_p) be a discretization of the time interval $[0, t]$, and \bar{q} be the approximate density. On each time interval, $[t_p, t_{p+1}]$, one first numerically solves the deterministic P.D.E.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}u(t) &= Au(t) \\ u(t_p) &= \bar{q}(t_p) \end{aligned}$$

and then one considers the stochastic P.D.E.

$$\begin{aligned} dv(t) &= B_0v(t)dt + B_1v(t)dt + C_0v(t) \circ dY(t) + C_1v(t) \circ dY(t) \\ v(t_p) &= u(t_{p+1}) \end{aligned}$$

Let us write the operators B_1 and C_1 under the form: $B_1 = b_1(x)\nabla$ and $C_1 = c_1(x)\nabla$.

Let $(Z(t; s, x))$ the flow associated to the stochastic differential equation :

$$dZ(t) = -b_1(Z(t))dt - c_1(Z(t)) \circ dY(t) \quad (7)$$

Then one computes the value of $v(t, x)$ at points $Z(t; t_p, z)$ according to the formula (d_1 and d_2 being appropriate functions) :

$$v(t, Z(t; t_p, z)) = v(t_p, z) \exp \left\{ \int_{t_p}^t d_1(Z(s; t_p, z))ds + \int_{t_p}^t d_2(Z(s; t_p, z)) \circ dY(s) \right\}$$

and $\bar{q}(t_{p+1})$ is given by $\bar{q}(t_{p+1}) = v(t_{p+1})$.

This procedure requires to solve (7) in a pathwise sense : one wants to get the path of $(Z(t))$ corresponding to the particular observed path of $(Y(t))$.

2.3 Computation of statistics of $(X(t))$ on a finite time interval

For example, one wants to compute the first moments of the response of the dynamical system $(X(t))$, or, more generally, $Ef(X(t))$, $f(\cdot)$ being an explicitly given function.

Another motivation is to construct Monte-Carlo methods to solve parabolic P.D.E.'s in \mathbb{R}^d

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}u(t,x) &= Lu(t,x) \\ u(0,x) &= f(x)\end{aligned}$$

in some situations where deterministic methods are not efficient : the theoretical accuracy and the numerical behaviour of the probabilistic algorithms are not affected by the possible non coercivity of the second-order elliptic differential operator L , and the computational cost grows only linearly w.r.t. the dimension d of the state space.

Therefore, these methods, as the stochastic particles methods (random vortex methods for the integration of certain non-linear P.D.E.'s in fluid mechanics e.g.) which also require the simulation of stochastic processes, can be useful in degenerate situations or when the state space is of large dimension (in random Mechanics, often $X(t)$ is a vector (position, speed), and therefore both degeneracy and a high dimensional state space occur). Other examples are the situations where $u(t,x)$ needs to be computed only at a small number of points, for example in order to separate the integration space in sub-domains where deterministic methods become efficient.

To compute $Ef(X(t))$, if we could simulate the process $(X(t))$ itself, we would simulate several independent paths of $(X(t))$, denoted by $(X(t,\omega_1), \dots, X(t,\omega_N))$ and then we would compute the average

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(X(t,\omega_i))$$

Instead of $(X(t))$, we propose to simulate another process $(\bar{X}(t))$; as we are interested in the approximation of the law of $(X(t))$, it is not necessary that $(\bar{X}(t))$ is a trajectorial approximation of $(X(t))$, and the "commutativity condition" will not be required (better, some efficient processes $(\bar{X}(t))$ in that context are not at all approximations of $(X(t))$ in the pathwise sense, and even do not converge almost surely to $(X(t))$).

2.4 Asymptotic behaviour of $(X(t))$, Lyapunov exponents

In a Section below, we will discuss in great detail an industrial problem leading to the study of a bilinear system, for which it can be shown that, $(X(t,x))$ denoting the solution of (2) with initial condition x , the almost-sure limit

$$\lambda = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |X(t,x)|$$

exists and is independent of x (it is the upper Lyapunov exponent of the system) : the problem is to determine the sign of this limit : if it is strictly negative, almost surely $(X(t))$ tends to 0 exponentially fast for any initial condition x , the system (2) is then said to be stable.

The proposed algorithm consists in simulating one particular path of a process $(\bar{X}(t))$ over a long time $[0, T]$ and in computing

$$\bar{\lambda}_T = \frac{1}{T} \log |\bar{X}(T, x)|$$

We will classify different processes $(\bar{X}(t))$ according to the following criterium : how large is

$$|\lambda - \bar{\lambda}|$$

where $\bar{\lambda}$ is the Lyapunov exponent of the process $(\bar{X}(t))$, defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda} &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\lambda}_T \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \log |\bar{X}(T, x)| \end{aligned}$$

Remark : this criterium does not take into account the error due to the necessary approximation of $\bar{\lambda}$ by $\bar{\lambda}_T$, which only depends on the choice of the integration time T . We will see that, from a practical point of view, this choice may be very difficult.

An extension of the method has been developed and analysed for non linear systems.

2.5 Computation of the stationary law

Under some conditions on the coefficients $b_0(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$, one a priori knows that the process $(X(t))$ is ergodic. Let us denote by μ its unique invariant probability law.

One may be interested in computing $\int f(x) d\mu(x)$ for a given function f (for example, in order to get the asymptotic value of $E f(X(t))$ when t goes to infinity, i.e to describe the stationary distribution of the response of the system, which often is of prime importance in random Mechanics). For reasons already underlined, the numerical solving of the stationary Fokker-Planck equation may be extremely difficult.

Here, we propose to choose T "large enough" and to compute

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(\bar{X}(s, x)) ds$$

2.6 Remark

As it has been mentioned above, it will appear that the choice of the convenient process $(\bar{X}(t))$ must be related to the final purpose of the simulation.

Our basic tool to construct this process is the time discretization of the system (4).

3 Discretization methods

3.1 Introduction to the Milshtein scheme

Let us consider the expression

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t b_0(X(s))ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) \circ dW(s)$$

From the definition (3) of the Stratonovich integral, for small t the integral $\int_0^t \sigma(X(s)) \circ dW(s)$ can be approximated by

$$\frac{1}{2}(\sigma(X(t)) + \sigma(X(0)))(W(t) - W(0))$$

and therefore this procedure would lead to an implicit discretization scheme.

According to the definition of a Ito integral, a rough approximation of $(X(t))$ (for a small t) can be :

$$X(t) \simeq b(X(0))t + \sigma(X(0))(W(t) - W(0))$$

Let h be a discretization step.

The above remark justifies the Euler scheme for (4) :

$$\bar{X}_{p+1}^h = \bar{X}_p^h + b(\bar{X}_p^h)h + \sigma(\bar{X}_p^h)(W((p+1)h) - W(ph)) \quad (8)$$

This scheme may easily be simulated on a computer : at each step p , one has just to simulate the vector $W((p+1)h) - W(ph)$, whose law is gaussian.

As we will see, nevertheless this scheme may be unsatisfying : for example, it is divergent for the pathwise approximation of $(X(t))$.

Let us introduce a new scheme, and first consider the case $d = r = 1$.

If we perform a Taylor expansion of $\sigma(X(t))$, we easily get :

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) \simeq & b(X(0))t + \sigma(X(0))(W(t) - W(0)) \\ & + \sigma(X(0))\sigma'(X(0)) \int_0^t (W(s) - W(0))dW(s) \end{aligned}$$

At a first glance, the situation is more complex than previously, because of the presence of the stochastic integral $\int_0^t (W(s) - W(0))dW(s)$. But the Ito formula shows :

$$\int_0^t (W(s) - W(0))dW(s) = \frac{1}{2}(W(t)^2 - t)$$

Then, again only gaussian laws are involved in the previous scheme, due to Milshtein [19] who introduced it in 1974 for the mean-square approximation of $(X(t))$.

3.2 The multi-dimensional Milshtein scheme

Let us now examine the general case.

Let us introduce a notation :

$$\Delta_{p+1}^h W = W((p+1)h) - W(ph)$$

The same procedure as before leads to the multi-dimensional Milshtein scheme :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= \bar{X}_p^h + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \Delta_{p+1}^h W^j + b(\bar{X}_p^h)h \\ &+ \sum_{j,k=1}^r \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h) \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph)) dW^j(s) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Now, the situation is really complex, because of the presence of the multiple stochastic integrals $\int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph)) dW^j(s)$: these integrals do not depend continuously on the trajectories of $(W(t))$ (therefore are annoying for the trajectorial approximation), and the conjoint law of these integrals and the increments $\Delta_{p+1}^h W$ seems difficult to simulate : in particular, it cannot be seen as the law of a simple transformation of a gaussian vector.

How to get rid of this difficulty is one of the main features of the numerical analysis of stochastic differential systems.

3.3 Mean-square approximation and Taylor formula

Milshtein [19] proved the following result :

Theorem 3.1 *Let us suppose that the functions b and σ are of class \mathcal{C}^2 , with bounded derivatives of first and second orders.*

Then the Euler scheme satisfies : for any integration time T , there exists a positive constant $C(T)$ such that, for any step-size h of type $\frac{T}{n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\left[E |X(T) - \bar{X}_n^h|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(T) \sqrt{h}$$

For the Milshtein scheme, we can substitute the following bound for the error :

$$\left[E |X(T) - \bar{X}_n^h|^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(T)h$$

It can be shown that the Milshtein scheme is not ‘‘asymptotically efficient’’ in the sense that the leading coefficient in the expansion of the mean square error as power series in h is not the smallest possible. Clark [7] and Newton ([22], [23] and [24]) have introduced

new schemes which are asymptotically efficient ; these schemes may be seen as versions of the Milshtein scheme with additional terms of order $h\Delta_{p+1}^h W$ and $(\Delta_{p+1}^h W)^3$ (when the Wiener process is scalar). In the two last references, efficient schemes based upon first passage times of the Wiener samples through given points, and efficient Runge-Kutta schemes are presented.

Another question concerns the order of convergence.

Let us say that a random variable is of order k if its variance is equal to $Constant \times h^{2k}$.

The Milshtein scheme involves only random variables of order less than 1.

To get a better rate of convergence in the mean-square sense than this scheme, one must involve multiple stochastic integrals of order strictly larger than 1, for example :

$$\int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph))(W^l(s) - W^l(ph))dW^j(s) ,$$

$$\int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (s - ph)dW^j(s) , \quad \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph))ds$$

in order to get an error of order $h^{\frac{3}{2}}$.

The coefficients of these integrals in the schemes are given by a Taylor formula (see Platen & Wagner [30]).

Of course, most of these integrals, as those involved in the multi-dimensional Milshtein scheme, have probability laws which seem difficult to simulate. Therefore, in the general case, the Euler scheme is the only efficient scheme for the mean-square approximation.

Nevertheless, there exists a situation where the multi-dimensional Milshtein scheme involves only the increments of the Wiener process $\Delta_{p+1}^h W$.

3.4 The commutativity condition

Let us suppose that the column vectors of the matrix σ satisfy the following condition :

$$\forall j, \forall k : \partial\sigma_j(\cdot)\sigma_k(\cdot) = \partial\sigma_k(\cdot)\sigma_j(\cdot) \quad (10)$$

That condition expresses the commutativity of the vector fields defined by the column vectors of σ .

It is obviously satisfied when the noise is one-dimensional, or when the function σ is constant.

The Ito formula and this hypothesis imply :

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial\sigma_k(\cdot)\sigma_j(\cdot) \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph))dW^j(s) + \partial\sigma_j(\cdot)\sigma_k(\cdot) \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^j(s) - W^j(ph))dW^k(s) \\ &= \partial\sigma_k(\cdot)\sigma_j(\cdot)(W^k((p+1)h) - W^k(ph))(W^j((p+1)h) - W^j(ph)) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and therefore the Milshtein scheme may be written again :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= \bar{X}_p^h + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \Delta_{p+1}^h W^j + b(\bar{X}_p^h) h \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=2}^r \sum_{j < k} \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h) \Delta_{p+1}^h W^j \Delta_{p+1}^h W^k \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \left[(\Delta_{p+1}^h W^j)^2 - h \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

A very nice result due to Clark & Cameron [6] shows that, under the commutativity condition, the Milshtein scheme leads to the best possible rate of convergence for the mean-square approximation (i.e h) among all the discretization schemes involving only values of the process ($W(t)$) at times ($ph, 0 \leq p \leq n = \frac{T}{h}$).

4 Almost sure and pathwise approximation

4.1 Statement of the problems

First, let us suppose that we observe or simulate increments of the Wiener process during time intervals of length h ; then we construct a continuous time process $(\bar{X}(t))$ by using the Euler scheme and interpolating linearly between the times ph . Does this process converge almost surely to $(X(t))$ on finite time intervals when h goes to 0 ?

Second, let us now suppose that we dispose of a deterministic function $t \rightarrow u(t)$ which approximates a given trajectory of $(W(t))$ in the sense of the topology of uniform convergence on the space of continuous functions on $[0, T]$.

We hope to get an approximation of the trajectory of $(X(t))$ on $[0, T]$ corresponding to this particular trajectory of $(W(t))$.

To give a sense to this new problem, a natural condition is that there exists a continuous mapping F from $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^r)$ ¹ to $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^r)$ such that $X(t) = F(X(0), W)(t)$, a.s.

A result due to MacShane [18], Doss [8] and Sussman [32] shows that this mapping exists if the above “commutativity condition” is satisfied.

Now, the question is to build a scheme defined by functionals ϕ_p^h on the space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{C}([0, ph])$:

$$\bar{X}_0^h = X(0) \quad , \quad \bar{X}_{p+1}^{h,u} = \phi_p^h(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}, (u(t), 0 \leq t \leq ph))$$

such that : for any entry $(u(t))$ belonging to a large set of functions (including the trajectories of $(W(t))$ and their reasonable approximations), if $x_u(t)$ denotes $F(X(0), u)(t)$, and if $t \rightarrow \bar{X}_u^h(t)$ is the function defined by :

$$\bar{X}_u^h(t) = \bar{X}_p^{h,u} \quad , \quad ph \leq t < (p+1)h$$

then

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |x_u(t) - \bar{X}_u^h(t)| = 0$$

If the previous requirement is satisfied, we will say that the scheme converges in the pathwise (or trajectorial) sense. This is a property of robustness of the scheme on the space of trajectories.

¹ $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{R}^r)$ denotes the set of continuous functions f from \mathbb{R}_+ to \mathbb{R}^d such that $f(0) = 0$.

4.2 Example

Let $(B(t))$ be a one-dimensional Wiener process. From the Ito formula (5), the process

$$X(t) = \exp(t + B(t))$$

solves the one-dimensional stochastic differential system :

$$dX(t) = \frac{3}{2}X(t)dt + X(t)dB(t)$$

It is easy to see that the Euler scheme (8) converges almost surely, and converges in the above pathwise sense only if the function $(u(t))$ has the same quadratic variation as the trajectories of the Wiener process.

The situation is different with the Milshtein scheme.

4.3 Main results

For the almost sure convergence problem of the Euler problem, a first result appears in Newton ([22] and [24]). More precise statements appear in Faure ([9] and [10]), for example :

Theorem 4.2 *Let us suppose that the coefficients $b(\cdot)$ and $\sigma(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz.*

(i) *If, for some integer $K > 1$, the initial condition X_0 verifies $E|X_0|^{2K} < \infty$, then the interpolated Euler scheme with step-size $\frac{T}{n}$, $(\bar{X}^h(t))$ converges almost surely to $(X(t))$ on $[0, T]$ when N goes to infinity.*

(ii) *If the initial condition has moments of any order, then the order of convergence is given by :*

$$\forall \alpha < \frac{1}{2} \quad , \quad n^\alpha \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X(t) - \bar{X}(t)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} 0 \quad , \quad a.s.$$

Let us now turn to the trajectorial problem.

In the multidimensional case, the remarkable point is that the commutativity condition, which is necessary to have a well-posed problem, is also sufficient to make the Milshtein scheme (9) depend only on the values of $(W(t))$ at the discretization points (formula (11)). This leads us to introduce the trajectorial Milshtein scheme defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_{p+1}^{h,u} &= \bar{X}_p^{h,u} + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) \Delta_{p+1}^h u^j + b(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) h \\ &+ \sum_{k=2}^r \sum_{j < k} \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) \sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) \Delta_{p+1}^h u^k \Delta_{p+1}^h u^j \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) \sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^{h,u}) \left[(\Delta_{p+1}^h u^j)^2 - h \right] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In Talay [33] the following result is proved :

Theorem 4.3 *Let us suppose that b and σ are bounded, of class \mathcal{C}^3 with bounded derivatives up to the order 3, and that the function $(u(t))$ satisfies :*

$$\lim_{|\Delta| \rightarrow 0} \sum_i |u(t_i) - u(t_{i-1})|^3 = 0 \quad (14)$$

where Δ denotes a partition $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m = t$, and $|\Delta|$ denotes $\max_{1 \leq i \leq m} (t_i - t_{i-1})$.

Then, if $(\bar{X}_u^h(t))$ is defined as in the previous section, under the commutativity condition :

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |x_u(t) - \bar{X}_u^h(t)| = 0 \quad (15)$$

Remarks

- The condition (14) is satisfied by the paths of the Wiener process, but also by a much larger class of functions (for example, the differentiable functions).
- The proof of Theorem (4.3) is based on an analytical expression of the mapping F .
- It is also shown that the Milshtein scheme has the best possible rate of convergence for the criterium (15).
- The commutativity condition is a strong limitation to the trajectorial approximation of the solution of an Ito differential system. But, in some sense, this problem forgets the fact that $(X(t))$ is a stochastic process, whose statistics may be more interesting than some particular paths. We will not need this condition to approximate quantities depending on the law of $(X(t))$.

4.4 Numerical example

The following numerical test illustrates the divergent behaviour of the Euler scheme for the pathwise approximation.

Let $(X(t))$ the 2-dimensional process defined by :

$$X(t) = (\sin(W(t)), \cos(W(t)))$$

where $(W(t))$ is a one-dimensional Wiener process.

This process solves a system with the function $b(x_1, x_2)$ defined by :



$$\begin{aligned} b^1 &= -\frac{x^1}{2} \\ b^2 &= -\frac{x^2}{2} \end{aligned}$$

and the matrix σ is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{11} &= x^2 \\ \sigma_{21} &= -x^1\end{aligned}$$

We have simulated a trajectory of $(W(t))$, and a perturbation of it : we have simulated a second brownian trajectory (denoted by $t \rightarrow V(t)$), and, for each t , we have added $\epsilon V(t)$ to $W(t)$.

The first figure shows the "exact" path of $(X(t))$ corresponding to the simulated path of $(W(t))$. The second figure compares the evolution in time, of the errors due to the Milshtein scheme (thick line) and the Euler scheme (thin line), corresponding to $\epsilon = 0.001$ and $h = 0.001$.



5 Computation of $Ef(X(t))$

5.1 Methodology

Now, we are interested in the approximation of $Ef(X(t))$ on a fixed finite time interval $[0, T]$.

Suppose that the coefficients b and σ are smooth enough, and that the operator L (6) is hypoelliptic ; if the law of the initial condition $X(0)$ has a density $p_0(\cdot)$, then for any $t > 0$ the law of $X(t)$ has a density $p(t, \cdot)$ solution of the Fokker-Planck equation :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}p(t, x) &= L^*p(t, x) \\ p(0, x) &= p_0(x)\end{aligned}$$

where L^* is the adjoint of the differential operator (6) (see [14] e.g.).

Thus a first way to compute $Ef(X(t))$ consists in integrating the previous P.D.E. But the numerical solving of this P.D.E. can be difficult, for example when the dimension d of the process ($X(t)$) is very large, or when the differential operator L is degenerate (it very often is the case in problems coming from Mechanics, in particular each time ($X(t)$) is a vector (position, velocity)).

A second way is to use a Monte-Carlo method. Let us begin by choosing the Euler scheme (8), and let us simulate (if possible, in parallel) a large number N of independent realizations of the gaussian sequence $(\Delta_{p+1}^h W, p \in \mathbb{N})$. Then, for each discretization step, we get N independent realizations of \bar{X}_p^h , denoted by $\bar{X}_p^h(\omega_i)$, and we can compute

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(\bar{X}_p^h(\omega_i)) \quad (16)$$

By the strong law of large numbers, this gives us an approximate value of $Ef(\bar{X}_p^h)$. The quality of this approximation depends only on the choice of N .

It remains to estimate the error $|Ef(X(ph)) - Ef(\bar{X}_p^h)|$. It can be shown that, under some smoothness assumptions on b, σ , if the law of $X(0)$ has moments of any order, then, for any time T , there exists a positive constant $C(T)$ such that, for any discretization step h of type $h = \frac{T}{n}, n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$|Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h)| \leq C(T)h$$

It can be also shown that, even under the commutativity condition, the Milshtein scheme has the same rate of convergence.

This is illustrated by the following example : choose $d = r = 1, b(x) = \frac{1}{2}x, \sigma(x) = x$ and $f(x) = x^4$. Then, for the Euler or Milshtein scheme, there exist constants C_1, C_2 such that :

$$|Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h)| = C_1 T \exp(C_2 T)h + O(h^2)$$

Therefore, the Milshtein scheme which is “optimal” in the mean-square sense and in the trajectorial sense is so poor as the Euler scheme for an approximation of the law of $(X(t))$.

Now, we are going to construct second-order schemes.

5.2 Second-order schemes

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of numerical functions of \mathbb{R}^d , of class C^6 , such that f and its partial derivatives up to order 6 have a growth at most polynomial at infinity.

A scheme will be said of second-order if it satisfies for any system with smooth coefficients b, σ with bounded derivatives of any order : for any function f in \mathcal{P} , for any time T , there exists a positive constant $C(T)$ such that, for any discretization step h of type $h = \frac{T}{n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$|Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h)| \leq C(T)h^2 \quad (17)$$

Let \mathcal{F}_p be the σ -algebra generated by $(\bar{X}_0^h, \dots, \bar{X}_p^h)$.

In Talay [35], it is shown that a sufficient condition for a scheme to satisfy (17) is the set of hypotheses (C1), (C2), (C3) :

(C1) $\bar{X}_0^h = X(0)$

(C2) $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \exists C > 0, \forall p \leq N, E|\bar{X}_p^h|^n \leq C$

(C3) the following properties are satisfied for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, where all the right-side terms of the equalities must be understood evaluated at \bar{X}_p^h :

$$\begin{aligned} E\left(\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X} | \mathcal{F}_p\right) &= bh + \frac{1}{2}(Lb)h^2 + \xi_{p+1}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}| \leq Ch^3 \\ E\left((\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_1} (\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_2} | \mathcal{F}_p\right) &= \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} h + (b^{i_1} b^{i_2} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_{k_1} \sigma_j^{i_1} \partial_{k_2} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_l^{k_1} \sigma_l^{k_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \partial_k b^{i_2} \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^k + \frac{1}{2} \partial_k b^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_j^k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_j^{i_1} \partial_k \sigma_j^{i_2} b^k + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_j^{i_2} \partial_k \sigma_j^{i_1} b^k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \sigma_j^{i_1} \partial_{kl} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_n^k \sigma_n^l + \frac{1}{4} \sigma_j^{i_2} \partial_{kl} \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_n^k \sigma_n^l) h^2 \\ &\quad + \xi_{p+1}^{i_1 i_2}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}^{i_1 i_2}| \leq Ch^3 \\ E\left((\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_1} \dots (\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_3} | \mathcal{F}_p\right) &= (b^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_j^{i_3} + b^{i_2} \sigma_j^{i_3} \sigma_j^{i_1} + b^{i_3} \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_2} \partial_k \sigma_l^{i_3} \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^k + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_3} \partial_k \sigma_l^{i_2} \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_3} \partial_k \sigma_l^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_j^k + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_1} \partial_k \sigma_l^{i_3} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_j^k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_1} \partial_k \sigma_l^{i_2} \sigma_j^{i_3} \sigma_j^k + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_l^{i_2} \partial_k \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_3} \sigma_j^k) h^2 \\
& + \xi_{p+1}^{i_1 i_2 i_3}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}^{i_1 i_2 i_3}| \leq Ch^3 \\
E\left((\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_1} \dots (\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_4} \middle| \mathcal{F}_p\right) & = (\sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_2} \sigma_l^{i_3} \sigma_l^{i_4} + \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_3} \sigma_l^{i_2} \sigma_l^{i_4} + \sigma_j^{i_1} \sigma_j^{i_4} \sigma_l^{i_2} \sigma_l^{i_3}) h^2 \\
& + \xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_4}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_4}| \leq Ch^3 \\
E\left((\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_1} \dots (\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_5} \middle| \mathcal{F}_p\right) & = \xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_5}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_5}| \leq Ch^3 \\
E\left((\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_1} \dots (\Delta_{p+1}^h \bar{X})^{i_6} \middle| \mathcal{F}_p\right) & = \xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_6}, \quad E|\xi_{p+1}^{i_1 \dots i_6}| \leq Ch^3
\end{aligned}$$

An interesting fact happens.

To satisfy the condition (C3), a scheme does not need to involve any stochastic integral (even $\Delta_{p+1}^h W = \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} dW(s)$!). Very simple random variables may be used, the only requirement is that the law of these random variables must have the same small number of statistics (for example, the same expectation vector, the same correlation matrix, and so on) as a certain finite family of stochastic integrals. Let us see 2 examples.

5.3 Two examples of efficient second-order schemes

Let us introduce the random variables that will be involved in our schemes.

- the sequence

$$(U_{p+1}^j, \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kj}, j, k = 1, \dots, r; p \in \mathbb{N})$$

will be a family of independent random variables ; the (U_{p+1}^j) are i.i.d. and must satisfy the following conditions :

$$E[U_{p+1}^j] = E[U_{p+1}^j]^3 = E[U_{p+1}^j]^5 = 0 \quad (18)$$

$$E[U_{p+1}^j]^2 = 1 \quad (19)$$

$$E[U_{p+1}^j]^4 = 3 \quad (20)$$

$$E[U_{p+1}^j]^6 < +\infty \quad (21)$$

the (\tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kj}) are i.i.d., their common law being defined by :

$$P(\tilde{U}_p^{kj} = \frac{1}{2}) = P(\tilde{U}_p^{kj} = -\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$$

For example, one could choose :

$$U_{p+1}^j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \Delta_{p+1}^h W^j$$

but also one could choose for U_{p+1}^j the discrete law of mass $\frac{2}{3}$ at 0 and of mass $\frac{1}{6}$ at the points $+\sqrt{3}$ and $-\sqrt{3}$;

- the family (Z_p^{kj}) is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{2} U_{p+1}^k U_{p+1}^j + \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kj} \quad , \quad k < j \\ Z_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{2} U_{p+1}^k U_{p+1}^j - \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{jk} \quad , \quad k > j \\ Z_{p+1}^{jj} &= \frac{1}{2} \left((U_{p+1}^j)^2 - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, a being $a = \sigma\sigma^*$, we define the vectors A_j by :

$$\begin{aligned} A_j &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d a_l^k \partial_{kl} \sigma_j \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d a_l^k \partial_{kl} \sigma_j \end{aligned}$$

We recall that we denote by L the infinitesimal generator of the process $(X(t))$:

$$L = \sum_{i=1}^d b^i(x) \partial_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_j^i(x) \partial_{ij}$$

We consider the scheme defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= \bar{X}_p^h + \sum_{j=1}^r \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) U_{p+1}^j \sqrt{h} + b(\bar{X}_p^h) h + \sum_{j,k=1}^r \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h) Z_{p+1}^{kj} h \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \left\{ \partial b(\bar{X}_p^h) \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) + \partial \sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h) b(\bar{X}_p^h) + A_j(\bar{X}_p^h) \right\} U_{p+1}^j h^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} L b(\bar{X}_p^h) h^2 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

It has been shown that this scheme is of second order (see Talay [34] or [35], Milshtein [21]). The Taylor formula given in Platen & Wagner [30] helps to understand how it has been constructed.

Another example of second-order scheme is the following ‘‘MCRK’’ scheme of Talay [35], which is of Runge-Kutta type, and therefore may be more interesting than the previous scheme from a numerical point of view, since most derivatives of the coefficients are avoided.

We define the new family

$$(V_{p+1}^j, \tilde{V}_{p+1}^{kj}, j, k = 1, \dots, r; p \in \mathbb{N})$$

so that the family

$$(U_{p+1}^j, \tilde{V}_{p+1}^j, \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kl}, \tilde{V}_{p+1}^{mn})_{j,k,l,m,n,p}$$

is a sequence of independent variables, the V_{p+1}^j 's having the same distribution as the U_{p+1}^j 's, and the \tilde{V}_{p+1}^{mn} 's having the same distribution as the \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kl} 's.

Now we define (S_p^{kj}) , (T_p^{kj}) and (Z_p^{kj}) by :

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{4}(U_{p+1}^k U_{p+1}^j + \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{kj}) \quad , \quad k < j \\
S_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{4}(U_{p+1}^k U_{p+1}^j - \tilde{U}_{p+1}^{jk}) \quad , \quad k > j \\
S_{p+1}^{jj} &= \frac{1}{4}((U_{p+1}^j)^2 - 1) \\
T_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{4}(V_{p+1}^k V_{p+1}^j + \tilde{V}_{p+1}^{kj}) \quad , \quad k < j \\
T_{p+1}^{kj} &= \frac{1}{4}(V_{p+1}^k V_{p+1}^j - \tilde{V}_{p+1}^{jk}) \quad , \quad k > j \\
T_{p+1}^{jj} &= \frac{1}{4}((V_{p+1}^j)^2 - 1) \\
Z_{p+1}^{kj} &= S_{p+1}^{kj} + T_{p+1}^{kj} + \frac{1}{2}U_{p+1}^k V_{p+1}^j \quad , \quad k \neq j \\
Z_{p+1}^{jj} &= \frac{1}{4}((U_{p+1}^j + V_{p+1}^j)^2 - 2)
\end{aligned}$$

The MCRK scheme proceeds in 2 steps.

From \bar{X}_p^h , one first computes :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_{p+\frac{1}{2}}^h &= \bar{X}_p^h + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\sigma(\bar{X}_p^h)U_{p+1}^j\sqrt{h} + \frac{1}{2}b(\bar{X}_p^h)h \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k=1}^r \partial\sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h)\sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h)S_{p+1}^{kj}h
\end{aligned}$$

Then the new value \bar{X}_{p+1}^h is obtained according to the formula :

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= \bar{X}_p^h + \left[\sigma(\bar{X}_p^h)U_{p+1} + \sigma(\bar{X}_{p+\frac{1}{2}}^h)V_{p+1} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma(\bar{X}_p^h)(U_{p+1} + V_{p+1}) \right] \sqrt{2h} \\
&\quad + b(\bar{X}_{p+\frac{1}{2}}^h)h \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k=1}^r \left[2\partial\sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h)\sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h)S_{p+1}^{kj}h + 2\partial\sigma_j(\bar{X}_{p+\frac{1}{2}}^h)\sigma_k(\bar{X}_{p+\frac{1}{2}}^h)T_{p+1}^{kj}h \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \partial\sigma_j(\bar{X}_p^h)\sigma_k(\bar{X}_p^h)Z_{p+1}^{kj}h \right] \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

Other examples of Runge-Kutta schemes are studied, for the quadratic mean error, in Rumelin [31] and in Newton [24].

5.4 Remarks

- The law of the family $(\sqrt{h}U_{p+1}^j, hS_p^{kj}, hT_p^{kj}, hZ_p^{kl})$ can be chosen in various ways. A precise formulation of families such that the above schemes are of second order is given by the notion of "Monte-Carlo equivalence" in Talay [35]. The idea is that the law of the family must only have a small number of properties ; in particular, these properties imply that the expectation vector and the correlation matrix of

$$(\sqrt{h}U_{p+1}^j, hS_p^{kj})$$

and

$$\left(\Delta_{p+1}^h W^j, \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} (W^k(s) - W^k(ph)) dW^j(s) \right)$$

differ only by terms of order h^3 .

- As already mentioned, the above schemes may diverge for the almost sure and pathwise approximations (even under the commutativity condition), in particular if one chooses for the U_{p+1}^j 's a discrete law.
- The choice of the number of the independent realizations to simulate in order to perform the Monte-Carlo computation depends on the wished accuracy. In practice, one may first roughly estimate the maximal value of the variance of $f(\bar{X}_p^h)$ on the considered time interval, simulating a small number N_0 of sample paths of (\bar{X}_p^h) ; then, one chooses N according to the central-limit theorem, and finally simulates $N - N_0$ other samples to approximate $E[f(\bar{X}_p^h)]$ with a better accuracy.

Of course, this is the critical point of the procedure : the Monte-Carlo algorithms converge slowly, and in practice N must be large (especially as very often the variance of $f(X(t))$ increases with t). If a particular discretization method permits to obtain a variance reduction remains an open question.

5.5 Numerical experiments

We will see that the numerical performances of the above different schemes may be extremely surprizing : the Euler scheme may be more efficient than second-order schemes (as for the ordinary differential equations, this will be explained by an expansion of the discretization error as a power series with respect to the discretization step).

First, let us consider an example where the second-order schemes are much better than the Euler and Milshtein schemes.

The processes $(X(t))$ and $(W(t))$ are one-dimensional, and $X(t) = \text{atan}(Z(t))$, where $(Z(t))$ is a stationary $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process solution of



$$dZ(t) = -Z(t)dt + \sqrt{2}dW(t)$$

so that $(X(t))$ solves a stochastic differential equation whose coefficients are :

$$b(x) = -\frac{1}{4} \sin(4x) - \sin(2x) \quad , \quad \sigma(x) = \sqrt{2} \cos^2(x)$$

We compute $E(\cosh(1.3X(t) + 2)) \sim 5.36168895$.

The first figure compares the evolution in time of the errors due to the Euler scheme (thin line) and the second-order scheme (22) (thick line). The second figure compares the evolution in time of the errors due to the Milshtein scheme (thin line) and the second-order scheme (22) (thick line) :



But, in the next example, a strange fact occurs : the Euler scheme gives as good results as the second-order schemes, whereas the Milshtein scheme may give very bad results.

The function $b(\cdot)$ is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} b^1 &= (3\sqrt{2}x^1 + 6\sqrt{2}x^2 - 2\sin(\Omega t)\Omega x^1 - 12x^1 - 6x^2)/(4(\cos(\Omega t) + 2)) \\ b^2 &= (3\sqrt{2}x^2 + 6\sqrt{2}x^1 - 2\sin(\Omega t)\Omega x^2 - 12x^2 - 6x^1)/(4(\cos(\Omega t) + 2)) \end{aligned}$$

and the matrix σ is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1^1 &= \sin(\nu(x^1 + x^2)) \\ \sigma_1^2 &= \cos(\nu(x^1 + x^2)) \\ \sigma_2^1 &= \sin\left(\frac{\pi + 3\nu x^1 + 3\nu x^2}{3}\right) \\ \sigma_2^2 &= \cos\left(\frac{\pi + 3\nu x^1 + 3\nu x^2}{3}\right) \end{aligned}$$


One may check that, if the initial law is gaussian with zero mean and covariance matrix equal to

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2}/2 \\ \sqrt{2}/2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$


then the law of $X(t)$ is also gaussian with zero mean and covariance matrix equal to $\frac{2+\cos(\Omega t)}{3}C$.

Let us fix $\nu = 2$, $\Omega = 5$, and the number of simulations $N = 10,000$.


The first figure shows the time evolution of the true value (thick line) of $E|X^1(t)|^2$ and of the approximate value corresponding to the Euler scheme (thin line) : the approximation error is weak.



The second figure compares the time evolution of the errors due to the Euler scheme (thin line) and the second-order scheme (22) (thick line) : these errors are similar.



Now, let us compare the time evolution of the errors due to the Euler scheme (thin line) and the Milshtein scheme (thick line). These 2 schemes have identical theoretical convergence rates, but, in that particular situation, the Milshtein scheme leads to absurd results.



Numerical trials have shown that this bad behaviour of the Milshtein scheme is not avoided by an (even large) increase of the number of simulations. The only remedy is a choice of a smaller discretization step. One also observes that the Milshtein scheme has a better behaviour for small ν . Let us explain why, and present a new algorithm.

5.6 Expansion of the error

The following Theorem (Talay & Tubaro [39]) explains the numerical results of the previous Section.

Theorem 5.4 *Let us suppose that the functions $b(\cdot)$, $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ are C^∞ ; the derivatives of all orders of b and σ are supposed bounded, those of f are supposed to have a growth at most polynomial at infinity.*

Then, for any step-size h of the form $\frac{T}{n}$:

(i) For the Euler scheme, the error at time T is given by :

$$Err_\epsilon(T, h) = Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h) = -h \int_0^T E\psi_\epsilon(s, X_s) ds + \mathcal{O}(h^2) \quad (24)$$

where, if $u(t, x) := Ef(X(t, x))$:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\epsilon(t, x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d b^i(t, x) b^j(t, x) \partial_{i,j} u(t, x) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k=1}^d b^i(t, x) a_k^j(t, x) \partial_{i,j,k} u(t, x) \\ &+ \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^d a_j^i(t, x) a_l^k(t, x) \partial_{i,j,k,l} u(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} u(t, x) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^d b^i(t, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \partial_i u(t, x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a_j^i(t, x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \partial_{i,j} u(t, x) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

(ii) The same result extends to the Milsthein scheme :

$$Err_m(T, h) = -h \int_0^T E\psi_m(s, X_s) ds + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

where $\psi_m(\cdot)$ is defined by :

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_m(t, x) &= \psi_\epsilon(t, x) + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i_1, i_2, j, k, l} a_k^l(t, x) \partial_l \sigma_j^{i_1}(t, x) \partial_k \sigma_j^{i_2}(t, x) \partial_{i_1, i_2} u(t, x) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i_1, i_2, i_3 \\ j_1, j_2, k}} \sigma_{j_1}^{i_1}(t, x) \sigma_{j_2}^{i_2}(t, x) \sigma_{j_1}^k(t, x) \partial_k \sigma_{j_2}^{i_3}(t, x) \partial_{i_1, i_2, i_3} u(t, x) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

(iii) The same result also extends to the schemes (22) and MCRK; besides, for these 2 schemes, as well as for the Euler and Milsthein schemes, an expansion of the error as power series in h exists: for any integer n , there exist constants C_1, \dots, C_n independent of h (but depending on the scheme) such that :

$$Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h) = C_1 h + C_2 h^2 + \dots + C_n h^n + \mathcal{O}(h^{n+1})$$

For the above example, tedious computations show (cf [39]) that the difference between the Euler and Milshtein schemes behaves (for large T) like

$$\frac{\nu^2}{2}(2 + \cos(\Omega T))h$$

5.7 Romberg extrapolations

An interesting consequence of the previous Theorem is the justification of a Romberg extrapolation between values corresponding to two different step-sizes. More precisely, let us consider a scheme such that ($h = \frac{T}{n}$) :

$$Err(T, h) = Ef(X(T)) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h) = e_1(T)h + \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

and consider the following new approximation (the Romberg extrapolation)


$$Z_T^h = 2Ef(\bar{X}_{2n}^{h/2}) - Ef(\bar{X}_n^h) \quad (27)$$

then :

$$Ef(X_T) - Z_T^h = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$$

That is, it is possible to get a result of precision of order h^2 from results given by a first-order scheme .

This procedure seems to be very robust w.r.t the choice of the discretization step. Let us give an illustration of this remark : let us compare the time evolution of the errors due to the extrapolation based on the Milshtein scheme with the 2 step-sizes $h = 0.05$ and $h = 0.1$ (thick line), and to the Milshtein scheme itself with the step-size $h = 0.05$ (thin line) : the extrapolation has extremely improved the accuracy.



5.8 High order schemes

Of course, theoretically, it is even possible to construct schemes with a convergence rate of arbitrary order, or to get a precision of arbitrary order by adequate linear combinations of results corresponding to a given scheme (Euler, MCRK, etc) run with numerous enough different step-sizes.

We are not sure that high order procedures can be useful. Generally, it is not possible to choose a step-size too large without losing too much information on the law of the increments of $(X(t))$. For small values of h (0.05 for example), it is difficult to see the gain in accuracy due to a 3rd order method, compared to a 2nd order one : the error due to the approximation of $Ef(\bar{X}_p^h)$ by the average (16) cannot be reduced enough (one cannot choose N so large as we would like !). Besides, the coefficients C_i in the expansion of the error depend on the successive derivatives of $b(\cdot)$, $\sigma(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$. Often, C_i is rapidly increasing w.r.t. i .

6 Computation of Lyapunov exponents, study of stability

A summary of the Theory of Lyapunov exponents of dynamical stochastic systems can be found in Arnold [2] ; for bilinear systems, complements can be found in Pardoux & Talay [27].

To compute the upper Lyapunov exponent of 2-dimensional bilinear systems, W. Wedig [40] proposes an ingenious deterministic algorithm.

This section is a summary of results concerning the approximation of Lyapunov exponents of (non necessary 2-dimensional) bilinear stochastic differential systems and the application to a helicopter blade problem, based on simulations and presented in Talay [37].

To be complete, we just mention that an algorithm of computation of the Lyapunov spectrum for non linear systems in \mathbb{R}^d or on compact manifolds has been developed, and its convergence rate given (see Grorud & Talay [13]).

6.1 An engineering stability problem

Let us study the stability of the motion of the movement of a rotor blade with 2 freedom degrees in terms of various physical parameters : velocity of the helicopter, geometric characteristics of the blade, statistical characteristics of the process modelizing the turbulency around the blade.

In first approximation, the stability of the movement of the blade is equivalent to the stability of the solution of a linearized ordinary differential equation in \mathbb{R}^4

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = A(t)X(t) + F(t)$$

where the matrix-valued function $A(t)$ and the vector-valued function $F(t)$ are periodic of same period (the period of rotation of the blade).

When one takes into account the turbulent flow around the blade, one may consider the following linearized model

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = A(t)X(t) + F(t) + [B(t)X(t) + G(t)]\sigma(t)\xi^\epsilon(t) \quad (28)$$

where $b(t)$ (resp. $G(t)$) has the same property as $A(t)$ (resp. $F(t)$), and $(\xi^\epsilon(t))$ is a one-dimensional noise. The intensity of the noise, $\sigma(t)$ is also a periodic function of the azimuth angle Ωt , where Ω is the angular velocity of the blade.

All the coefficients $A(t)$, $b(t)$, $F(t)$, $G(t)$ are explicitly known in terms of different physical parameters of the blade.

Here the “stability” we are interested in, is the following : the system is stable when it admits a unique periodic in law solution ($Y(t)$) and when, for each initial deterministic condition, the corresponding process ($X(t)$) satisfies :

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |Y(t) - X(t)| = 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (29)$$

First we will consider the white-noise case. The system (28) becomes :

$$dX(t) = [A(t)X(t) + F(t)]dt + [B(t)X(t) + G(t)]\sigma(t) \circ dW(t) \quad (30)$$

where ($W(t)$) is a standard one-dimensional Wiener process.

One can show (cf Pardoux[25]) :

Theorem 6.5 *Let us suppose there exists $\lambda_0 < 0$ such that the solution of the system*

$$dX(t) = A(t)X(t)dt + B(t)X(t)\sigma(t) \circ dW(t) \quad (31)$$

satisfies, for any deterministic initial condition x :

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |X(t)| \leq \lambda_0 \text{ a.s} \quad (32)$$

Then the system (30) is stable in the sense (29).

In her thesis, Maryse Pignol ([28]) has proved the existence of the Lyapunov exponent $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |X(t)|$ for the blade system. Let us see how we could compute it (in order to know its sign !).

6.2 Numerical tests

Let us consider an example of Baxendale for which there exists an explicit formula giving the Lyapunov exponent. More precisely, let us consider a one-dimensional Wiener process ($W(t)$) and the system :

$$dX(t) = AX(t)dt + \sigma BX(t) \circ dW(t) \quad (33)$$

with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Then :

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(a + b) + \frac{1}{2}(a - b) \frac{\int_0^{2\pi} \cos(2\theta) \exp(\frac{a-b}{2\sigma^2} \cos(2\theta)) d\theta}{\int_0^{2\pi} \exp(\frac{a-b}{2\sigma^2} \cos(2\theta)) d\theta}$$

We discretize (33). For each Markov chain defined by one of our schemes, and for any h small enough, one may show that there exists $\bar{\lambda}^h$ such that, for any deterministic initial condition :

$$\bar{\lambda}^h = a.s \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{ph} \log |\bar{X}_p^h|$$


We want to compare $\bar{\lambda}^h$ and λ .

It is important to note that we cannot use the formula $\bar{\lambda}^h \sim \frac{1}{ph} \log |\bar{X}_p^h|$ in practice, because it leads to numerical instabilities, the process ($|\bar{X}_p^h|$) decreasing to 0 or increasing to infinity exponentially fast. This is avoided by a projection at each step technique, described in the next Section.


We have tested the Milshtein method and the second-order method (22).

By example, let us choose $a = 1$, $b = -2$, $\sigma = 3.5$. Then an accurate numerical computation gives $\lambda = -0.4$. In this example, the second-order schemes are extremely accurate, whereas the Euler scheme and the Milshtein scheme lead to completely wrong results, as illustrated by the 2 figures below, which represent the evolution (in terms of time ph) of our estimator of $\bar{\lambda}^h$.

First, we compare the scheme (22) (thick line) and the Euler scheme (thin line) :



Now we compare the scheme (22) (thick line) and the Milshtein scheme (thin line) :



6.3 Algorithm for the helicopter problem

In the deterministic case (corresponding to $\sigma(t) \equiv 0$), only the Runge-Kutta methods of order larger than 4 have given good results (because of the numerical instability of the system, due to the large coefficients of the matrix $A(t)$ and their very short period).

Moreover, the discretization step had to be chosen smaller than 10^{-4} .

For the stochastic case, the use of a second-order scheme has been also completely necessary. We observed that we needed a large final integration time, therefore too small steps would have lead to too large CPU times. Moreover, the second-order schemes were less sensitive than the first-order ones to the above underlined strong instability of the system.

Besides, the above study of the deterministic case shows the necessity to improve the scheme (22), in order that it reduces to the Runge-Kutta scheme of order 4 when the intensity of the noise is nought.

Finally, our algorithm has been the following :

1. one chooses an initial condition on the unit sphere \mathcal{S}^3
2. at step $(p + 1)$, one proceeds in two stages :
 - one applies to a single step the Runge-Kutta method of order 4 in order to integrate the system

$$\begin{aligned}
 y(0) &= \bar{X}_p^h \\
 \dot{y}(t) &= \tilde{A}(ph + t)y(t)
 \end{aligned}$$

(the presence of $\tilde{A} = A + \frac{1}{2}B^2$ is due to the discretization of the system written in the Ito sense)

- then one calculates :

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= y(h) + \left\{ \sigma(ph)B\Delta_{p+1}^h W + \frac{1}{2}\sigma(ph)^2 B^2((\Delta_{p+1}^h W)^2 - h) \right. \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma(ph)(\tilde{A}B + B\tilde{A} + B')) \\ &\quad \left. + \sigma'(ph)B)h\Delta_{p+1}^h W \right\} \bar{X}_p^h\end{aligned}\quad (34)$$

where we have used the following notations :

$(\Delta_{p+1}^h W) :=$ sequence of mutually independent gaussian random variables
 $\mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{h})$

b' : derivative of the matrix $b(t)$

all the matrices are calculated at time $t = ph$

3. one computes the new approximate value λ_{p+1} from the previous one, λ_p by

$$\lambda_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) + \frac{\log(|\bar{X}_{p+1}^h|)}{(p+1)h}\quad (35)$$

4. one projects \bar{X}_{p+1}^h on the unit sphere.


A Theorem below shows that this algorithm is of order 2, in the sense that, for any deterministic initial condition x :

$$\left| \lambda - \lim_{p \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{ph} \log |\bar{X}_p^h(x)| \right| = O(h^2)$$

For the given models of blades, the deterministic system was extremely stable for admissible velocities.

Let us suppose that $\sigma(t)$ is a constant function : $\sigma(t) \equiv \sigma_0$ (i.e the effects of the turbulency are independent of the azimuth angle).

For a velocity equal to 100m/s, we obtain the corresponding diagram :



- Variations of the Lyapunov exponent in terms of σ_0 -

The destabilization of the system could occur only for intensities of the noise larger than 0.3 ; such intensities are not realistic for the turbulent winds around the blade.

Moreover, let us consider a more precise modelization of the noise. We suppose that its intensity is a periodic function of the azimuth angle $\Psi = \Omega t$, reaching its maximum for $\Psi = \frac{3\pi}{4}$, and defined by the function :

$$\sigma_0 \exp(\delta(\cos(0.75\pi - 0.5\Omega t)^2 - 1))$$

We have observed a strong dependency of the Lyapunov exponent upon δ but in that case also the instability could not appear for realistic intensities of the noise.

6.4 Choice of the integration time

This choice is much more complex than the choice of the number of simulations to perform a Monte-Carlo approximation : the error due to the fact that one integrates during a finite time asymptotically has a gaussian law, but the variance of this law is given by the solution of a P.D.E., and moreover this P.D.E. depends on the Lyapunov exponent that one wants to compute !

More precisely, considering again the case of matrices A and B independent of t for the sake of simplicity, let \mathcal{L} define the infinitesimal generator of the process $(s(t))$ defined by $s(t) = \frac{X(t)}{|X(t)|}$; under technical assumptions on the matrices A and B (satisfied by the blade

system and described below), this process has a unique invariant probability measure μ on the projective space P^{d-1} (i.e the set obtained by identifying s and $-s$ on the sphere).

We have the following central-limit theorem (Bhattacharya [4]) :

Theorem 6.6 *Let the function Q be defined by :*

$$Q(s) := (As, s) + \frac{1}{2} [(B^2s, s) + |Bs|^2 - 2(Bs, s)^2]$$

For t tending to $+\infty$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \int_0^t (Q(s(\theta)) - \lambda) d\theta \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \nu^2) \text{ in distribution}$$

where the constant ν^2 depends only on the coefficients of the system and is given by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denoting the inner product in $\mathcal{L}^2(P^{d-1}, \mu)$:

$$\nu^2 = -2 \langle Q - \lambda, \mathcal{L}^{-1}(Q - \lambda) \rangle$$

An estimation of the integration time can be got by a first estimation of λ , and by a numerical resolution of the Poisson P.D.E. on the projective space

$$\mathcal{L}u = Q - \lambda$$

Of course, this phase of the algorithm is very critical. Further researches in that direction are necessary .

6.5 Algorithm for the wideband noise case

Let us consider the system

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = A(t)X(t) + B(t)X(t)\sigma(t)\xi^\varepsilon(t) \quad (36)$$

with a wide-band noise of the form

$$\xi^\varepsilon(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} Z\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

where $(Z(t))$ is a stationary $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

The above system is an ordinary differential system, so that the pathwise simulation of the solution can be achieved using, by example, the Euler scheme :

$$\bar{X}_{p+1}^h = \bar{X}_p^h + (A(ph)\bar{X}_p^h + \sigma(ph)B(ph)\xi^\varepsilon(ph))\bar{X}_p^h h$$

Pardoux [25] and Kushner [16] have shown that the Lyapunov exponent of (36) converges to the Lyapunov exponent of (31).

But it appears that, even for small h , the Lyapunov exponent of that discrete-time process defined by the Euler scheme does not converge, when ε goes to 0, towards the Lyapunov exponent of the system (31).

One reason is that the process $\{\xi^\varepsilon(ph)\}$ does not converge in law, so that the scheme must rather involve the sequence

$$\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi = \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} \xi^\varepsilon(s) ds$$

which converges in law to the sequence $(\Delta_{p+1}^h W)$.

But one has to be careful : the new scheme

$$\bar{X}_{p+1}^h = \bar{X}_p^h + (A(ph)h + \sigma(ph)B(ph)\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi)\bar{X}_p^h$$

does not converge to a discretization scheme of (31) ($A \neq \hat{A}$).

Finally, we introduce a convenient second-order scheme, similar to (34).

First, one applies to a single step the Runge-Kutta method of order 4 in order to integrate the system

$$\begin{aligned} y(0) &= \bar{X}_p^h \\ \dot{y}(t) &= A(ph+t)y(t) \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_{p+1}^h &= y(h) + \left\{ \sigma(ph)B\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi + \frac{1}{2}\sigma(ph)^2 B^2 (\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2}(\sigma(ph)(AB + BA + B') + \sigma'(ph)B)h\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi \right\} \bar{X}_p^h \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

It is interesting to note that the limit of the above scheme when ε goes to 0 is not the scheme (34), the difference including only terms of order $h\Delta_{p+1}^h W$ and h^2 . We have not succeeded to build a second-order scheme of the wideband system converging to a second-order scheme of the white noise system.

Let us describe our simulation of the integrals $\Delta_{p+1}^h \xi$.

Let $(V(t))$ is a Wiener process independent of $(W(t))$ such that :

$$dZ(t) = -Z(t)dt + \sqrt{2}dV(t)$$

Then we have the formula :

$$\int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} \xi^\varepsilon(s) ds = \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left[1 - \frac{e^{-2h}}{2} \xi^\varepsilon(ph) + \Delta_{p+1}^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} V - e^{-\frac{2(p+1)h}{\varepsilon}} \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} e^{2s} dV_s \right]$$

Therefore, it is possible to simulate the vector :

$$(\xi^\varepsilon(ph), \Delta_{p+1}^h \xi)$$

by the simulation of the gaussian vector :

$$(\Delta_{p+1}^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} V, \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} e^s dV_s, \int_{ph}^{(p+1)h} e^{2s} dV_s)$$

For our models, we observed that the coloration of the noise tended to stabilize the system (the limit case being the case of very large ε , equivalent to the deterministic case).

6.6 Remarks

The models for the blade and the noise were simplified ; in particular, only physical experiments during a flight could permit to improve the modelization of the noise, and overall a more realistic model should be non linear.

In this simplified context, the conclusion was that the turbulency around the blade has small effects on the stability of the blade.

6.7 Convergence rate

Let us consider a bilinear system

$$dX(t) = AX(t)dt + \sum_{i=1}^r B_i X(t) \circ dW_i(t) \quad (38)$$

Let $s(t)$ be the process on the projective space of \mathbb{R}^d , P^{d-1} , defined as the equivalence class of $\frac{X(t)}{|X(t)|}$ with respect to the equivalence relation : $x \sim y$ iff $x = -y$ or $x = y$.

The process $s(t)$ is the solution of the following Stratonovich stochastic differential equation, describing a diffusion process in P^{d-1} :

$$ds(t) = g(A, s(t))dt + \sum_{i=1}^r g(B_i, s(t)) \circ dW_i(t) \quad (39)$$

where :

$$g(C, s) := Cs - (Cs, s)s$$

Now, let us introduce the Lie algebra $\Lambda = L.A.\{g(A, \cdot), g(B_1, \cdot), \dots, g(B_k, \cdot)\}$, i.e. the smallest vector space of differential operators containing the operators

$$\sum_i g^i(A, \cdot) \partial_i \quad , \quad \sum_i g^i(B_j, \cdot) \partial_i \quad (j = 1, \dots, r)$$

and closed under the brackett operation $[P_1, P_2] = P_1 \circ P_2 - P_2 \circ P_1$.

For s in the projective space P^{d-1} , $\Lambda(s)$ denotes the space obtained by considering all the elements of Λ with all the coefficients of the operators frozen at their value in s .

In Arnold, Oeljeklaus and Pardoux [3] is proved the following Theorem :

Theorem 6.7 *Let us suppose :*

(H) $\dim \Lambda(s) = d - 1$, $\forall s \in P^{d-1}$

Then the process $(s(t))$ on P^{d-1} has a unique invariant probability measure μ , and there exists a real number λ such that, for any x in $\mathbb{R}^d - \{0\}$:

$$\lambda = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log |X(t, x)| \text{ , a.s.}$$

In Talay [37], is proved the

Theorem 6.8 *Let us suppose that the system (39) satisfies the hypothesis :*

(H0) *the infinitesimal generator \mathcal{L} of the process $(s(t))$ on S^{d-1} is uniformly elliptic, i.e there exists a strictly positive constant α such that, for any x in S^{d-1} and any vector ξ in the tangent space $T_{S^{d-1}}(x)$:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^r (h(B_i, x), \xi)^2 \geq \alpha |\xi|^2$$

(HU) **(i)** *the (U_{p+1}^j) 's are i.i.d., and the following conditions on the moments are fulfilled :*

$$\begin{aligned} E[U_{p+1}^j] &= E[U_{p+1}^j]^3 = E[U_{p+1}^j]^5 = 0 \\ E[U_{p+1}^j]^2 &= 1 \\ E[U_{p+1}^j]^4 &= 3 \\ E[U_{p+1}^j]^n &< +\infty \text{ , } \forall n > 5 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

(ii) *the common law of the (U_{p+1}^j) 's has a continuous density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure ; the support of this density contains an open interval including 0 and is compact.*

Let $(\bar{X}_p^h, p \in \mathbb{N})$ be defined by the Euler scheme, the Milshstein scheme or the scheme (22).

Then, if λ is the upper Lyapunov exponent of (38) :

(i) *for (\bar{X}_p^h) defined by the Euler or Milshstein scheme, $|\lambda - \bar{\lambda}^h| = O(h)$;*

(ii) *for (\bar{X}_p^h) defined by the scheme (22), $|\lambda - \bar{\lambda}^h| = O(h^2)$.*

Remark : the hypothesis (HU) is not limitative from a practical point of view, but (ii) was not necessary to obtain the results concerning the Monte-Carlo type approximation.

7 Computation of the invariant law

7.1 Position of the problem

We again consider the general system (4).

Under the hypotheses below, the system has a unique invariant measure μ , which has a smooth density, p . One way to compute $\int f(x)d\mu(x)$ for a given function f is to solve the stationary Fokker-Plank equation $L^*p = 0$, where L^* is the adjoint of the infinitesimal generator of the process $(X(t))$.

This stationary Fokker-Plank equation is a P.D.E., and its numerical resolution could be extremely difficult or impossible, especially when the dimension of the state-space, d , is large, or when L is degenerate (remember the Remark of Section (5.1)).

In [12], Gerardi, Marchetti & Rosa propose to approximate $(X(t))$ by a sequence of ergodic pure jump processes which converge in law.

Since for any μ -integrable function f we have :

$$\int f(x)d\mu(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X(s))ds$$

we propose to simulate one long trajectory of a process (\bar{X}_p^h) , and to approximate $\int f(x)d\mu(x)$ by :

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^N f(\bar{X}_p^h)$$

As in the previous Section, the critical point is the choice of N : again the random variable

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \int_0^t [f(X(s)) - \int f(\theta)d\mu(\theta)]ds$$

is asymptotically gaussian, but the variance of the limit law depends on the solution of a P.D.E. which itself depends on the unknown $\int f(x)d\mu(x)$.

At the present time, we do not know what could be a good procedure to estimate this variance.

7.2 Second-order schemes

As for the approximation of Lyapunov exponents, these schemes seem to have a better long-time behaviour than simpler ones.

For example, one can show (cf Talay [36]) :

Theorem 7.9 *Suppose that the hypotheses (H1), (H2), (H3) hold :*

(H1) the functions b, σ are of class C^∞ with bounded derivatives of any order ; the function σ is bounded

(H2) the operator L is uniformly elliptic : there exists a positive constant α such that :

$$\forall x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^i(\xi) x^i x^j \geq \alpha |x|^2$$

(H3) there exists a strictly positive constant β and a compact set K such that :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d - K, \quad x \cdot b(x) \leq -\beta |x|^2$$

Let us consider the scheme (22) and the MCRK scheme (23), with the law of the involved random variables defined as in Section (5.3), with the additional hypothesis : the law of the U_{p+1}^j 's and of the U_{p+1}^j 's has a continuous density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure.

Then the schemes (22) and MCRK define ergodic Markov chains and for any function f of \mathbb{R}^d of class C^∞ , having the property that f , as well as all its derivatives, have an at most polynomial growth at infinity :

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^N f(\bar{X}_p^h(x)) = \int f(\theta) d\mu(\theta) + O(h^2), \quad a.s.$$

For the Euler and the Milshtein schemes, the convergence rate is of order h .

Let us underline that, this time, we do not require that the law of the U_{p+1}^j 's has a compact support, therefore the gaussian law of the increments of the Wiener process is allowed.

Again, a good algorithm is also to perform a Romberg extrapolation : as for the problem of computation of $Ef(X(t))$ on a finite time interval, the errors due to the different schemes introduced above can be expanded as power series in the discretization step h (see Talay & Tubaro [39]).

7.3 Numerical experiments


The example is the same as in the Section (5.5), with $\Omega = 0$, so that the invariant law is gaussian of zero mean and of covariance matrix C .

We have observed a strong numerical instability of all the schemes (the results are very different when $h = 0.01$ and $h = 0.015$), but the second-order schemes lead to good results.

Below, we compare $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^N f(\bar{X}_p^h(x))$ for the Milshtein scheme (thin line) and the scheme (22) (thick line), for

$$f(x^1, x^2) = |x^1|^4$$

(the correct value is 3.0 ; in x -axis : Nh).



Remark : for the two schemes, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{p=1}^N f(\bar{X}_p^h(x))$ converges to $\int f(\theta) d\mu^h(\theta)$, where μ^h is the invariant law of the Markov chain (\bar{X}_p^h) .

8 PRESTO : a generator of Fortran programs

8.1 A brief presentation

PRESTO is a system of automatic generation of Fortran programs corresponding to the methods described above.

The user is asked to describe his problem in a convivial way (a bitmap environment, including menus, mouse-events, etc is managed).

Then PRESTO treats the data, performs the transformation Stratonovich/Ito of the system if necessary, uses its knowledge base in order to decide what particular scheme can be used in the context described by the user, what random variables must be involved and how they must be simulated, and finally writes a commented complete Fortran program ready to be run.

Internally, the analytical expressions of the coefficients of the Ito system and of the chosen scheme are computed by Reduce procedures (Reduce is a Computer Algebra Programming System, with which PRESTO is interfaced).

PRESTO is totally written in *LeLisp*, and uses a version of Reduce written in *LeLisp* (due to A.Beges), it runs on SUN workstations for example. A more complete description can be found in Leblond & Talay [17], or in the users' manual [38].

8.2 An example of PRESTO session

Let us examine the problem of the stability of the motion of a helicopter blade.

Let us see how PRESTO proceeds.

First, dialoguing with the user, PRESTO will successively learn :

- the aim is the computation of a Lyapunov exponent
- the system is bilinear with periodic coefficients
- the dimension of the state is 4
- the dimension of the noise is 1
- the noise is coloured (or white)
- if necessary the value of the parameter ε and the type of modelization for the wide-band noise
- the Fortran program may call subroutines of the NAG Fortran library

Then the user is asked to enter the algebraic expression of the functions $A(t)$, $b(t)$ and $v(t)$, the syntax being very natural.

Finally PRESTO performs the operations mentioned in the previous Section and generates the program.

8.3 The internal mechanism of PRESTO

Any program to be generated by PRESTO is conceptually seen as a determined succession of chapters, for example :

- Chapter 1 : comments recalling the coefficients of the system
- Chapter 2 : comments recalling the aim of the program
- :
- Chapter i : initialization of the generator of random numbers
- :
- Chapter j : computation of \bar{X}_{p+1}^h in terms of \bar{X}_p^h .
- :

PRESTO disposes of a collection of procedures written in Reduce language, each one devoted to generate one chapter in the state appropriate to the particular context defined by the user.

The collection of Reduce procedures also includes procedures performing the possibly necessary algebraic computations (for example, the conversion Stratonovich/Ito or the verification of the commutativity condition).

Therefore, after the user has entered the characteristics of his problem, PRESTO selects the Reduce procedures performing the necessary algebraic computations, and the Reduce procedures devoted to generate each one one chapter of the Fortran program.

That selection is done by a LISP program of consultation of the knowledge base of PRESTO, which contains all the informations such as :

*if Condition 1 and Condition 2 ... and Condition N,
then the Reduce procedure X must be selected*

PRESTO also uses functions managing the environment of the user's bitmap (windows, mouse, ...).

To sum up, PRESTO is a set including :

1. a collection of Reduce procedures,
2. a knowledge base describing the conditions under which each Reduce procedure will be selected,
3. a program of user's data acquisition and user's terminal management,
4. a program of consultation of the knowledge base devoted to produce the list of the Reduce procedures to be selected and run according to the user's data.

9 Conclusion

We have proposed some discretization methods of stochastic differential systems, which seem efficient when one wants to simulate trajectories of diffusion processes, or when one wants to compute certain quantities depending on the law of a diffusion process, by techniques involving simulations.

A lot of open problems still remain : as examples, we could quote the discretization of reflected diffusions processes (we know no theoretical result on that topics, except the interesting paper of Calzolari & Costantini & Marchetti [5] on the simulation of obliquely reflecting brownian motions), the estimation of the simulation time in the ergodic-type situations (computation of the stationary law, Lyapunov exponents, etc), the estimation of the rates of convergence to $Ef(X(t))$ when the function f is not smooth (in particular, when it is an indicatrix function).

All these problems are of prime importance for various applications, as computations of threshold crossing probabilities, or numerical integration of non linear deterministic P.D.E.'s by stochastic particles methods.

References

- [1] L.ARNOLD : *Stochastic Differential Equations*, J.Wiley, 1974.
- [2] L.ARNOLD : Lyapunov exponents of Nonlinear Stochastic systems , *Nonlinear Stochastic Dynamic Engineering Systems* , G.I.Schueller & F.Ziegler (Eds.), Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium, Innsbruck, 1987, Springer-Verlag.
- [3] L.ARNOLD, E.OELJEKLAUS & E.PARDOUX : Almost sure and moment stability for linear Ito Equations , *Lyapunov Exponents* , L.Arnold & V.Wihstutz Ed. , Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1186, Springer, 1986.
- [4] R.N. BHATTACHARYA : On the functional central limit theorem and the law of the iterated logarithm for Markov processes, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* 60 (1982), 185-201.
- [5] A.CALZOLARI & C.COSTANTINI & F.MARCHETTI : A confidence interval for Monte-Carlo methods with an application to simulation of obliquely reflecting brownian motion , *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 29(2), Sept.1988.
- [6] J.M.C.CLARK & R.J.CAMERON : The maximum rate of convergence of discrete approximations for stochastic differential equations , *Stochastic Differential Systems - Filtering and Control*, B. Grigelionis (Ed.), Proceedings of the IFIP Working Conference, Vilnius, Lithuania, USSR, 1978, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 25, Springer-Verlag, 1980.

- [7] J.M.C.CLARK : An efficient approximation for a class of stochastic differential equations , *Advances in Filtering and Optimal Stochastic Control*, W. Fleming & L. Gorostiza (Eds.), Proceedings of the IFIP Working Conference, Cocoyoc, Mexico, 1982, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 42, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [8] H.DOSS : Liens entre équations différentielles stochastiques et ordinaires , *Ann. Inst. H.Poincaré*, 13, 1977.
- [9] O.FAURE : Numerical pathwise approximate of stochastic differential equations , LAMM Report 90/7, 1990, submitted for publication.
- [10] O.FAURE : Simulation of diffusions, Thesis in preparation.
- [11] P.FLORCHINGER & F.LE GLAND : Time-discretization of the Zakai equation for diffusion processes observed in correlated noise , *9th Conference on Analysis and Optimization of Systems*, A. Bensoussan & J.L. Lions (Eds.), Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 144, Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [12] A.GERARDI & F.MARCHETTI & A.M.ROSA : Simulation of diffusions with boundary conditions , *Systems & Control Letters* 4, 253,1984.
- [13] A.GRORUD & D.TALAY : Approximation of Lyapunov exponents of stochastic differential systems on compact manifolds , *9th Conference on Analysis and Optimization of Systems*, A. Bensoussan & J.L. Lions (Eds.), Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 144, Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [14] N.IKEDA & S.WATANABE : *Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes* , North-Holland, 1989.
- [15] H.J. KUSHNER : *Approximation and weak convergence methods for random processes* , M.I.T. Press, 1984.
- [16] H.J. KUSHNER : Approximations and optimal control for the pathwise average cost per unit time and discounted problems for wideband noise driven systems , *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization* 27-3, 546-562, 1987.
- [17] J.LEBLOND & D.TALAY : Simulation of diffusion processes with Presto, building systems like Presto with Adagio , Proceedings of the 7th French-Belgian Statisticians Meeting, Rouen, France, 1986.
- [18] E.J.McSHANE : *Stochastic calculus and stochastic models* , Academic Press, 1974.
- [19] G.N.MILSHTEIN : Approximate integration of stochastic differential equations , *Theory of Probability and Applications*, 19, 557-562, 1974.
- [20] G.N.MILSHTEIN : A method of second-order accuracy integration of stochastic differential equations , *Theory of Probability and Applications*, 23, 1976.

- [21] G.N.MILSHTEIN : Weak approximation of solutions of systems of stochastic differential equations , *Theory of Probability and Applications*, 30, 750-766, 1985.
- [22] N.J.NEWTON : An asymptotically efficient difference formula for solving stochastic differential equations , *Stochastics* 19, 175-206, 1986.
- [23] N.J.NEWTON : An efficient approximation for stochastic differential equations on the partition of symmetrical first passage times , *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports* 29, 227-258, 1990.
- [24] N.J. NEWTON : Asymptotically efficient Runge-Kutta methods for a class of Ito and Stratonovich equations , University of Essex Research Report 201/njn, 1989, to appear in *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics*.
- [25] E. PARDOUX : Stabilité du mouvement des pales d'hélicoptères dans le cas d'un écoulement de l'air turbulent , *Actes du Colloque "L'Automatique pour l'Aéronautique"* , Paris, 1986.
- [26] E.PARDOUX & M.PIGNOL : Etude de la stabilité de la solution d'une E.D.S. bilinéaire à coefficients périodiques. Application au mouvement d'une pale d'hélicoptère , *Analysis and Optimization of Systems, Part 2* , A.Bensoussan & J.L.Lions (Eds.), *Lecture Notes in Control and Info. Sc.* 63, 92-103, 1984.
- [27] E.PARDOUX & D.TALAY : Stability of linear differential systems with parametric excitation , *Nonlinear Stochastic Dynamic Engineering Systems* , G.I. Schueller & F. Ziegler (Eds.), *Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium*, Innsbruck, 1987, Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- [28] M.PIGNOL : *Stabilité stochastique des pales d'hélicoptère* , Thèse de 3ème Cycle, Université de Provence.
- [29] E.PLATEN : An approximation method for a class of Ito processes, *Lietuvos Matematikos Rinkiniys*, 1981.
- [30] E.PLATEN & W.WAGNER : On a Taylor formula for a class of Ito processes , *Probability and Mathematical Statistics* ,3, 37-51, 1982.
- [31] W.RUMELIN : Numerical treatment of stochastic differential equations , *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 19, 604-613, 1982.
- [32] H.J.SUSMANN : On the gap between deterministic and stochastic ordinary differential equations , *Ann.Prob.* 6, 1978.
- [33] D.TALAY : Résolution trajectorielle et analyse numérique des équations différentielles stochastiques , *Stochastics*, 9, 275-306, 1983.

- [34] D.TALAY : Efficient numerical schemes for the approximation of expectations of functionals of S.D.E. , *Filtering and Control of Random Processes* , H.Korezlioglu & G.Mazziotto & J.Szpirglas (Eds.), Proceedings of the ENST-CNET Colloquium, Paris, 1983, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 61, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [35] D.TALAY : Discrétisation d'une E.D.S. et calcul approché d'espérances de fonctionnelles de la solution , *Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 20-1, 141, 1986.
- [36] D.TALAY : Second Order Discretization Schemes of Stochastic Differential Systems for the computation of the invariant law , *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports* 29(1), 13-36, 1990.
- [37] D.TALAY : Approximation of upper Lyapunov exponents of bilinear stochastic differential systems , INRIA Report 965, 1989, to appear in *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*.
- [38] D.TALAY : Presto, mode d'emploi, INRIA Technical Report 106, 1989.
- [39] D.TALAY & L.TUBARO : Expansion of the global error for numerical schemes solving Stochastic Differential Equations, INRIA Report 1069, 1989, to appear in *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*.
- [40] W.WEDIG : Pitchfork and Hopf Bifurcations in Stochastic Systems - Effective Methods to calculate Lyapunov Exponents , "Effective stochastic Analysis", P.Kree & W.Wedig (Eds.), to appear.





ISSN 0249-6399