

ADAPTIVE MULTILEVEL SUBSET SIMULATION WITH SELECTIVE REFINEMENT

D. ELFVERSON*, R. SCHEICHL[†], S. WEISSMANN[‡], AND F.A. DIAZDELAO[§]

Abstract. In this work we propose an adaptive multilevel version of subset simulation to estimate the probability of rare events for complex physical systems. Given a sequence of nested failure domains of increasing size, the rare event probability is expressed as a product of conditional probabilities. The proposed new estimator uses different model resolutions and varying numbers of samples across the hierarchy of nested failure sets. In order to dramatically reduce the computational cost, we construct the intermediate failure sets such that only a small number of expensive high-resolution model evaluations are needed, whilst the majority of samples can be taken from inexpensive low-resolution simulations. A key idea in our new estimator is the use of a posteriori error estimators combined with a selective mesh refinement strategy to guarantee the critical subset property that may be violated when changing model resolution from one failure set to the next. The efficiency gains and the statistical properties of the estimator are investigated both theoretically via shaking transformations, as well as numerically. On a model problem from subsurface flow, the new multilevel estimator achieves gains of more than a factor 200 over standard subset simulation for a practically relevant relative error of 25%.

Keywords. Rare event probabilities, adaptive model hierarchies, high-dimensional problems, Markov chain Monte Carlo, shaking transformations.

AMS(MOS) subject classifications. 65N30, 65C05, 65C40, 35R60

1. Introduction. Estimating the probability of rare events is one of the most important and computationally challenging tasks in science and engineering. By definition, the probability that a rare event occurs is very small. However, its effect could be catastrophic, e.g., when it is associated with some critical system failure such as the breakthrough of pollutants into a water reservoir or the structural failure of an airplane wing. An efficient and reliable estimator is of utmost importance in such situations.

We are interested in estimating rare event probabilities occurring in mathematical models of physical systems described by stochastic differential equations (SDEs) or partial differential equation (PDEs) with uncertain data, with possibly large stochastic dimension. Standard Monte Carlo (MC) methods are infeasible due to the huge amount of samples needed to produce even a single rare event. Remedies for this are offered by different variance reduction techniques, such as *importance sampling* [35, 36, 12], *multilevel MC methods* [22, 7, 17, 21, 13, 29] and *subset simulation* [5, 6, 32, 37]. In the statistics and probability literature [28], subset simulation is also known as *splitting* and can be interpreted as a sequential Monte Carlo method [10, 16, 26, 15, 11]. There are also Bayesian versions of subset simulation using Gaussian process emulators to reduce the number of model evaluations [9]. Moreover, a cross-entropy-based importance sampling method for rare events and a failure-informed dimension reduction through the connection to Bayesian inverse problems has been addressed in [38].

In this work, we propose a multilevel version of the classical subset simulation approach of Au & Beck [5] for rare event estimation in the context of complex models. More specifically, we combine the ideas of incorporating multilevel model resolutions across the subsets proposed in [37] with the selective mesh refinement strategy proposed in [21]. As a result, our method does not violate the subset property, critical in subset simulation, when chang-

*Formerly at Department of Mathematics and Mathematical statistics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden (daniel.elfverson@gmail.com).

[†]Institute for Applied Mathematics & Interdisciplinary Center for Scientific Computing (IWR), Heidelberg University, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany (r.scheichl@uni-heidelberg.de).

[‡]IWR, Heidelberg University, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany (simon.weissmann@uni-heidelberg.de).

[§]Clinical Operational Research Unit, Department of Mathematics, University College London, London WC1H 0BT, UK (alex.diaz@ucl.ac.uk).

ing the model resolution. Furthermore, we formulate the subset simulation based on shaking transformations to ensure asymptotic convergence of the resulting estimator, as shown in [24].

Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space with σ -algebra Σ and probability measure \mathbb{P} . The sample space Ω can be seen as the input space of a model used to describe the behaviour of a physical system. Let $F \in \Sigma$ be a *rare event* that can be associated to system failure, that is, the demand exceeding the capacity of the system under study. Given the above probability space, subset simulation splits the estimation of $\mathbb{P}(F)$ into a product of conditional probabilities by introducing a sequence of nested events

$$(1.1) \quad F = F_K \subset F_{K-1} \subset \dots \subset F_1 \subset F_0 = \Omega, \quad F_j \in \Sigma, \quad j = 0, \dots, K,$$

corresponding to larger failure probabilities as the subscript $j \rightarrow 0$. The rare event probability $\mathbb{P}(F)$ is usually prohibitive to estimate directly by MC sampling, but it can be expressed as the product of conditional probabilities

$$(1.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(F) = \prod_{j=1}^K \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}),$$

where each $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$ is larger than $\mathbb{P}(F)$ and hence easier to estimate. The conditional probabilities in (1.2) can be estimated effectively using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC).

Computer simulations to study physical systems very often take the form of SDE or PDE models. Making use of a hierarchy of discretisations of these underlying models, we exploit ideas from multilevel Monte Carlo (MLMC) methods [22, 7, 17, 21] to reduce the overall cost of subset simulation. We refer to [27, 39] for different variants of MLMC estimators of rare event probabilities. In principle, our approach is similar to the approach presented in [37]. However, in contrast to that work and more closely related to the ideas in MLMC methods, we design the sequence of nested events in (1.1) such that most samples can be computed with inexpensive, coarse models. This reduces the total cost significantly compared to classical subset simulation, leading to more significant gains than the multilevel variant in [37].

Following the ideas in [20, 21], another key advance in our new method is the use of a posteriori error estimators to guarantee the critical subset property, which may be violated when changing the model resolution from one intermediate failure set to the next. It also allows a selective, sample-dependent choice of model resolution. Finally, these three advances lead to significant speed-up over classical subset simulation for our multilevel estimator.

In summary, the paper makes the following contributions: (i) The subset simulation method is formulated via shaking transformations, incorporating a selective mesh refinement strategy. The resulting algorithm is based on a MCMC method, where each sample involves an adaptive mesh resolution based on its limit state function value. As a result, high accuracy is only needed for samples with a rather small limit state function, whereas for most samples low resolution evaluations are sufficiently accurate when the state is far away from failure. (ii) Under certain assumptions, it is shown that the proposed selective refinement strategy does not violate the subset property. Moreover, a detailed complexity analysis quantifies the gains due to the selective refinement strategy. (iii) A novel, adaptive multilevel subset simulation method is proposed where the accuracy increases over the defined subsets. Through a selective refinement strategy and appropriately chosen intermediate threshold values, the failure sets satisfy the critical subset property. Our complexity analysis shows significant improvement through the proposed adaptive multilevel subset choice and through the additional application of selective mesh refinement.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the problem and define hierarchies of discretisations via two abstract, sample-wise assumptions. In Section 3, we ex-

plore in detail the estimation of rare event probabilities, first using standard MC and classical subset simulation, before proposing two improved estimators based on selective refinement and adaptive multilevel subset selection. Section 4 contains a concrete implementation of the proposed subset simulation algorithms via shaking transformations, as well as an asymptotic convergence result. The complexity analysis of the novel approaches is provided in Section 5, while Section 6 demonstrates their performance on a series of numerical experiments, starting with two toy problems and finishing with a Darcy flow model. Finally, Section 7 offers some conclusions.

2. Problem Formulation and Model Hierarchy. We consider a (linear or nonlinear) model \mathcal{M} on an infinite dimensional function space V , e.g., a PDE, which is subject to uncertainty, or an SDE. The solution is modelled as a random field on the probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ with values in V . For any $\omega \in \Omega$, we denote by $u(\omega) \in V$ the solution of

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{M}(\omega, u(\omega)) = 0.$$

Given a quantity of interest $\Phi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., a functional of the model solution u , we are interested in computing the probability that a so-called *rare event* occurs. We let $G = G(\omega) := \Phi^* - \Phi(u(\omega))$ be the associated limit state function, which is negative when the quantity of interest exceeds a critical value Φ^* . Thus, we want to compute the probability that $\omega \in \Omega$ is in the failure set

$$F := \{\omega \in \Omega : G(\omega) \leq 0\}.$$

For simplicity, we will assume that G is a real valued random variable with probability density function (pdf) (with respect to Lebesgue measure) $\pi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, which is assumed to be unknown. If $\mathbb{1}_F$ denotes the indicator function of F , i.e., $\mathbb{1}_F(\omega) = 1$ if $\omega \in F$ and $\mathbb{1}_F(\omega) = 0$ otherwise, then the failure probability can also be expressed as the integral

$$(2.2) \quad P = \mathbb{P}(F) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_F(\omega) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(x) \pi(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^0 \pi(x) dx$$

which, for very small $P \ll 1$, will be classified as a rare event. Note that the integral in (2.2) is equivalent to the expected value $\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathbb{1}_F]$. We are interested in applications where not only the dimension of V , but also the dimension of the underlying sample space Ω is high (or infinite), e.g., in subsurface flow simulations where the permeability is described by a spatially correlated random field. To estimate P , both V and the high-dimensional integral in (2.2) need to be approximated in practice.

We return to the approximation of the above integral in Section 3 and finish this section by formulating an abstract assumption on the numerical approximation of the model \mathcal{M} and of the limit state function G , for any given $\omega \in \Omega$. To this end, we introduce a hierarchy of numerical approximations to G with increasing accuracy, namely G_{ℓ} , for $\ell = 1, \dots, L$.

ASSUMPTION 2.1. *Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $q \geq 0$. We assume that*

$$(2.3) \quad |G(\omega) - G_{\ell}(\omega)| \leq \gamma^{\ell}, \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s. in } \omega,$$

and that there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$, such that

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathcal{C}[G_{\ell}]] \leq c_0 \gamma^{-\ell q}, \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $\mathcal{C}[G_{\ell}]$ is the cost of computing one sample of G_{ℓ} . Furthermore, we assume that the cdf of G is Lipschitz continuous, i.e. there exists a constant $c_{\text{Lip}} > 0$ such that for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$(2.5) \quad |\mathbb{P}(G \leq x_1) - \mathbb{P}(G \leq x_2)| \leq c_{\text{Lip}} |x_1 - x_2|.$$

Note that increased accuracy is only needed for samples $\omega \in \Omega$, where the limit state function G is small. Thus, in [20, 21] the following *selective refinement* assumption was introduced.

ASSUMPTION 2.2. *Let $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and consider a fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}$. We assume that G_ℓ , now denoted G_ℓ^y to emphasise the dependence on y , satisfies the weaker condition*

$$(2.6) \quad |G(\omega) - G_\ell^y(\omega)| \leq \max\left(\gamma^\ell, |G_\ell^y(\omega) - y|\right) \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s. in } \omega.$$

As it has been shown in [21, Lemma 5.2] under Assumption 2.2, the expected costs of computing $\mathbb{1}_{G_\ell^y \leq y}(\omega)$ can be reduced to

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[C \left[\mathbb{1}_{G_\ell^y \leq y} \right] \right] \leq c'_0 \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} \gamma^{(1-q)j} \leq c_0 \left(1 + \gamma^{(1-q)\ell} \right), \quad \text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N},$$

while the bias remains of order γ^ℓ , i.e.

$$|\mathbb{P}(G_\ell^y \leq y) - \mathbb{P}(G \leq y)| \leq c_y \gamma^\ell$$

for some constant $c_y > 0$ independent of γ and ℓ .

REMARK 2.3. *For the complexity analysis of the standard MC method as well as of the subset simulation we will consider a fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppress the dependence of G_ℓ^y on y . We then refer to G_ℓ under Assumption 2 to the random variable G_ℓ^y satisfying (2.6).*

In a PDE setting, we typically have error estimates or bounds of the type

$$(2.7) \quad |G(\omega) - G_\ell(\omega)| \leq C(\omega) h_\ell^\alpha$$

where h_ℓ is a discretisation parameter, such as mesh size, α is a convergence rate and $C(\omega)$ is a constant that may depend on ω . Both α and $C(\omega)$ can be estimated using adjoint methods or hierarchical error estimators, see, e.g., [23], or [14, 31] for SDEs or PDEs with random coefficients.

If the corresponding sequence of meshes \mathcal{T}_j , $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is obtained by uniform mesh refinement with $h_j = h_0 2^{-j}$ for some fixed coarsest mesh \mathcal{T}_0 , then the bound in (2.3) can be achieved by choosing $\gamma = 2^{-\alpha}$ and $j(\omega) \geq \max(0, \ell + \log_2(h_0 C(\omega)^{1/\alpha}))$. Note that this crucially requires a sample-dependent mesh hierarchy. The constant q in (2.4) depends on the (physical) dimension of the problem, the order of accuracy of the underlying numerical method, and the choice of deterministic solver. The constant c_0 depends on the distribution of the constant $C(\omega)$. A similar choice is possible in the case of locally adaptive mesh refinement, driven by an a posteriori error estimator. In that case, the bound in (2.7) is typically replaced by a sharper bound in terms of the number of mesh elements [8].

3. Adaptive Subset Simulation and Selective Refinement. In this section, we explore in detail the estimation of the failure probability P given by (2.2), and propose two new extensions of the classical subset simulation approach.

Let \hat{P} denote an estimator of P . There are several sources of error in this estimator. These include: systematic error due to the choice of mathematical model, numerical error due to model approximation, and statistical error due to finite sampling size. Here, we will assume the model is exact and will only consider how to control the numerical and the statistical errors. We measure the quality of the estimator \hat{P} by its coefficient of variation (c.o.v.)

$$(3.1) \quad \delta(\hat{P}) = \frac{1}{\hat{P}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[(\hat{P} - P)^2 \right]}$$

and we let $\text{TOL} > 0$ be the desired accuracy for $\delta(\hat{P})$.

3.1. Estimating rare event probabilities by standard Monte Carlo. The most basic way of estimating the probability in (2.2) to an accuracy TOL is to use a standard MC method where all samples are computed with a numerical approximation to accuracy $\mathcal{O}(\text{TOL})$. Let $F^L := \{\omega \in \Omega : G_L(\omega) \leq 0\}$ be the approximate failure set on a fixed numerical discretisation level L , and consider the standard MC estimator

$$(3.2) \quad \widehat{P}^{\text{MC}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{F^L}(\omega_i) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(G_L^{(i)}),$$

where $\omega_i \in \Omega$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) samples and each $G_L^{(i)} = G_L(\omega_i)$ is computed to accuracy γ^L . This is an unbiased estimator for

$$(3.3) \quad P_L = \mathbb{P}(F^L) = \int_{\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{F^L}(\omega) \mathbb{P}(d\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}],$$

and we can expand

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta(\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}})^2 &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[(\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}})^2] - 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}]P + P^2}{P^2} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[(\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}})^2] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}]^2 + \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}]^2 - 2\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}]P + P^2}{P^2} \\ &= \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}} - P]}{P} \right)^2 + \frac{\mathbb{V}_{\pi}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}] P_L^2}{P_L^2 P^2} = \left(1 - \frac{P_L}{P} \right)^2 + \frac{1 - P_L}{NP_L} \frac{P_L^2}{P^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which now includes also a bias error due to the numerical approximation $G_L \approx G$. As shown in [21, Sec. 3], it follows from Assumption 2.2 that

$$\left(1 - \frac{P_L}{P} \right)^2 \leq c_1^2 \gamma^{2L},$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Thus, it suffices to choose

$$(3.5) \quad L \propto \log(\text{TOL}^{-1})$$

to guarantee that the first term on the right hand side of (3.4) is less than $\text{TOL}^2/2$. We will assume this throughout the paper.

The main challenge in achieving the required accuracy for $\delta(\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}})$, is to ensure that the second term on the right hand side of (3.4) is sufficiently small such that

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{1 - P_L}{NP_L} \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \leq \frac{\text{TOL}^2}{2}.$$

A sufficient condition for this to hold is

$$(3.7) \quad N \propto \text{TOL}^{-2} P_L^{-1} (P/P_L)^2.$$

Hence, the number of samples needs to be proportional to the inverse of the rare event probability. For realistic applications, where the cost $\mathcal{C}[G_L] \gg 1$ and $P_L \approx P \ll 1$, this is completely infeasible. Under Assumption 2.1 and choosing L as in (3.5), the total cost of the standard MC estimator would be

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{MC}}]] = N \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\mathcal{C}[G_L]] \leq N c_0 \gamma^{-Lq} \leq c_2 \text{TOL}^{-(2+q)} P_L^{-1} \frac{P^2}{P_L^2},$$




FIGURE 3.1. A cartoon of the limit state function $\omega \mapsto G(\omega)$ and the resulting failure sets.

for some constant $c_2 > 0$ that is independent of TOL. It is possible to improve this through importance sampling techniques [35, 36, 12], but that requires some a priori knowledge of the distribution of G_L , which we typically do not have. We further note that the factor P/P_L is close to 1, since we have chosen L large enough such that $P/P_L \in (1 - \text{TOL}/2, 1 + \text{TOL}/2)$.

Furthermore, we note that the constant c_1 crucially depends on the underlying distribution of G and G_L and, in particular, on the rareness of the event and on the gradient of G on the boundary of the failure domain. We refer to [40] for a detailed analysis of approximation errors for rare event probabilities in the context of PDE based models.

3.2. Subset Simulation. In engineering applications, subset simulation [5, 6, 32] is one of the most widespread variance reduction techniques to design an efficient estimator for P in Equation (2.2). It has been successfully used in many different contexts and for different applications, which include engineering reliability analysis [4], robust design [2], topology optimisation [33], multi-objective optimisation [41], Bayesian inference [19] and model calibration through history matching [25].

The main idea is to define a sequence of nested failure sets that contain the target failure set F , as in (1.1). This is accomplished using a sequence of intermediate failure thresholds

$$(3.9) \quad 0 = y_K < y_{K-1} < \dots < y_0 = \infty.$$

That way, each intermediate failure set is defined as

$$F_j := \{\omega \in \Omega : G(\omega) \leq y_j\} = \{G \in (-\infty, y_j]\}, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, K.$$

The failure set F and some intermediate failure sets that contain it are illustrated in Fig. 3.1 via level curves of $G(\omega)$. As stated in (1.2), the rare event probability $\mathbb{P}(F)$ can be expressed as product of conditional probabilities, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(F) = \prod_{j=1}^K \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$, where each $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$ is by construction larger than $\mathbb{P}(F)$ – significantly so if K is sufficiently large.

To estimate $\mathbb{P}(F)$ from the product of conditional probabilities we need to compute

$$(3.10) \quad \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, y_j]}(x) \pi_{j-1}(x) dx, \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, K,$$

where π_{j-1} is the pdf of G conditioned on the event $G \leq y_{j-1}$, i.e.

$$(3.11) \quad \pi_{j-1}(x) = \frac{\pi(x) \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, y_{j-1}]}(x)}{Z} \quad \text{with} \quad Z := \int_{-\infty}^{y_{j-1}} \pi(x) dx.$$

The standard MC estimator for the integral in (3.10) is given by

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, y_j]}(G^{(i)}), \quad G^{(i)} \sim \pi_{j-1}.$$

In general, we can not generate i.i.d. samples from π_{j-1} directly, at least not efficiently. In order to circumvent this, MCMC methods are commonly employed, see Section 4 below.

3.3. Subset Simulation with Selective Refinement. In practice we also need to take into account the numerical approximations of the failure domains. Instead of having a fixed computational mesh for all samples, which is the typical approach in the literature, we follow [21] and use a sample-dependent approximation $G_L(\omega)$ that guarantees instead that the error in the limit state function satisfies either the bound (2.3) in Assumption 2.1 or the weaker bound (2.6) in Assumption 2.2.

Firstly, in the case of Assumption 2.1, we use the sequence of intermediate failure sets

$$(3.13) \quad F_j^L := \{\omega : G_L(\omega) \leq y_j\}, \quad \text{for } \infty = y_0 > \dots > y_{K-1} > y_K = 0,$$

which obviously fulfill the critical subset property

$$(3.14) \quad F^L = F_K^L \subset F_{K-1}^L \subset \dots \subset F_1^L \subset F_0^L = \Omega.$$

In the case of the selective refinement strategy, i.e., under Assumption 2.2, the following sequence of intermediate failure sets is chosen:

$$(3.15) \quad F_j^L := \{\omega : G_L^{y_j}(\omega) \leq y_j\}, \quad \text{for } \infty = y_0 > \dots > y_{K-1} > y_K = 0.$$

We can guarantee the subset property provided the failure thresholds are sufficiently far apart.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Suppose that the random variable G_L satisfies Assumption 2.2 and that $y_{j-1} - y_j \geq 2\gamma^L$. Then*

$$F_j^L = \{\omega : G_L^{y_j}(\omega) \leq y_j\} \subset \{\omega : G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) \leq y_{j-1}\} = F_{j-1}^L.$$

Proof. We will give a proof by contradiction. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $G_L^{y_j}(\omega) \leq y_j$ and $G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) > y_{j-1}$.

Case 1: Assume that $|G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega)| > \gamma^L$, i.e. $\max(|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)|, \gamma^L) = y_j - G_L^{y_j}(\omega)$. If $|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)| \leq \gamma^L$ then

$$G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) = G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega) + G(\omega) \leq \gamma^L + y_j \leq y_{j-1},$$

which contradicts $G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) > y_{j-1}$. On the other hand, if $|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)| > \gamma^L$ then

$$G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) = G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega) + G(\omega) \leq G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - y_{j-1} + y_j < G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega),$$

which is a contradiction in itself.

Case 2: Now, assume that $|G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega)| \leq \gamma^L$, i.e. $\max(|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)|, \gamma^L) = \gamma^L$. Now, if $|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)| \leq \gamma^L$ then

$$G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) = G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega) + G(\omega) - G_L^{y_j}(\omega) + G_L^{y_j}(\omega) \leq 2\gamma^L + y_j \leq y_{j-1},$$

which contradicts $G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) > y_{j-1}$. If again $|G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) - G(\omega)| > \gamma^L$, then

$$\begin{aligned} G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega) &= G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - G(\omega) + G(\omega) - G_L^{y_j}(\omega) + G_L^{y_j}(\omega) \\ &\leq G_L^{y_j}(\omega) - y_{j-1} + \gamma^L + y_j < G_L^{y_{j-1}}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

due to the assumed lower bound on $y_j - y_{j-1}$, which is again a contradiction in itself. \square

Hence, in both cases the numerical approximation of the rare event probability $P_L = \mathbb{P}(F^L)$ on level L can be written as a product of intermediate failure set probabilities as

$$(3.16) \quad P_L = \prod_{j=1}^K \mathbb{P}(F_j^L \mid F_{j-1}^L).$$

Finally, given estimators \hat{P}_j for $\mathbb{P}(F_j^L \mid F_{j-1}^L)$, we define the subset simulation estimator as

$$(3.17) \quad \hat{P}^{\text{SuS}} = \prod_{j=1}^K \hat{P}_j.$$

In general, this is a biased estimator for P_L , but it can be shown that it is asymptotically unbiased [5]. We will return to this in Section 4. For simplicity, we will omit the dependence on y_j and write $G_\ell(\omega)$ instead of $G_\ell^{y_j}(\omega)$ in the following. This is also the case when referring to Assumption 2.2 being satisfied.

3.4. Adaptive Multilevel Subset Simulation. We will now go one step further and consider the sequence of failure sets

$$F_j^{\text{ML}} = \{\omega : G_{\ell_j}(\omega) \leq y_j\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, K,$$

where each G_{ℓ_j} is computed only to tolerance γ^{ℓ_j} with $\ell_j \leq L$, and y_j and ℓ_j are adaptively chosen. Typically $\ell_j \geq \ell_{j-1}$ and $\ell_K = L$.

Such a multilevel strategy was also at the heart of [37], but there the thresholds y_j were chosen to roughly balance the contributions from the individual subsets, i.e., $\hat{P}_1 \approx \hat{P}_2 \approx \dots \approx \hat{P}_K$, as in classical subset simulation. This reduces the number of expensive fine resolution samples only by a linear factor $\mathcal{O}(K)$. Furthermore, without any further conditions the crucial subset property $F_j^{\text{ML}} \subset F_{j-1}^{\text{ML}}$ cannot be guaranteed. Thus, the focus in [37] is on estimating the correction factor that arises due to the loss of the subset property.

To circumvent this problem, in the following lemma we propose a method whereby the thresholds y_j are chosen adaptively, to maintain the subset property. Crucially, we exploit here the sample-wise error bounds in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

LEMMA 3.2. *Consider the sequence F_j^{ML} , $j = 1, \dots, K$, where either Assumption 2.1 or Assumption 2.2 is satisfied. Let $y_K = 0$ and $y_0 = \infty$, and choose $y_j = y_{j+1} + (\gamma^{\ell_j} + \gamma^{\ell_{j+1}}) > 0$, for $j = K - 1, \dots, 1$. Then, the subset property $F_{j+1}^{\text{ML}} \subset F_j^{\text{ML}}$ holds.*

Proof. First suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Then

$$(3.18) \quad |G_{\ell_j}(\omega) - G_{\ell_{j+1}}(\omega)| \leq |G(\omega) - G_{\ell_j}(\omega)| + |G(\omega) - G_{\ell_{j+1}}(\omega)| \leq (\gamma^{\ell_j} + \gamma^{\ell_{j+1}}),$$

and hence, if $G_{\ell_{j+1}}(\omega) \leq y_{j+1}$ then

$$(3.19) \quad G_{\ell_j}(\omega) \leq G_{\ell_{j+1}}(\omega) + (\gamma^{\ell_j} + \gamma^{\ell_{j+1}}) \leq y_{j+1} + (\gamma^{\ell_j} + \gamma^{\ell_{j+1}}) = y_j,$$

which concludes the proof for Assumption 2.1.

The proof for Assumption 2.2 then follows directly since $y_j - y_{j-1} \geq 2\gamma^{\ell_j}$. \square

For simplicity, we assume that $K = L$ and that $\ell_j = j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, K$. The rare event probability can then be written as

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbb{P}(F_L^{\text{ML}}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} \mid F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}}),$$




FIGURE 3.2. Illustration of the choice of failure thresholds in Lemma 3.2, which guarantee the subset property $F_{\ell+1}^{ML} \subset F_{\ell}^{ML}$. It holds, when $y_{\ell} - y_{\ell+1} = \gamma^{\ell+1} + \gamma^{\ell}$ and $|G_{\ell}(\omega) - G_{\ell+1}(\omega)| \leq \gamma^{\ell+1} + \gamma^{\ell}$ as chosen in Lemma 3.2 (left plot). If $y_{\ell} - y_{\ell+1} < \gamma^{\ell+1} + \gamma^{\ell}$, then Lemma 3.2 does not apply. In particular, for too small choices of $y_{\ell} - y_{\ell+1}$ we may find $\omega \in \Omega$ such that $G_{\ell+1}(\omega) \leq y_{\ell+1}$, but $G_{\ell}(\omega) > y_{\ell}$, as illustrated by the red zone (in the right plot).




FIGURE 3.3. Illustration of the shrinkage of the subsets F_{ℓ}^{ML} with increasing ℓ .

where $F_{\ell}^{ML} = \{\omega : G_{\ell}(\omega) \leq y_{\ell}\}$. However, this does not preclude us from using more than L subsets. If the first intermediate failure set F_1^{ML} is still a rare event, we can estimate $\mathbb{P}(F_1^{ML} | F_0^{ML}) = \mathbb{P}(F_1^{ML})$ using classical subset simulation with an additional K_1 subsets instead of plain MC, but with all evaluations of the limit state function on those additional K_1 subsets only computed to an accuracy of γ in Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2.

Let \hat{P}_1 be an estimator for $\mathbb{P}(F_1^{ML}) = \mathbb{P}(F_1^{ML} | F_0^{ML})$ using standard MC or classical subset simulation on discretisation level $\ell = 1$. For $\ell > 1$ we assume as above that we are given estimators \hat{P}_{ℓ} for $\mathbb{P}(F_{\ell}^{ML} | F_{\ell-1}^{ML})$, which we will show in the following can be constructed by MCMC sampling. We define the multilevel subset simulation estimator by

$$(3.21) \quad \hat{P}^{ML} = \hat{P}_1 \prod_{\ell=2}^L \hat{P}_{\ell}.$$

In practice, we propose to apply classical subset simulation for the estimation of \hat{P}_1 .

An illustration of the idea behind Lemma 3.2 is given in Figure 3.2. An additional benefit of the choice of thresholds in Lemma 3.2 is that the measure of F_{ℓ}^{ML} shrinks geometrically as ℓ increases. See Figure 3.3 for an illustration. Thus, $\mathbb{P}(F_{\ell}^{ML} | F_{\ell-1}^{ML}) \rightarrow 1$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ which reduces the variance on the latter subsets that have to be computed to higher accuracy. As a consequence, significantly fewer samples have to be computed at high accuracy reducing the overall complexity of the estimator dramatically. We will return to this point in Section 5.

The multilevel subset simulation algorithm for \hat{P}^{ML} is summarised in Algorithm A.1 in Appendix A. To estimate the conditional probabilities in (3.20) a MCMC algorithm is used, which will be described in the following section. We have further included an adaptive choice of N_{ℓ} in Algorithm A.1 in order to verify the required tolerance w.r.t. the c.o.v. $\delta(\hat{P})$, where sufficient bounds on $\delta(\hat{P})$ can be estimated via (5.1).

Algorithm 4.1 Parallel One-Path algorithm [POP].

- 1: Given a seed $X_{0,0} \sim X$
- 2: **for** $j = 0, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
- 3: **for** $i = 0, \dots, N_{j+1} - 1$ **do**
- 4: Generate $Y_{j,i} \sim Y$,
- 5: Shake and accept/reject $X_{j,i+1} = M_j^S(X_{j,i}, Y_{j,i})$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Estimate the probability of subset F_{j+1} by

$$\widehat{P}_{j+1} = \frac{1}{N_{j+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{N_{j+1}-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{j+1}}(X_{j,k}),$$

- 8: $i_j = \arg \min\{k \mid X_{k,j} \in A_{j+1}\}$
 - 9: Define initial state for next level $X_{j+1,0} = X_{j,i_j}$
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **Result:** $\widehat{P} = \prod_{j=1}^K \widehat{P}_j$
-

4. Shaking Transformations and Asymptotic Convergence. From the above discussion we see that a crucial component of any subset simulation is an efficient estimator for the conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$, for $j > 1$. In other words, we need to generate samples from the pdf given in (3.11). Due to the small probability of failure, standard MC sampling is infeasible. Instead, several authors have developed MCMC algorithms [5, 32, 3]. Here, we use the general, parallel, one-path (POP) algorithm based on shaking transformations introduced in [24] and further developed in [1]. The key idea is to build one Markov chain, exploring the space through shaking transformations and moving from the coarsest subset to the finest via a sequence of rejection operators.

The shaking transformation of a random variable X with respect to the random variable Y , acting on a measurable space $(\mathbb{X}, \mathcal{X})$ and a measurable space $(\mathbb{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, respectively, can be defined as a measurable mapping $S : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ that satisfies

$$(4.1) \quad (X, S(X, Y)) = (S(X, Y), X)$$

in distribution. Assuming that the rare event and the corresponding intermediate subsets can be written as events of X , i.e.,

$$F = \{X \in A\}, \quad F_j = \{X \in A_j\}, \quad \text{such that } A, A_j \in \mathcal{X}, \quad j = 1, \dots, K,$$

the shaking transformation will act as the proposal in the constructed MCMC algorithm. In order to force the Markov chain to explore the subset F_j , we define the rejection operator

$$M_j^S : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}, \quad \text{with } M_j^S(x, y) = S(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{S(x, y) \in A_j} + x \mathbb{1}_{S(x, y) \notin A_j}.$$

The proposed MCMC algorithm in the earlier multilevel subset simulation paper [37] is based on a preconditioned Crank-Nicholson (pCN) [30, 18] proposal which can in fact be written as a shaking transformation and hence the theoretical results in [24] can be applied. The property of being a shaking transformation is related to the detailed balance condition. This observation has been made and verified already in [1, Thm. 8]. The general POP algorithm is given in Algorithm 4.1.

Assuming that the resulting Markov chains $(X_{j,i})_{i \geq 0}$ are π_j -irreducible and Harris recurrent under a small set condition, the POP algorithm converges in the sense that for every j

Algorithm 4.2 Parallel One-Path algorithm based on Gaussian transformation.

- 1: Given a seed $\Theta_{0,0} \sim \Theta$ and a correlation parameter $\eta \in [0, 1]$
- 2: **for** $j = 0, \dots, K - 1$ **do**
- 3: **for** $i = 0, \dots, N_{j+1} - 1$ **do**
- 4: Generate $Y_{j,i} \sim \Theta$,
- 5: Shake and accept/reject $\Theta_{j,i+1} = M_j^{S_\eta}(\Theta_{j,i}, Y_{j,i})$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: Estimate the probability of subsets F_{j+1} by

$$\hat{P}_{j+1} = \frac{1}{N_{j+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{N_{j+1}-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{j+1}}(T(\Theta_{j,k})),$$

- 8: $i_j = \arg \min \{k \mid T(\Theta_{j,k}) \in A_{j+1}\}$
 - 9: Define initial state for next level $\Theta_{j+1,0} = \Theta_{j,i_j}$
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **Result:** $\hat{P} = \prod_{j=1}^K \hat{P}_j$
-

there exists a constant $C_j > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\hat{P}_j - \mathbb{P}(X \in A_{j+1} \mid X \in A_j)|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_j}{N_j}.$$

In [1] the authors include a model for X via Gaussian transformations which has also been considered in [32]. We consider X modelled through a one-to-one transformation T as

$$X(\omega) = T(\Theta(\omega)), \quad \omega \in \Omega, \quad T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{X} \text{ measurable,}$$

where $\Theta \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{\mathbb{R}^d})$. The underlying rare event can then be formulated as

$$A = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid \varphi(x, \bar{y}) \leq 0\}, \quad \varphi : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

where φ is non-increasing in the second component in the sense that $\varphi(x, y) \geq \varphi(x, y')$, for any $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $y \geq y'$, and the convention $\varphi(x, \infty) := -\infty$ is assumed. Further, we assume that φ is measurable in the first component. The nested subsets are built through a sequence of level parameters $\bar{y} := y_K < \dots < y_k < \dots < y_0 \leq \infty$ by

$$(4.2) \quad A_j = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid \varphi(x, y_j) \leq 0\} \in \mathcal{X},$$

such that

$$A := A_K \subset \dots \subset A_j \subset \dots \subset A_0 := \mathbb{X}.$$

Note that a special case is $\varphi(x, y) := G(x) - y$ for a model functional $G : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, connecting the presented approach to the setting considered in the previous sections. The above considered sequence of subsets F_j can then be written as $F_j = \{X \in A_j\} \in \Sigma$.

Consider the shaking transformation

$$S_\eta(x, y) = \sqrt{1 - \eta^2}x + \eta y,$$

which obviously satisfies (4.1), and let Y be an independent copy of Θ . The shaking transformation (with rejection) is now defined as

$$M_j^{S_\eta} : \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \\ (x, y) \mapsto S_\eta(x, y) \mathbb{1}_{T(S_\eta(x, y)) \in A_j} + x \mathbb{1}_{T(S_\eta(x, y)) \notin A_j}. \end{cases}$$

We note that this is in fact equivalent to using the pCN approach, which is in detailed balance with the prior. This has the advantage that the acceptance rate does not decrease with the dimension, which is the case, e.g., for traditional random walk proposals. The POP algorithm is then of very similar form as one of the algorithms proposed in [32] to generate samples from the conditional pdf π_{j-1} . For completeness, details are provided in Algorithm 4.2. Under certain assumptions geometric convergence of the resulting estimator can be verified.

THEOREM 4.1 ([1, Thm. 8]). *Let $j \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$ be fixed and consider the Markov chain $(\Theta_{j,i})_{i \geq 0}$ resulting from Algorithm 4.2. Assume that*

$$(4.3) \quad \sup_{\{\theta \mid T(\theta) \in A_j\}} \mathbb{P}(S(\theta, Y) \notin A_j) = \delta_1 < 1$$

and let $c \geq 2$ and $q \geq 2$. Define $V(\theta) = \exp(c \sum_{k=1}^d \theta_k)$ and assume that the initial condition $\Theta_{j,0}$ is independent of the future evolution of the Markov chain and such that $\mathbb{E}[V(\Theta_{j,0})] < +\infty$. Then, there exists $C > 0$ and a geometric rate $r \in (0, 1)$ such that for any measurable function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|g(\theta)|}{V^{1/q}(\theta)} < +\infty$$

it holds true that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N g(\Theta_{j,i}) - \mathbb{E}[g(\Theta) \mid T(\Theta) \in A_j] \right|^q \right] \leq CN_j^{-q/2},$$

and $|\mathbb{E}[g(\Theta_{j,N})] - \mathbb{E}[g(\Theta) \mid T(\Theta) \in A_j]| \leq Cr^n$.

In this setting, the estimator \widehat{P}_j of $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$ is then given by

$$(4.4) \quad \widehat{P}_j = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{\{T(\Theta_{j-1,i}) \in A_j\}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(\varphi(T(\Theta_{j-1,i}), y_j)).$$

Note that through defining the limit-to-state function pointwise in y_ℓ by $\varphi(x, y_\ell) := G_\ell(x) - y_\ell$, following Lemma 3.2 the subset property holds and Theorem 4.1 applies to our adaptive multilevel subset simulation.

Since the sequences of samples $\{\Theta_{j-1,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ are dependent, we use convergence diagnostics to estimate the autocorrelation factor in the sequence. The autocorrelation factor is a measure of the dependence in the sequence. Following [5], we use multiple chains to compute an estimate of the autocorrelation factor ϕ_j . The total number of samples N to achieve a certain accuracy of the estimator in (4.4) is determined by the c.o.v.

$$(4.5) \quad \delta(\widehat{P}_j) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\pi_{j-1}} \left[(\widehat{P}_j - \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}))^2 \right]}.$$

Expanding the square of the c.o.v., we can estimate

$$(4.6) \quad \delta(\widehat{P}_j)^2 = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{j-1}}[\widehat{P}_j]}{N \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{j-1}}[\widehat{P}_j]} \approx \frac{1 - \widehat{P}_j}{N \widehat{P}_j} (1 + \phi_j),$$

with autocorrelation factor $\phi_j = 0$ for i.i.d. samples and $\phi_j > 0$ for dependent samples.

5. Complexity Analysis. We will now bound the complexity of the new estimators.

5.1. Complexity of subset simulation with selective refinement. The square of the coefficient of variation $\delta(\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}})^2$ of the subset simulation estimator defined in (3.5) can be expanded as in (3.4) into the sum of a bias term (identical to the bias term for MC) and the relative variance $\mathbb{V}_\pi[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}}]/P_L^2$. The bias term can again be made less than $\text{TOL}^2/2$ by choosing L as before in (3.5). Moreover, applying results derived in [5] it turns out that

$$(5.1) \quad \widehat{\delta}_L^{\text{SuS}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{(\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P_L)^2}{P_L^2}\right] \leq \frac{\text{TOL}^2}{2} \quad \text{if} \quad \widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_j)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_{j-1}}\left[\frac{(\widehat{P}_j - P_j)^2}{P_j^2}\right] \propto K^{-s} \text{TOL}^2,$$

where $s = 1$ if the estimators \widehat{P}_j , $j = 1, \dots, K$, are uncorrelated and $s = 2$ if they are fully correlated. To simplify notation, the biased densities defined by F_{j-1}^L instead of F_{j-1} in (3.11) are again denoted by π_{j-1} suppressing the dependence on L .

Let us now estimate the cost for the particular case where \widehat{P}_j is chosen to be the MCMC estimator for $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})$ described in Section 4 with N_j samples. As it has been shown in [5] the c.o.v. can be computed as

$$(5.2) \quad \delta(\widehat{P}_j)^2 = \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})}{N_j \mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1})} (1 + \phi_j)$$

where ϕ_j is the autocorrelation factor of the Markov chain produced by Algorithm 4.2. We note that (5.2) crucially depends on the fact that the underlying Markov chain generated through the MCMC algorithm is ergodic. The ergodicity of the Markov chain can be obtained from Theorem 4.1. In the following complexity analysis, we assume that (5.2) is satisfied. Moreover, we assume an adaptive selection of the failure sets has been applied, e.g. as described in [5], where the values of y_j are chosen in the course of the algorithm, such that $\widehat{P}_j \approx p_0$, for all $j = 1, \dots, K$. It was shown in [42] that the best performance is achieved for values of the constant $p_0 \in [0.1, 0.3]$. For simplicity, we assume (without loss of generality) that $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}) = p_0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, K$.

THEOREM 5.1. *Suppose that*

1. *Assumption 2.1 is satisfied for some $q \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$,*
2. *the subsets are chosen such that $\mathbb{P}(F_j | F_{j-1}) = p_0 := P_L^{1/K}$, for all $j = 1, \dots, K - 1$, and*
3. *there exists a constant $\phi < \infty$ such that $\phi_j \leq \phi$ in (5.2), for all $j = 1, \dots, K$.*

Then, for any $\text{TOL} > 0$ the maximum discretisation level L and the numbers of samples $\{N_j\}$ can be chosen such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P|^2}{P^2}\right] \leq \text{TOL}^2$$

with a cost that is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}}]\right] \leq c_4 \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \text{TOL}^{-(2+q)} \left(\log(P_L^{-1})\right)^{s+1}$$

for some constant $c_4 > 0$. Here, $s = 1$ if the estimators \widehat{P}_j , $j = 1, \dots, K$, are uncorrelated and $s = 2$ if they are fully correlated.

If in addition Assumption 2.2 is satisfied, the cost can be bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}}]\right] \leq c_4 \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, 1+q)} \left(\log(P_L^{-1})\right)^{s+1}.$$

Proof. We first split

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P|^2}{P^2} \right] = \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P]}{P} \right)^2 + \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P_L)^2}{P_L^2} \right],$$

where the first term can be bounded by

$$(5.4) \quad \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P]}{P} \right)^2 \leq 2 \left(\frac{P_L - P}{P} \right)^2 + 2 \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P_L]}{P_L} \right)^2.$$

To bound the bias error we choose $L \propto \log(\text{TOL}^{-1})$ as in (3.5). Due to the assumptions of the theorem we can choose $N_j = N$ uniformly across all subsets. The expressions

$$A := \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P_L]}{P_L} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P_L)^2}{P_L^2} \right]$$

have been analysed in [5], where it has been shown that

$$A \leq \sum_{i,j=1, j>i}^K \delta(\widehat{P}_i) \delta(\widehat{P}_j) + o\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad B \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^K \delta(\widehat{P}_i) \delta(\widehat{P}_j) + o\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$$

if the estimators $\{\widehat{P}_j\}$ are correlated, whereas

$$A \leq \sum_{j=1}^K \delta(\widehat{P}_j)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad B \leq \sum_{j=1}^K \delta(\widehat{P}_j)^2$$

if the estimators $\{\widehat{P}_j\}$ are uncorrelated. If N is now chosen such that

$$(5.5) \quad \delta(\widehat{P}_j)^2 \leq c_3 K^{-s} \frac{\text{TOL}^2 P^2}{5 P_L^2}$$

it follows that

$$(5.6) \quad A \leq c_3 \frac{\text{TOL}^2 P^2}{5 P_L^2} \quad \text{and} \quad B \leq c_3 \frac{\text{TOL}^2 P^2}{5 P_L^2}.$$

Taking into account the choice of L in (3.5) and combining (5.3), (5.4) and (5.6), finally leads to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}} - P|^2}{P^2} \right] \leq \text{TOL}^2.$$

Now, using the third assumption of the theorem, i.e., that $\phi_j \leq \phi$, a sufficient condition on the number of samples to ensure that the bound in (5.5) holds is

$$N \propto \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} K^s \text{TOL}^{-2},$$

where the proportionality constant depends on p_0 , ϕ and c_3 , but is independent of TOL and K . Then, recalling that $P_L = p_0^K$ and thus $K \propto \log(P_L^{-1})$ it follows that

$$N \propto \left(\log(P_L^{-1}) \right)^{s+1} \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \text{TOL}^{-2}.$$

Hence, combining this with the assumed bound on the cost per sample in Assumption 2.1 and using the fact that $L \propto \log(\text{TOL}^{-1})$ implies $\gamma^{-qL} \propto \text{TOL}^q$, the total cost to compute the subset simulation estimator can be bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}}] \right] \leq KNc_0\gamma^{-Lq} \leq c_4 \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \text{TOL}^{-(2+q)} \left(\log(P_L^{-1}) \right)^{s+1},$$

for some constant $c_4 > 0$. Under the selective refinement Assumption 2.2 and for $q > 1$, we can even bound the computational costs by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{SuS}}] \right] \leq KNc_0(1 + \gamma^{(1-q)L}) \leq c_4 \frac{P_L^2}{P^2} \text{TOL}^{-\max(2,1+q)} \left(\log(P_L^{-1}) \right)^{s+1}. \quad \square$$

5.2. Complexity of adaptive multilevel subset simulation. We now turn our attention to the complexity of the adaptive multilevel subset estimator defined in (3.21). We will make use of the following convergence property in the analysis below, assuming that we can control the ratio of the subset probabilities sufficiently well.

LEMMA 5.2. *Suppose Assumption 2.1 is satisfied and y_ℓ is defined as in Lemma 3.2. Furthermore, we assume that*

$$(5.7) \quad \frac{\mathbb{P}(G \leq x_1)}{\mathbb{P}(G \leq x_2)} \leq 1 + \tilde{c}|x_1 - x_2| \log(P^{-1}),$$

for $x_1 > x_2 > 0$ and $\tilde{c} > 0$ independent of P . Then the difference between the intermediate probabilities can be bounded in the following way

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})}{\mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})} = \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell | G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1})}{\mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell | G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1})} \leq c_5 \gamma^\ell \log(P^{-1}).$$

Proof. Applying the subset property we obtain

$$\frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell | G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1})}{\mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell | G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1})} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1})}{\mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)} - 1 = \frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1}) - \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)}{\mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)}.$$

First, note that by Assumption 2.1 we have $G_\ell \leq G + \gamma^\ell$ and $G - \gamma^{\ell-1} \leq G_{\ell-1}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell) &\geq \mathbb{P}(G + \gamma^\ell \leq y_\ell) = \mathbb{P}(G \leq y_\ell - \gamma^\ell), \\ \mathbb{P}(G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(G - \gamma^{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1}) = \mathbb{P}(G \leq y_{\ell-1} + \gamma^{\ell-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By definition we have $y_{\ell-1} + \gamma^\ell = y_\ell + (\gamma^\ell + \gamma^{\ell-1}) + \gamma^\ell$, which together with (5.7) implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1}) - \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)}{\mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)} &\leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(G \leq y_{\ell-1} + \gamma^{\ell-1}) - \mathbb{P}(G \leq y_\ell - \gamma^\ell)}{\mathbb{P}(G \leq y_\ell - \gamma^\ell)} \\ &\leq \tilde{c}(2\gamma^\ell + 2\gamma^{\ell-1}) \log(P^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\mathbb{P}(G_{\ell-1} \leq y_{\ell-1}) \geq \mathbb{P}(G_\ell \leq y_\ell)$ due to Lemma 3.2. \square

We note that the dependence on $\log(P^{-1})$ in equation (5.7) is the weakest assumption we can take in order to obtain an improvement through our proposed multilevel subset simulation strategy. However, the bound (5.7) crucially depends on the underlying state function G and one might drop the dependence on $\log(P^{-1})$ for certain models.

As in the classical subset simulation, we estimate the failure sets such that

$$(5.8) \quad \delta(\widehat{P}_\ell)^2 = \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})}{\mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})} (1 + \phi_\ell) N_\ell^{-1} \leq L^{-s} \text{TOL}^2,$$

which guarantees that the relative variance of the multilevel estimator is bounded by TOL^2 .

We finish by stating and proving the main theoretical result of the paper on the complexity of the proposed adaptive multilevel subset simulation method, with and without selective refinement, under similar assumptions made for the single-level complexity result in Theorem 5.1. Recall that we have set $K = L$ and $\ell = \ell_j = j$ for $j = 1, \dots, K$.

THEOREM 5.3. *Suppose that*

1. *Assumption 2.1 is satisfied for some $q \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and (5.7) holds,*
2. *the level thresholds y_ℓ are defined as in Lemma 3.2,*
3. *there exists a constant $\phi < \infty$ such that $\phi_\ell \leq \phi$ in (5.8), for all $\ell = 1, \dots, L$.*

Then, for any $\text{TOL} > 0$ the maximum discretisation level L and the numbers of samples $\{N_\ell\}$ can be chosen such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}} - P|^2}{P^2} \right] \leq \text{TOL}^2$$

with a cost that is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \right] \leq \begin{cases} c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, (1+q))} (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}), & s = 1, \\ c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, (1+q))} \log(\text{TOL}^{-1}) (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}), & s = 2, \end{cases}$$

for some constant $c_7 > 0$. Here, $s = 1$ if the estimators \widehat{P}_ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, L$, are uncorrelated and $s = 2$ if they are fully correlated.

If in addition Assumption 2.2 is satisfied, the cost can be bounded by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \right] \leq \begin{cases} c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, q)} (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}), & s = 1, \\ c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, q)} \log(\text{TOL}^{-1}) (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}), & s = 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The result follows similarly as the proof of Theorem 5.1 for single-level subset simulation. Note that the resulting number of samples

$$N_\ell \propto \frac{P_\ell^2}{P^2} \frac{1 - \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})}{\mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})} (1 + \phi_\ell) L^s \text{TOL}^{-2}$$

are now level dependent due to the fact that the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})$ differ in ℓ . Hence, applying Lemma 5.2 the total computational costs result in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \right] &\leq \text{TOL}^{-2} L^{s-1} (1 + \phi) \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})^{-1} (1 - \mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})) \gamma^{-\ell q}, \\ &\leq \text{TOL}^{-2} L^{s-1} (1 + \phi) \sum_{\ell=1}^L c_5 \gamma^{(1-q)\ell} \log(P^{-1}) \\ &\leq c_6 \text{TOL}^{-2} L^{s-1} (1 + \phi) (1 + \gamma^{(1-q)L}) \log(P^{-1}) \\ &\leq c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, 1+q)} L^{s-1} (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_5, c_6, c_7 > 0$. If in addition Assumption 2.2 holds the bound can be improved to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{C}[\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \right] \leq c_7 \text{TOL}^{-\max(2, q)} L^{s-1} (1 + \phi) \log(P^{-1}). \quad \square$$




FIGURE 6.1. Mean computational cost plotted against the estimated values of $\delta(\hat{P})$ (with tolerance TOL) for the toy problem in Example 1 using standard MC (expected), classical subset simulation, as well as subset simulation and multilevel subset simulation with selective refinement.

Clearly, the asymptotic complexity is significantly improved over classical subset simulation. In addition to the gains due to the level-dependent cost of the samples and the variance reduction on the rarer subsets, an additional cost reduction in practice comes from the fact that the accept/reject step for $\ell > 0$ in Algorithm 4.2 is computed to tolerance $\gamma^{\ell-1}$ and only accepted samples are then computed also to tolerance γ^ℓ . The intermediate failure thresholds and thus the failure sets F_ℓ^{ML} are defined a priori based on the value of γ . Thus, the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(F_\ell^{\text{ML}} | F_{\ell-1}^{\text{ML}})$ are problem dependent and optimal sample sizes N_ℓ – like in MLMC [22] – are difficult to compute. This would be an interesting area for future investigation.

6. Numerical Results. In the following, we consider three numerical examples with increasing difficulty. We start the experiments with a one-dimensional toy example where we can ensure Assumption 2.2. In this example, it is possible to verify the complexity results expected from Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.3 respectively. In our second example we consider a rare event estimation problem based on a Brownian motion. In this case, Assumption 2.2 does not hold almost surely but only in L^p . The results of our numerical experiments remain promising and we observe a significant improvement through our multilevel subset simulation and the incorporation of selective refinement. The last experiment is based on an elliptic PDE model and represents a more realistic scenario of application.

6.1. Example 1: Toy experiment. We start by verifying our derived complexity results on a simplified toy model. We assume that $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and define the pointwise approximation $G_\ell(\omega) := G(\omega) + \kappa(\omega)\gamma^\ell$ with $\kappa \sim \mathcal{U}(\{-1, 1\})$ such that (2.3) is obviously satisfied. Applying Algorithm 1 in [21] allows to simulate G_ℓ^y satisfying Assumption 2.2. For any accuracy level ℓ , starting on the coarsest level 1, the algorithm successively refines the accuracy until $|G_{\ell_i}^y(\omega) - y| \leq \gamma^\ell$ or $|G_{\ell_i}^y(\omega) - G(\omega)| \leq \gamma^\ell$ is satisfied. Note that in more realistic scenarios one needs a posteriori estimates of the error $|G_{\ell_i}^y(\omega) - G(\omega)|$, see Section 6.3 for more details. In this simplified example we increase the accuracy until $|G_{\ell_i}^y(\omega) - y| \leq \gamma^\ell$ or $\ell_i = \ell$ since we know that $|G_\ell(\omega) - G(\omega)| = \gamma^\ell$. Let $\gamma = 1/2$ and assume that $q = 2$ for the expected costs in (2.4).

The aim is to estimate the failure probability

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbb{P}(G \leq -3.8) \approx 7.23 \cdot 10^{-5}.$$

We compare standard MC, the classical subset simulation with and without selective

refinement, as well as our proposed multilevel subset simulation. For the subset simulation, we apply $K = 5$ subsets such that all $\mathbb{P}(F_j \mid F_{j-1}) \approx [0.1, 0.2]$, where we choose the threshold values $(y_5, y_4, y_3, y_2, y_1, y_0) = (-3.8, -3.3, -2.8, -2, -1.3, \infty)$. In contrast, for the multilevel subset simulation we choose y_ℓ following Lemma 3.2 and let the number of subsets increase according to $L \propto \log(\text{TOL}^{-1})$. For the estimation of \tilde{P}_1 in (3.21) we apply a standard MC estimate. The highest accuracy level L and the numbers of samples on each subset (N_j and N_ℓ resp.) are chosen according to the assumptions in Theorems 5.1 and 5.3, respectively. Fig. 6.1 shows the estimated c.o.v. $\delta(\hat{P})$ using the true reference probability of equation (6.1) for the different applied estimators plotted against the computational cost. We have used 100 runs for building the estimates of $\delta(\hat{P})$ for each algorithm.

6.2. Example 2: Brownian motion. In our second numerical example, we consider estimating the probability that a standard Brownian motion drops below a threshold value within a certain time interval. To be more precise, let $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a Brownian motion. We are interested in the estimation of

$$\mathbb{P}(F) = \mathbb{P}(\min_{t \in [0,1]} B_t \leq -4),$$

where we can compute the reference value of $\mathbb{P}(F)$ by

$$\mathbb{P}(\min_{t \in [0,1]} B_t \leq -4) = 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(B_1 \leq -4) \approx 6.3 \cdot 10^{-5}.$$

We define the limit state function pointwise by

$$G(\omega) := \min_{t \in [0,1]} B_t(\omega) + 4,$$

and introduce approximations of the limit state function such that

$$G_\ell(\omega) = \min_{t \in T_\ell} B_t(\omega) + 4, \quad T_\ell = \left\{ \frac{i}{2^\ell} \mid i = 0, \dots, 2^\ell \right\}.$$

The resulting approximation error can be bounded in L^p by

$$(6.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[|G - G_\ell|^p]^{1/p} = \mathbb{E}[|\min_{t \in [0,1]} B_t(\omega) - \min_{t \in T_\ell} B_t(\omega)|^p]^{1/p} \leq C_p 2^{-\ell/2},$$

for some constant $C_p > 0$ [34]. The Brownian motion is generated path-wise through a Karhunen-Loève expansion

$$B_t(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \xi_i(\omega) \varphi_i(t),$$

with $\xi_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{(i-1/2)^2})$ and $\varphi_i(t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \sin((i-1/2)\pi t)$. See Fig. 6.2 for various realizations of the Brownian motion conditioned on the different chosen subsets, i.e. for different level thresholds y_j .

Following the error bound (6.2), we consider $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and set again $L \propto \log(\text{TOL}^{-1})$ for the number of evaluated points of the Brownian motion, depending on the considered tolerance value TOL. The number of subsets in the classical subset simulation is fixed to $K_{\text{SL}} = 5$, while $K_{\text{ML}} = \max(L(\text{TOL}) - 1, 8)$ subsets are considered in the multilevel formulation, choosing y_j according to Lemma 3.2 and the following values of ℓ_j for the failure sets $F_j = \{\omega : G_{\ell_j}^{y_j}(\omega) \leq y_j\}$:

j	1	2	3	4	5	...	$L-1$
ℓ_j	4	4	4	5	6	...	L




FIGURE 6.2. Paths of the Brownian motion conditioned on the different subsets F_j .




FIGURE 6.3. Mean computational cost plotted against the estimated values of $\delta(\hat{P})$ (with tolerance TOL) for the Brownian motion in Example 2 using standard MC (expected), classical subset simulation, as well as subset simulation and multilevel subset simulation with selective refinement.

The MC estimates for the multilevel estimator ML are built using 100 paths, resulting in

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \approx 5.11 \cdot 10^{-5} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(\hat{P}^{\text{ML}}) \approx 0.0534 \leq \text{TOL} =: 0.1.$$

To compare the proposed multilevel method with classical subset simulation in Fig. 6.3 we compare the resulting costs for various choices of tolerance values TOL. Note that we have estimated the expected number of samples for the classical MC estimator as $N = (\text{TOL})^{-2} P^{-1}$.

6.3. Example 3: Elliptic PDE. Finally, we consider the following diffusion equation, which is used to model stationary Darcy flow:

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & -\nabla \cdot A \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}, \\ & \text{subject to } u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_1, \quad u = 1 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_2, \quad \nu \cdot A \nabla u = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_3 \cup \Gamma_4, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{D} = (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ is a unit square and $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$ are the left, right, upper, and lower boundaries, respectively. The permeability $A(x, \omega)$ is a log-normal field. In particular, $\log(A(x, \omega))$ is a stationary, zero mean Gaussian field $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathcal{C})$ with covariance operator $\mathcal{C} = (-\Delta + \tau^2 \cdot \text{id})^{-\alpha}$, where Δ denotes the Laplacian operator equipped with Neumann boundary




FIGURE 6.4. Two realizations of the log-normal permeability field $A(x, \omega)$ (left) and the corresponding solution for the Darcy flow problem (6.3) (right) in Example 3. The first realization is sampled from the whole probability space, whereas the second one is a rare event realization.




FIGURE 6.5. Different levels of refinement of the FE mesh for the Darcy flow problem (6.3) in Example 3.

conditions and we set $\tau = 0.1$ and $\alpha = 1$. The random field has been generated path-wise through a truncated Karhunen-Loève expansion. The limit state function is chosen to be

$$(6.4) \quad G(u) = y - \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B u(x) dx,$$

for $B = [0.4, 0.6] \times [0.9, 0.99] \subset \mathcal{D}$, i.e., ‘failure’ occurs when the mean of u over the subdomain B exceeds y , with $|\cdot|$ denoting the area of B .

Now, given a sample $\omega \in \Omega$ and defining $H_D^1(\mathcal{D}) = \{v \in H^1(\mathcal{D}) : v|_{\Gamma_1} = 0, v|_{\Gamma_2} = 1\}$ and $H_0^1(\mathcal{D}) = \{v \in H^1(\mathcal{D}) : v|_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2} = 0\}$, the weak form of (6.3) is equivalent to finding $u \in H_D^1(\mathcal{D})$ such that

$$(6.5) \quad a(\omega; u, v) = \int_{\mathcal{D}} A(x, \omega) \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx = 0, \quad \text{for all } v \in H_0^1(\mathcal{D}).$$

We approximate the limit state function and the weak formulation with a finite element (FE) method. Let \mathcal{T}_h be a uniform triangulation of \mathcal{D} , and suppose \mathcal{V}_h denotes the associated P_1 -Lagrange FE space. The FE approximation of the solution u of (6.5) on \mathcal{T}_h is then defined to be the $u_h \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap H_D^1(\mathcal{D})$ satisfying

$$(6.6) \quad a(\omega; u_h, v_h) = 0 \quad \text{for all } v_h \in \mathcal{V}_h \cap H_0^1(\mathcal{D}).$$

j	1	2	3	4	5	j	1	2	3	4
ℓ_j	2	2	2	3	4	ℓ_j	4	4	4	4
P_j	0.05	0.13	0.17	0.38	0.83	\bar{P}_j	0.13	0.1	0.16	0.07
α_j	—	0.45	0.32	0.22	0.18	α_j	—	0.5	0.38	0.29

TABLE 6.1

Chosen level (ℓ_j), mean probability (P_j) and mean acceptance rates (α_j) for each subset j after 100 runs of the adaptive multilevel subset simulation estimator (left) and of the single-level subset simulation estimator (right), both with selective refinement.

The approximation G_L of G is defined as

$$G_L = y - \frac{1}{|B|} \int_B u_L(x) dx,$$

where u_L is the first solution on a sequence of uniformly refined meshes \mathcal{T}_h with $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $|G - G_L| \leq \gamma^L$ or $|G - G_L| \leq |G_L|$. To estimate the error in the limit state function G_L we use a-posteriori estimates, in particular the simple bound

$$|G(\omega) - G_\ell(\omega)| \leq (1 - \gamma^{-1})^{-1} |G_{\ell+1}(\omega) - G_\ell(\omega)|.$$

which can be derived simply via the triangle inequality from Assumption 2.2. We used the PDE `TOOLBOX` of MATLAB for our implementation. In the limit state function defined in (6.4), we let $y = 0.92$ and choose $\gamma = 1/4$.

For the proposed single-level and multilevel estimator we choose L , N_j , N_ℓ according to Theorems 5.1 and 5.3, with a fixed number of subsets $K = 4$ for the classical (single level) subset simulation. The number of subsets with the corresponding accuracy levels ℓ_j for our multilevel subset simulation on the highest evaluated accuracy are presented in Table 6.1 (left). Moreover, the Table shows the mean probability for each level and the mean acceptance rate for the Markov chains. The details for single-level subset simulation are presented in Table 6.1 (right).

After 100 runs of this setting for the multilevel estimator ML, the estimated mean rare event probability and relative variance resulted in

$$(6.7) \quad \mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{P}^{\text{ML}}] \approx 1.8 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(\hat{P}^{\text{ML}}) \approx 0.172.$$

and for the classical subset simulation estimator SuS

$$(6.8) \quad \mathbb{E}_\pi[\hat{P}^{\text{SuS}}] \approx 1.5 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(\hat{P}^{\text{SuS}}) \approx 0.28.$$

For each level ℓ in the multilevel subset simulation, the mean number of samples computed on each mesh level k are presented in Table 6.2 (left). In the selective refinement process, the computation for each sample always starts on mesh level $k = 1$ and the numbers on the lower mesh levels are the cumulative ones. Furthermore, the table shows the normalized theoretical cost c_k (assuming an optimal PDE solver, such as an algebraic multigrid method) for one sample on each mesh level. It can be seen clearly that the vast majority of samples are generated from inexpensive low-resolution simulations. Since the chosen regime is not yet optimally balancing the cost, there is still potential for significant further gains in practice.

Finally, a comparison of the normalized cost for all the estimators is presented in Fig. 6.6 for various choices of the tolerance TOL. The vastly superior performance of the proposed multilevel estimator is again apparent, e.g., for TOL = 0.25 there is a more than twenty-fold gain in efficiency compared to subset simulation with selective refinement and a more than

$j \setminus k$	1	2	3	4	$j \setminus k$	1	2	3	4
1	3602	610.7	0	0	1	1602	523.5	169.3	30.2
2	3602	1902.9	0	0	2	1602	1117.5	569.4	107.8
3	3602	1564	0	0	3	1602	1054.1	567.2	114.1
4	2002	1071.6	326.2	0	4	1602	986.1	474.4	83.1
5	502	281	108.5	15.2					
Total	13310	5430.2	434.7	15.2	Total	6408	3681.2	1780.3	335.2
c_k	1	16	256	4096	c_k	1	16	256	4096

TABLE 6.2

Mean number of samples computed on mesh level k for subset j , for adaptive multilevel subset simulation (left) and single-level subset simulation (right), both with selective refinement, estimated from 100 runs and summed up over all mesh levels. The tables also show the total number of samples and the (normalized) theoretical cost per sample c_k on each mesh level.




FIGURE 6.6. Mean computational cost plotted against the estimated values of $\delta(\hat{P})$ (with tolerance TOL) for the Darcy flow problem (6.3) in Example 3 using classical subset simulation, as well as subset simulation and adaptive multilevel subset simulation with selective refinement.

200-fold gain compared to standard subset simulation with all samples being computed on the finest mesh level. Asymptotically the cost does appear to grow as predicted in Theorem 5.3, even though Assumption 2.2 (as in Example 1) does not hold uniformly in ω here.

Note that the selective refinement approach alone also leads to clear gains over standard subset simulation and to a better asymptotic rate as predicted in Theorem 5.1.

7. Conclusions. In this paper, we propose a new multilevel subset simulation estimator of the probability of rare events. By constructing a hierarchy of numerical approximations to a model of a complex physical process, and by using a posteriori error estimation, the subset property of the intermediate failure domains is preserved. The estimator was tested in a Darcy flow problem, for which it reduced the cost compared to the classical subset simulation estimator by more than a factor of 200 for a practically relevant relative error tolerance of 25%. Given the wide applicability of subset simulation, several problems beyond the simulation of rare events may also benefit from this dramatic increase in efficiency.

Acknowledgements. The work of RS is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 218/1 - 390900948 (the Heidelberg STRUCTURES Excellence Cluster). RS and SW acknowledge the support of the Erwin Schrödinger Institute.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. AGARWAL, S. DE MARCO, E. GOBET, AND G. LIU, *Rare event simulation related to financial risks: efficient estimation and sensitivity analysis*, HAL Preprint, hal-01219616 (2017). Available at <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01219616/>.
- [2] S. AU, *Reliability-based design sensitivity by efficient simulation*, *Computers & Structures*, 83 (2005), pp. 1048–1061.
- [3] S. AU AND E. PATELLI, *Rare event simulation in finite-infinite dimensional space*, *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 148 (2016), pp. 67–77.
- [4] S. AU AND Y. WANG, *Engineering Risk Assessment with Subset Simulation*, Wiley, Singapore, 2014.
- [5] S.-K. AU AND J. L. BECK, *Estimation of small failure probabilities in high dimensions by subset simulation*, *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 16 (2001), pp. 263–277.
- [6] ———, *Subset simulation and its application to seismic risk based on dynamic analysis*, *Journal of Engineering Mechanics*, 129 (2003), pp. 901–917.
- [7] A. BARTH, C. SCHWAB, AND N. ZOLLINGER, *Multi-level Monte Carlo finite element method for elliptic PDEs with stochastic coefficients*, *Numerische Mathematik*, 119 (2011), pp. 123–161.
- [8] R. BECKER AND R. RANNACHER, *A feed-back approach to error control in finite element methods: Basic analysis and examples*, *East-West J. Numer. Math.*, 4 (1996), pp. 237–264.
- [9] J. BECT, L. LI, AND E. VAZQUEZ, *Bayesian subset simulation*, *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 5 (2017), pp. 762–786.
- [10] Z. I. BOTEV AND D. P. KROESE, *Efficient Monte Carlo simulation via the generalized splitting method*, *Statistics and Computing*, 22 (2010), pp. 1–16.
- [11] C.-E. BRÉHIER, T. LELIÈVRE, AND M. ROUSSET, *Analysis of adaptive multilevel splitting algorithms in an idealized case*, *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 19 (2015), pp. 361–394.
- [12] C. G. BUCHER, *Adaptive sampling — an iterative fast Monte Carlo procedure*, *Structural Safety*, 5 (1988), pp. 119 – 126.
- [13] C. G. BUCHER, *Asymptotic sampling for high-dimensional reliability analysis*, *Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics*, 24 (2009), pp. 504 – 510.
- [14] T. BUTLER, C. DAWSON, AND T. WILDEY, *A posteriori error analysis of stochastic differential equations using polynomial chaos expansions*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33 (2011), pp. 1267–1291.
- [15] V. CARON, A. GUYADER, M. M. ZUNIGA, AND B. TUFFIN, *Some recent results in rare event estimation*, *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 44 (2014), pp. 239–259.
- [16] F. CÉROU, P. DEL MORAL, T. FURON, AND A. GUYADER, *Sequential Monte Carlo for rare event estimation*, *Statistics and Computing*, 22 (2012), pp. 795–808.
- [17] K. A. CLIFFE, M. B. GILES, R. SCHEICHL, AND A. L. TECKENTRUP, *Multilevel Monte Carlo methods and applications to elliptic PDEs with random coefficients*, *Computing and Visualization in Science*, 14 (2011), pp. 3–15.
- [18] S. L. COTTER, G. O. ROBERTS, A. M. STUART, AND D. WHITE, *MCMC methods for functions: modifying old algorithms to make them faster*, *Statistical Science*, 28 (2013), pp. 424–446.
- [19] F. DIAZDELAO, A. GARBUNO-INIGO, S. AU, AND I. YOSHIDA, *Bayesian updating and model class selection with subset simulation*, *CMAME*, (2017), pp. 1102–1121.
- [20] D. ELFVERSON, D. ESTEP, F. HELLMAN, AND A. MÅLQVIST, *Uncertainty quantification for approximate p-quantiles for physical models with stochastic inputs*, *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 2 (2014), pp. 826–850.
- [21] D. ELFVERSON, F. HELLMAN, AND A. MÅLQVIST, *A multilevel Monte Carlo method for computing failure probabilities*, *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, 4 (2016), pp. 312–330.
- [22] M. GILES, *Multilevel Monte Carlo path simulation*, *Operations Research*, 56 (2008), pp. 607–617.
- [23] M. B. GILES AND E. SULLI, *Adjoint methods for pdes: a posteriori error analysis and postprocessing by duality*, *Acta Numerica*, 11 (2002), pp. 145–236.
- [24] E. GOBET AND G. LIU, *Rare event simulation using reversible shaking transformations*, *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 37 (2015), pp. A2295–A2316.
- [25] Z. T. GONG, F. A. DIAZDELAO, P. O. HRISTOV, AND M. BEER, *History matching with subset simulation*, *International Journal for Uncertainty Quantification*, 11 (2021), pp. 19–38.
- [26] A. GUYADER, N. HENGARTNER, AND E. MATZNER-LØBER, *Simulation and estimation of extreme quantiles and extreme probabilities*, *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 64 (2011), pp. 171–196.
- [27] A.-L. HAJI-ALI, J. SPENCE, AND A. TECKENTRUP, *Adaptive multilevel monte carlo for probabilities*, Preprint arXiv:2107.09148, (2021).
- [28] H. KAHN AND T. HARRIS, *Estimation of particle transmission by random sampling*, *Bureau of Standard Appl. Math. Series.*, 12 (1951), pp. 27–30.
- [29] P.-S. KOUTSOURELAKIS, *Accurate uncertainty quantification using inaccurate computational models*, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 31 (2009), pp. 3274–3300.
- [30] R. NEAL, *Regression and classification using Gaussian process priors*, *Bayesian Statistics*, 6 (1998), pp. 475–

- [31] T. ODEN, C. DAWSON, AND T. WILDEY, *Adaptive multiscale predictive modelling*, Acta Numerica, 27 (2018), p. 353–450.
- [32] I. PAPAIOANNOU, W. BETZ, K. ZWIRGLMAIER, AND D. STRAUB, *MCMC algorithms for subset simulation*, Probabilistic Engineering Mechanics, 41 (2015), pp. 89–103.
- [33] W. QI, Z. LU, AND C. ZHOW, *New topology optimization method for wing leading-edge ribs*, Journal of Aircraft, 48 (2011), pp. 1741–1748.
- [34] K. RITTER, *Approximation and optimization on the Wiener space*, Journal of Complexity, 6 (1990), pp. 337–364.
- [35] G. SCHÜLLER AND R. STIX, *A critical appraisal of methods to determine failure probabilities*, Structural Safety, 4 (1987), pp. 293 – 309.
- [36] M. SHINOZUKA, *Basic analysis of structural safety*, Journal of Structural Engineering, 109 (1983), pp. 721–740.
- [37] E. ULLMANN AND I. PAPAIOANNOU, *Multilevel estimation of rare events*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 3 (2015), pp. 922–953.
- [38] F. URIBE, I. PAPAIOANNOU, Y. M. MARZOUK, AND D. STRAUB, *Cross-entropy-based importance sampling with failure-informed dimension reduction for rare event simulation*, SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification, 9 (2021), pp. 818–847.
- [39] F. WAGNER, J. LATZ, I. PAPAIOANNOU, AND E. ULLMANN, *Multilevel sequential importance sampling for rare event estimation*, SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing, 42 (2020), pp. A2062–A2087.
- [40] F. WAGNER, J. LATZ, I. PAPAIOANNOU, AND E. ULLMANN, *Error analysis for probabilities of rare events with approximate models*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, 59 (2021), pp. 1948–1975.
- [41] S. XIN-SHI, Y. XIONG-QING, AND L. HONG-SHUANG, *Subset simulation for multi-objective optimisation*, Applied Mathematical Modelling, 44 (2017), pp. 425–445.
- [42] K. ZUEV, J. BECK, S. AU, AND L. KATAFYGIOTIS, *Bayesian post-processor and other enhancements of subset simulation for estimating failure probabilities in high dimensions*, Computers & Structures, 92 (2012), pp. 283–296.

Appendix A. Algorithm of adaptive multilevel subset simulation.

The following algorithm summarises the proposed adaptive multilevel subset simulation algorithm with a standard MC estimator for the first intermediate subset. To employ classical subset simulation for the estimation of $\mathbb{P}(F_1^{\text{ML}})$, it suffices to replace lines 3-14 by a single-level subset simulation which is again of the form of Algorithm 4.2 but on the coarse accuracy level $\ell = 1$.

Algorithm A.1 Adaptive multilevel Parallel One-Path algorithm based on Gaussian transformation.

- 1: Given a seed $\Theta_{0,0} \sim \Theta$ and a correlation parameter $\eta \in [0, 1]$
- 2: Determine a sequence of failure thresholds, $y_L = 0$ and $y_\ell = (\gamma^\ell + \gamma^{\ell+1}) + y_{\ell+1}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, L-1$
- 3: **for** $\ell = 0$ **do**
- 4: Set $i = 0$, $N_1 = 1$, $\widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_1) = \infty$
- 5: Define the subset $A_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid \varphi(x, y_1) \leq 0\}$
- 6: **while** $\widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_1) \leq \text{TOL}$ **do**
- 7: Generate i.i.d. $\Theta_{0,i} \sim \Theta$
- 8: Increase $i = i + 1$, $N_1 = N_1 + 1$
- 9: Estimate the probability of subset F_1^{ML} by

$$\widehat{P}_1 = \frac{1}{N_1} \sum_{k=0}^{N_1-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_1}(T(\Theta_{1,k}))$$

- 10: Estimate $\delta(\widehat{P}_1) \approx \widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_1)$
- 11: **end while**
- 12: Set $i_0 = \arg \min\{k \mid T(\Theta_{0,k}) \in A_1\}$
- 13: Define initial for next level $\Theta_{1,0} = \Theta_{0,i_0}$
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **for** $\ell = 1, \dots, L-1$ **do**
- 16: Set $i = 0$, $N_{\ell+1} = 0$, $\widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_{\ell+1}) = \infty$
- 17: Define the subset $A_{\ell+1} = \{x \in \mathbb{X} \mid \varphi(x, y_\ell) \leq 0\}$
- 18: **while** $\widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_{\ell+1}) \leq \text{TOL}$ **do**
- 19: Generate $Y_{\ell,i} \sim \Theta$
- 20: Shake and accept/reject $\Theta_{\ell,i+1} = M_\ell^{S_\eta}(\Theta_{\ell,i}, Y_{\ell,i})$
- 21: Increase $i = i + 1$, $N_{\ell+1} = N_{\ell+1} + 1$
- 22: Estimate the probability of subset $F_{\ell+1}^{\text{ML}}$ by

$$\widehat{P}_{\ell+1} = \frac{1}{N_{\ell+1}} \sum_{i=0}^{N_{\ell+1}-1} \mathbb{1}_{A_{\ell+1}}(T(\Theta_{\ell,i}))$$

- 23: Estimate $\delta(\widehat{P}_1) \approx \widehat{\delta}(\widehat{P}_1)$
 - 24: **end while**
 - 25: Set $i_\ell = \arg \min\{k \mid T(\Theta_{\ell,k}) \in A_{\ell+1}\}$
 - 26: Define initial for next level $\Theta_{\ell+1,0} = \Theta_{\ell,i_\ell}$
 - 27: **end for**
 - 28: **Result:** $\widehat{P}^{\text{ML}_1} = \prod_{\ell=1}^L \widehat{P}_\ell$
-