VARIANCE REDUCTION FOR CHEMICAL REACTION NETWORKS WITH ARRAY-RQMC

Florian Puchhammer Université de Montréal, Canada MCM 2019, Sydney July 12, 2019



Joint work with Amal Ben Abdellah and Pierre L'Ecuyer

Chemical reaction networks

Consider chemical species S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_ℓ that react via reactions R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_K with reaction rates c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_K .

$$R_k: \qquad \alpha_{1,k}S_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,k}S_\ell \xrightarrow{c_k} \beta_{1,k}S_1 + \dots + \beta_{\ell,k}S_\ell, \qquad \alpha_{i,k}, \beta_{i,k} \in \mathbb{N}$$

Goal: Simulate system over time $t \in [0, T]$ and observe (a function g of) copy numbers $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{1,t}, X_{2,t}, \dots, X_{\ell,t})$ of the species.

The τ -leap algorithm

 $\alpha_{1,k}S_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\ell,k}S_\ell \xrightarrow{c_k} \beta_{1,k}S_1 + \dots + \beta_{\ell,k}S_\ell$

Simulate with fixed step τ -leap algorithm, Gillespie '01. Summarizes several reactions into one time step of length $\tau \rightarrow$ faster, but introduces bias (negative copy numbers).

Poisson variables p_k model how often reaction R_k fires in $[t, t + \tau)$.

- Mean parameters of p_k are $a_k(\mathbf{X}_t)\tau$, where a_k are the propensity functions.
- \blacksquare a_k 's are polynomials in \mathbf{X}_t of degree $\alpha_{1,k} + \alpha_{2,k} + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell,k}$.

In each step, generate p_1, \ldots, p_K and update copy numbers through

$$X_{i,t+\tau} = X_{i,t} + \sum_{k=1}^{K} p_k \cdot (\beta_{i,k} - \alpha_{i,k}).$$

This is a discrete time Markov chain (DTMC), with ℓ -dimensional state space using K random variates to advance the chain by one step.

Simulation

Goal: Estimate

 $\mu = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{X}_T)].$

MC: Generate n points $\mathbf{U}_i \sim \mathcal{U}(0,1)^{K \cdot T/\tau}$.

Each \mathbf{U}_i simulates one chain $\rightsquigarrow \mathbf{X}_{i,T}$.

Estimate

$$u \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g(\mathbf{X}_{i,T}).$$

RQMC: Generate *n* points $\mathbf{U}_i \in (0, 1)^{K \cdot T/\tau}$ such that:

- Each \mathbf{U}_i is uniformly distributed in $(0,1)^{K \cdot T/\tau}$.
- The point set $\{\mathbf{U}_0, \mathbf{U}_1, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{n-1}\}$ has low discrepancy.
 - Then, estimate as above.

Previous work

Beentjes, Baker '18: Traditional RQMC for τ -leaping. Found that, using *n* RQMC points, the convergence rate is not better than for MC, n^{-1} , even when ℓ , K, T/τ were not too big.

Possible problems:

- Discontinuities because of integer values.
- High dimensional point sets needed, dim= $K \cdot T/\tau$ (actually effective dimension important).

Possible solution: array-RQMC.

- Can work well even when discontinuities appear.
- Reduces the dimensionality of the points to $\ell + K$.

Array-RQMC

Simulation of n chains with n RQMC points.

Traditional approach: One point for the trajectory of one chain. Simulates chains sequentially \rightsquigarrow high dimension $K \cdot T/\tau$.

Array-RQMC: One point to advance one chain by one step. Advances all *n* chains in parallel at each step \rightarrow lower dimension $\ell + K$.

- Idea: the distance between empirical and theoretical distribution of states is small at each step.
- achieved by matching the states to first ℓ coordinates of point set via (multivariate) sort after each step.
- empirical mean of a *n* evaluations of function *g* at the final states is unbiased estimator for the mean of $g(\mathbf{X}_T)$.
- empirical variance of m independent repetitions is unbiased estimator for the variance of the mean estimator.

Multivariate sorting algorithms

If $\ell = 1$ sort chains by size. If $\ell > 1$:

Split sort: Split states into 2 packets by size of first coordinate. Split each packet into 2 by size of second coordinate...

Batch sort: Split states into n_1 packets by size of first coordinate. Split each packet into n_2 by size of second coordinate...

Hilbert curve sort: Map states to $[0, 1]^{\ell}$. Sort the states in the order they are visited by (discrete version of) hilbert curve. Here, we use sample data to estimate mean and variance, normalize each state, and use the CDF of standard normal distribution to map states to $[0, 1]^{\ell}$.

Customized sorts: Ideally, find importance function $h_j : \mathbb{R}^{\ell} \to \mathbb{R}$ for step j, then sort by size of $h_j(\mathbf{X}_{j\tau})$. Might increase efficiency!

Experimental setting

In every experiment, we observe copy number of one specific species.

Point sets:

- MC: Plain monte carlo
- Lat+Baker: Lattice rule with random shift mod 1 and baker transformation.
- Sob+LMS: Sobol' points with a left matrix scramble and a digital shift.
- Sob+NUS: Sobol' points with Owen's nested uniform scramble.

Observed statistics: We replicate each experiment m = 100 times independently.

- **VRF20**: Variance reduction factor in comparison to MC for $n = 2^{20}$ points.
- **a** $\hat{\beta}$: Variance convergence rate $n^{-\hat{\beta}}$ estimated by regression $n = 2^{13}, 2^{14}, \dots, 2^{20}$.

Goal: Show that

array-RQMC can beat MC-variance rate β̂ > 1,
 customized sorts can improve your results (proof of concept).

The Schlögl system

Model with 3 species S_1 , S_2 , S_3 and K = 4 reactions. We observe S_1 .

$$2S_1 + S_2 \xrightarrow{c_1} 3S_1,$$

$$3S_1 \xrightarrow{c_2} 2S_1 + S_2,$$

$$S_3 \xrightarrow{c_3} S_1,$$

$$S_1 \xrightarrow{c_4} S_3$$

Note: $X_{1,t} + X_{2,t} + X_{3,t} = \text{const.}$, therefore $\ell = 2$. Expect standard sorts to work well.

Simulation: $\mathbf{X}_0 = \{250, 10^5, 2 \cdot 10^5\}, c_1 = 3 \cdot 10^{-7}, c_2 = 10^{-4}, c_3 = 10^{-3}, c_4 = 3.5, T = 4, \tau = T/15.$

Array-RQMC reduces points' dimension from $KT/\tau = 60$ to $\ell + K = 6$ or 5.

Customized sorts revisited

Observe that $\ell = 2$, so we can plot final copy number of S_1 vs. current state at time $j\tau \rightarrow$ importance function h_j .

- Simulate 2^{20} sample chains with MC.
- Fit polynomial to this data.

Take

To reduce terms: take propensity functions and current copy number of observed species.

Here (N_0 is total number of molecules):

$$a_1(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}c_1x(x-1)y, \qquad a_2(x,y) = \frac{1}{6}c_2x(x-1)(x-2),$$

$$a_3(x,y) = c_3(N_0 - x - y), \qquad a_4(x,y) = c_4x.$$

$$h_j(x,y) = a_{j,0} + a_{j,1}x + a_{j,2}y + a_{j,3}x^2 + a_{j,4}xy + a_{j,5}x^3 + a_{j,6}x^2y.$$

The sample data at step $j\tau$ and fitted h_j , j = 5, 10, 14.



For customized sorts we can follow two strategies:

Multi step: Fit h_j in every step.

Expected to be more representative.

Last step: Fit $h_i = h$ to last step only. Use this *h* in every step.

Maybe less impact of randomness on data.

Schlögl system – results

			c_2
Sort	Sample	\hat{eta}	VRF20
	MC	1.00	1
Last step	Lat+Baker	1.30	4894
	Sob+LMS	1.36	7000
	Sob+NUS	1.37	10481
Multi step	Lat+Baker	1.01	178
	Sob+LMS	1.07	206
	Sob+NUS	0.99	196
Batch	Lat+Baker	1.39	4421
	Sob+LMS	1.48	9309
	Sob+NUS	1.56	11150
Hilbert curve	Lattice+Baker	1.68	2493
	Sobol+LMS	1.51	4464
	Sobol+NUS	1.53	4562





Problems with multi step sort

Look at mean copy numbers per step with MC (left) and copy numbers of S_1 for n = 30 paths (right). MC n = 30 paths copy number S_1 average $\mathbf{2}$ step step

cAMP aktivation of PKA model

More challenging example: $\ell = 6$ species, K = 6 reactions (Koh, Blackwell ('12); Strehl, Ilie ('15)):

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{PKA} + 2\text{cAMP} \xleftarrow[]{c_1}{\leftarrow}{c_2} \text{PKA-cAMP}_2, \\ \text{PKA-cAMP}_2 + 2\text{cAMP} \xleftarrow[]{c_3}{\leftarrow}{c_4} \text{PKA-cAMP}_4, \\ \text{PKA-cAMP}_4 \xleftarrow[]{c_5}{\leftarrow}{c_6} \text{PKAr} + 2\text{PKAc}. \end{array}$$

Initial values: PKA: $33 \cdot 10^3$, cAMP: $33.03 \cdot 10^3$, others: $1.1 \cdot 10^3$.

Parameters: $c_1 = 8.696 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $c_2 = 0.02$, $c_3 = 1.154 \cdot 10^{-4}$, $c_4 = 0.02$, $c_5 = 0.016$ and $c_6 = 0.0017$; $T = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$, $\tau = T/15$.

Array-RQMC reduces points' dimension from $KT/\tau = 90$ to $\ell + K = 12$ or 7.

Begin with PKA and use same heuristics (sample paths, propensity functions, and current copy number of PKA) for last step and multi step.

Sort	Sample	β	VRF20
	MC	1.00	1
Last step	Lat+Baker	1.05	2593
	Sob+LMS	1.05	3334
	Sob+NUS	1.04	3126
Multi step	Lat+Baker	1.03	2492
	Sob+LMS	1.04	3307
	Sob+NUS	1.01	3099
Batch	Lat+Baker	1.05	2575
	Sob+LMS	1.06	3611
	Sob+NUS	1.01	2735
Hilbert curve	Lattice+Baker	1.00	2327
	Sobol+LMS	1.03	2920
	Sobol+NUS	1.02	2847

- Variance rate aligns with MC rate.
- Best result for Batch with Sob+LMS. Last step makes up for it with computation time.
- Reducing noise in sample paths improved Last step up to VRF20=4100 (Sob+NUS).
- Select "optimal" sequence of last step and multi step sorts w.r.t. variance increment at each step improved up to VRF20=4300 (Sob+LMS).

Dimensionality is NOT the key

Same model, but now we observe PKAr:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{PKA} + 2\mathrm{cAMP} \xleftarrow{c_1}{\leftarrow} \mathrm{PKA}\text{-}\mathrm{cAMP}_2, \\ \mathrm{PKA}\text{-}\mathrm{cAMP}_2 + 2\mathrm{cAMP} \xleftarrow{c_3}{\leftarrow} \mathrm{PKA}\text{-}\mathrm{cAMP}_4, \\ \mathrm{PKA}\text{-}\mathrm{cAMP}_4 \xleftarrow{c_5}{\leftarrow} \mathrm{PKAr} + 2\mathrm{PKAc} \end{array}$$

Analyzed the data and found indicator, that only PKAc is important for development of PKAr.

■ Tried to simply sort by PKAc.

Results for PKAr

Exploiting additional information to customize your sort pays off!

Sort	Sample	Â	VRF20
	MC	1.03	1
By PKAc	Lattice+Baker	1.59	5187
	Sobol+LMS	1.63	19841
	Sobol+NUS	1.61	16876
Split	Lattice+Baker	1.06	1021
	Sobol+LMS	1.28	1958
	Sobol+NUS	1.26	1756
Batch	Lattice+Baker	1.16	803
	Sobol+LMS	1.22	561
	Sobol+NUS	1.25	744
Hilbert curve	Lattice+Baker	1.01	103
	Sobol+LMS	1.00	103
	Sobol+NUS	1.04	106



Conclusion

- Introduced chemical reaction networks.
- Presented τ -leap algorithm, which allows to simulate via DTMCs.
- With traditional RQMC, no improvement in convergence of variance (Beentjes, Baker ('18)).
- We investigate same problem with array RQMC, which relies on sorting strategies for the states.
- In empirical studies we showed that standard multivariate sorts work very well.
- When states have higher dimension, customized sorts can increase efficiency.
- Using additional info/heuristics to customize own sort can improve results tremendously!

References – chemical reaction networks.

- C. H. L. Beentjes, Baker, Ruth E., Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods Applied to Tau-Leaping in Stochastic Biological Systems. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology, 2018.
- Y. Cao, D. T. Gillespie, L. R. Petzold Avoiding negative populations in explicit Poisson tau-leaping. Journal of Chemical Physics 123. 054104, 2005.
- Y. Cao, D. T. Gillespie, L. R. Petzold *Efficient step size selection for the tau-leaping simulation method.* Journal of Chemical Physics 124. 044109, 2006.
- D. T. Gillespie., Approximate accelerated stochastic simulation of chemically reacting systems. The Journal of Chemical Physics 115. 1716–1733, 2001.
- D. T. Gillespie., Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. The Journal of Physical Chemistry 81. 2340–2361, 1977.
- W. Koh, K. T. Blackwell, Improved spatial direct method with gradient-based diffusion to retain full diffusive fluctuations. The Journal of Chemical Physics 137. 154111, 2015.
- J.M.A. Padgett, S. Ilie, An adaptive tau-leaping method for stochastic simulations of reaction-diffusion systems. AIP Advances 6. 035217, 2016.
- R. Strehl, S. Ilie, Hybrid stochastic simulation of reaction-diffusion systems with slow and fast dynamics. The Journal of Chemical Physics 143. 234108, 2015.

References – array-RQMC.

- A. Ben Abdellah, P. L'Ecuyer, F. Puchhammer Array-RQMC for option pricing under stochastic volatility models. submitted, 2019 (available on arXiv).
- M. Gerber, N. Chopin, Sequential quasi-Monte Carlo. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 77. 509–579, 2015.
- P. L'Ecuyer, V. Demers, B. Tuffin, *Rare-Events, Splitting, and Quasi-Monte Carlo.* ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation 17. Article 9, 2007.
- P. L'Ecuyer, C. Lécot, A. L'Archevêque-Gaudet, On Array-RQMC for Markov Chains: Mapping Alternatives and Convergence Rates. Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods 2008. 485–500, 2009.
- P. L'Ecuyer, C. Lécot, B. Tuffin, A randomized quasi-Monte Carlo simulation method for Markov chains. Operations Research 56. 958–975, 2008.
- P. L'Ecuyer, D. Munger, C. Lécot, B. Tuffin, Sorting methods and convergence rates for array-rqmc: Some empirical comparisons. Mathematics and Computers in Simulation. 2017.