# The Stationary Distribution of Discretised SPDEs

Jochen Voss

University of Leeds, UK

10th September 2013, NASPDE 2013, Rennes, France

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

### Outline

Motivation: MCMC Methods using SPDEs

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Finite Element Discretisation

Main Result: Discretisation Error

Ideas of the Proof

This talk is based on the following article:

The Effect of Finite Element Discretisation on the Stationary Distribution of SPDEs. Communications in Mathematical Sciences, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 1143–1159, 2012.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# MCMC Methods using SPDEs

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

#### example 1. The stochastic heat equation

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) + \sqrt{2} \, \partial_t w(t,x)$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u(t,0) = 0, \quad u(t,1) = 0 \qquad \forall t > 0$$

has the distribution of a Brownian bridge on [0, 1] as its stationary distribution.

- $\partial_t w$  is space-time white noise
- $t \in [0,\infty)$  is "time" of the SPDE
- x ∈ [0, 1] ("space" of the SPDE) is "time" of the Brownian bridge.



化口下 化固下 化医下不良下

example 2. Consider the stochastic partial differential equation (SPDE)

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) - \left(gg' + \frac{1}{2}g''\right)\left(u(t,x)\right) + \sqrt{2}\partial_t w(t,x)$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$u(t,0) = 0, \quad u(t,1) = 0 \qquad \forall t > 0.$$

► The stationary distribution of this SPDE on C([0,1], ℝ) coincides with the conditional distribution of the process X given by

$$egin{aligned} dX_{ au} &= g(X_{ au}) \, d au + dW_{ au} \qquad orall au \in [0,1] \ X_0 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

conditioned on  $X_1 = 0$ .

• We can study X by studying  $x \mapsto u(t,x)$  for large times t.

In general, we aim to construct SPDEs such that

- In stationarity, the paths x → u(t,x) have the distribution of some "interesting" process X, e.g. of a conditioned diffusion
- *u* is ergodic: for suitable test functions  $\varphi$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\varphi(X)\big) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi\big(u(t,\,\cdot\,)\big) \, dt$$

If we can solve the SPDE on a computer, this leads to Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods: the process u generates samples of X which we can use to study the distribution of X.

We consider SPDEs of the form

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) + f(u(t,x)) + \sqrt{2} \,\partial_t w(t,x)$$

where

- ▶  $(t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times [0,1]$ ,
- $\partial_t w$  is space-time white noise,
- the drift  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a smooth function,
- ► the differential operator L = ∂<sup>2</sup><sub>x</sub> is equipped with boundary conditions such that it is a negative operator on the space L<sup>2</sup>([0, 1], ℝ).

**Lemma.** For f = 0, let  $\nu$  be the stationary distribution of the linear SPDE

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) + \sqrt{2} \, \partial_t w(t,x).$$

Then  $\nu$  coincides with the distribution of the process U given by

$$U(x) = B(x) + (1 - x)L + xR \qquad \forall x \in [0, 1]$$

where

- ▶ B is a Brownian bridge, independent of L and R,
- $L \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_L^2)$ ,  $R \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_R^2)$  with  $Cov(L, R) = \sigma_{LR}$ ,
- $\sigma_L^2$ ,  $\sigma_R^2$ ,  $\sigma_{LR}$  are determined by the boundary conditions of  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**Lemma.** For f = F' where  $F \colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is bounded from above, let  $\mu$  be the stationary distribution of the SPDE

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) + f(u(t,x)) + \sqrt{2} \partial_t w(t,x).$$

Then  $\mu$  satisfies

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}(u) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(\int_0^1 F(u(x)) \, dx\right)$$

where  $\nu$  is the stationary distribution of the linear SPDE.

On  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we know that the SDE

$$dX_t = \nabla \log \varphi(X_t) \, dt + \sqrt{2} \, dW_t$$

has invariant density  $\varphi$ . The above lemma is an infinite dimensional analogue of this result.

# **Finite Element Discretisation**

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

In this talk we only consider space discretisation of our SPDE.

▶ let 
$$\Delta x = 1/n$$
,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ 

- consider x-values on the grid  $\{0, \Delta x, \dots, (n-1)\Delta x, 1\}$
- we use "hat functions" φ<sub>i</sub> for i = 0, 1, ..., n which have φ<sub>i</sub>(i Δx) = 1, φ<sub>i</sub>(j Δx) = 0 for all j ≠ i, and which are affine between the grid points

Formally, expressing the solution in the basis  $\varphi_i$  as

$$u(t,x) = \sum_{j} U_{j}(t)\varphi_{j}(x)$$

gives

$$\langle \varphi_i, \sum_j \frac{dU_j}{dt} \varphi_j \rangle = \langle \varphi_i, \partial_x^2 \sum_j U_j \varphi_j \rangle + \langle \varphi_i, f\left(\sum_j U_j \varphi_j\right) \rangle + \sqrt{2} \langle \varphi_i, \frac{dw}{dt} \rangle$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the  $L^2$ -inner product. We will see that this is a system of n + 1 SDEs.

$$\langle \varphi_i, \sum_j \frac{dU_j}{dt} \varphi_j \rangle = \langle \varphi_i, \partial_x^2 \sum_j U_j \varphi_j \rangle + \langle \varphi_i, f\left(\sum_j U_j \varphi_j\right) \rangle + \sqrt{2} \langle \varphi_i, \frac{dw}{dt} \rangle$$

can be written as

$$M\frac{dU}{dt} = L^{\rm FE}U + f^{\rm FE}(U) + \sqrt{2}M^{1/2}\frac{dW}{dt}$$

#### where

- ▶ the matrix  $L^{\text{FE}}$  is defined by  $L_{ij}^{\text{FE}} = \langle \varphi_i, \partial_x^2 \varphi_j \rangle$ ,
- the matrix M is defined by  $M_{ij} = \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle$ ,

• 
$$f^{\text{FE}}(u)_i = \left\langle \varphi_i, f\left(\sum_{j=0}^n u_j \varphi_j\right) \right\rangle$$
 for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, i = 0, \dots, n$ .

 $\mathsf{Cov}(\langle \varphi_i, w_t \rangle, \langle \varphi_j, w_t \rangle) = \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle t.$ 

By multiplication with  $M^{-1}$  we get the finite element discretisation:

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = M^{-1}L^{\mathrm{FE}}U + M^{-1}f^{\mathrm{FE}}(U) + \sqrt{2}M^{-1/2}\frac{dW}{dt}$$

where

• W is an (n+1)-dimensional standard Brownian motion

• 
$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{FE}} = \frac{1}{\Delta x} \begin{pmatrix} -1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \Delta x & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \Delta x \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$$
  
•  $M = \Delta x \begin{pmatrix} 2/6 & 1/6 \\ 1/6 & 4/6 & 1/6 \\ 1/6 & 2/6 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$ 

**Lemma.** Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be symmetric, negative definite and G be symmetric, positive definite. Then the SDEs

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = L U + f(U) + \frac{dW}{dt}$$

and

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = GL U + G f(U) + G^{1/2} \frac{dW}{dt}$$

have the same stationary distribution.

Using the lemma with  $G = M^{-1}$  shows that

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = L^{\rm FE}U + f^{\rm FE}(U) + \sqrt{2} \frac{dW}{dt}$$

has the same stationary distribution as the finite element discretisation.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Again, we first consider the case f = 0.

**Lemma.** Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be a matrix such that the real part of all eigenvalues is strictly negative. Then the unique stationary distribution of

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = LU + B \, \frac{dW}{dt}$$

is  $\mathcal{N}(0, C)$ , where the covariance matrix C solves the Lyapunov equation

$$LC + CL^T = -BB^T.$$

Thus, for f = 0, the stationary distribution is  $\nu_n = \mathcal{N}(0, C^{\text{FE}})$  where  $C^{\text{FE}}$  is the unique solution of  $L^{\text{FE}}C^{\text{FE}} + C^{\text{FE}}L^{\text{FE}} = -21$ , *i.e.*  $C^{\text{FE}} = (-L^{\text{FE}})^{-1}$ .

The stationary distribution  $\mu_n$  for the discretised SPDE with  $f \neq 0$  can be found using the following lemma:

**Lemma.** Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  be a vector field with  $f = \nabla F$  for some  $F : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ . Then the SDE

$$dU = LU \, dt + f(U) \, dt + \sqrt{2} \, dW$$

has stationary distribution  $\mu_n$  with

$$\frac{d\mu_n}{d\nu_n}(u) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp(F(u))$$

where  $\nu_n$  is the stationary distribution of the linear equation and  $Z_n$  is a normalisation constant.

Once we show that  $f^{\rm FE}$  can be written as a gradient, the lemma allows to find  $\mu_n$ .

### **Discretisation Error**

We have seen how to find

- the stationary distribution  $\mu$  of the SPDE on  $C([0,1],\mathbb{R})$
- ▶ the stationary distribution  $\mu_n$  of the discretised SPDE on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ We want to show  $\mu_n \to \mu$  as  $n \to \infty$ .

questions. What metric to use? On which space?

Here we project everything to  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ : We define

 $\Pi_n\colon C\big([0,1],\mathbb{R}\big)\to\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ 

by

$$\Pi_n u = (u(0\Delta x), u(1\Delta x), \ldots, u(n\Delta x)).$$

Main result:

**Theorem.** For  $f \neq 0$ , let  $\mu$  be the stationary distribution of the SPDE and let  $\mu_n$  be the stationary distribution of the finite element discretisation. Assume f = F' where  $F \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$  is bounded from above with bounded second derivatives. Then we have

$$ig\|\mu_n-\mu\circ\Pi_n^{-1}ig\|_{\mathrm{TV}}=Oig(rac{1}{n}ig)$$
 as  $n o\infty$ 

where  $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$  denotes total-variation distance.

If  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  both have densities w.r.t. a common reference measure  $\lambda$ , then the total variation distance can be computed as follows:

$$\|\mu-
u\|_{ ext{TV}} = \int ig|rac{d\mu}{d\lambda} - rac{d
u}{d\lambda}ig| \, d\lambda.$$

### **Ideas of the Proof**

Again, we start with the linear equation.

**Lemma.** For f = 0, let  $\nu$  be the stationary distribution of the linear SPDE

$$\partial_t u(t,x) = \partial_x^2 u(t,x) + \sqrt{2} \, \partial_t w(t,x).$$

and let  $\nu_n$  be the stationary distribution of the (linear) finite element discretisation with  $f \equiv 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then we have

$$\nu_n = \nu \circ \Pi_n^{-1}$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

This shows that for the linear equation there is no discretisation error at all!

We want to compare

- ▶ the stationary distribution  $\mu$  of the SPDE on  $C([0,1],\mathbb{R})$
- the stationary distribution  $\mu_n$  of the discretised SPDE on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$

Steps of the proof:

- 1. find a common space for both measures
- 2. rewrite the total variation distance using the densities

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\nu} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp\left(\int_0^1 F(U(x)) \, dx\right) \qquad \frac{d\mu_n}{d\nu_n} = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp\left(\int_0^1 F(U_n(x)) \, dx\right)$$

where U is distributed according to the stationary distribution  $\nu$  and  $U_n = \sum_{j=0}^n U(j\Delta x)\varphi_j(t)$ .

- 3. deal with the normalisation constants
- 4. compare the two exponentials

Using the above steps, the theorem can be reduced to the question how fast  $||U - U_n||_{\infty}$  converges to 0.



The difference  $U - U_n$  is a chain of independent Brownian bridges, the resulting questions are easy to answer.

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト

# Conclusion

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

We have seen that

$$ig\|\mu\circ {\sf \Pi}_n^{-1}-\mu_nig\|_{\operatorname{TV}}=Oig(rac{1}{n}ig) \ \ \, ext{as } n o\infty.$$

One can show that this bound is sharp.

- Instead of projecting µ onto ℝ<sup>n+1</sup> one can embed ℝ<sup>n+1</sup> in C([0,1], ℝ) by interpolating the discretisation with Brownian bridges. Nearly no changes are required in the proof and the result is the same.
- ► One would expect for a similar result to hold for SPDEs with values in ℝ<sup>d</sup> instead of in ℝ (but notation will be more challenging).

## Advertisement



- comes out "October 2013", available for pre-order now
- textbook for postgraduate students
- contents:
  - random number generation
  - Monte Carlo estimation
  - MCMC
- highlights:
  - ABC
  - Reversible jump MCMC
  - Multi-level Monte Carlo