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Abstract

Inspired by the latest developments in multilevel Monte Carlo (MLMC) methods and randomised sketching for linear algebra problems we propose a MLMC estimator for real-time processing of matrix structured random data. Our algorithm is particularly effective in handling high-dimensional inner products and matrix multiplication, in applications of image analysis and large-scale supervised learning.

1 Introduction

Randomised algorithms for matrix operations are in general ‘pass-efficient’, and are primarily aimed at problems involving massive data sets that are otherwise cumbersome to process with deterministic algorithms. Pass-efficient implies that the algorithm necessitates only a very small number of passes through the complete data set, and for the cases we consider here such a pass may be impractical due to memory or time restrictions. For the matrix multiplication for example, the paradigm randomised algorithm is considered to be BasicMatrixMultiplication [2], where, based on a probability assigned to the columns of some matrix $A$ (respectively rows of a matrix $B$), it approximates the product $AB$ through re-scaling the outer products of some sampled columns of $A$ with the corresponding rows of $B$ via a sampling-and-rescaling matrix operator. Variants of the BasicMatrixMultiplication algorithm were published in [3], [7], [12], depending on the type of information that’s available on the elements of the matrices involved. In particular, the algorithm in [3] addresses the case where the probability distributions of the elements are known a priori by devising an importance sampling strategy based on BasicMatrixMultiplication that minimizes the expected value of the variance. The algorithm was shown to be effective when implemented with the optimized sampling probabilities, particularly so in comparison to the estimators resulting from uniform sampling. This result indeed extends BasicMatrixMultiplication to a random setting and can be applied to many query matching with information retrieval applications [3]. However, designing the optimized probabilities relies exclusively on knowing the probability distributions of the matrix elements, which may restrict its applicability to
the cases where this information is not a priori available. Conversely, it can be argued that \textsc{BasicMatrixMultiplication} with uniform probabilities becomes more appealing when dealing with real-time random matrix multiplication tasks, where distributions change dynamically. In batch processing for instance, the task at hand is to evaluate the expectation of the multiplication or indeed a functional of a matrix product at any given time, a formidable task in terms of the required speed and accuracy. For instance, to accelerate the (time-dependent) training of large-scale kernel machines, the evaluation of the kernel function is identified as and approximated through the expectation of the random inner product via some randomised feature map \cite{9, 10}. In this case, coupling a standard Monte Carlo method (MC) and \textsc{BasicMatrixMultiplication} with uniform probabilities may satisfy the speed specifications but compromise the accuracy of the result. A more balanced alternative is to employ a multilevel Monte Carlo method, similar to the one developed in \cite{4} instead of MC.

MLMC was initially conceived for reducing the cost of computing the expected value of a financial derivative whose payoff depends upon the solution of a stochastic differential equation (SDE). The framework in \cite{4} generalizes Kebaier’s approach in \cite{8} to multiple levels, using a geometric sequence of different time step sizes. In doing so it reduces substantially the computational cost of MC by taking most of the samples on coarse grids resulting to low cost and accuracy, and only very few samples on finer computationally expensive grids that lead to solutions of high accuracy. Over time, MLMC has grown in scope and found a wide range of applications in the broad area of SDEs, SPDEs, for stochastic reaction networks and inverse problems \cite{11}, while further variants have been developed in the form of multilevel quasi-Monte Carlo estimators \cite{6} and multilevel sequential Monte Carlo samplers \cite{1}. For an overview on MLMC we refer the reader to the excellent survey \cite{5}. Therein the author emphasizes that the multilevel theorem allows for the use of other estimators as long as they satisfy some specific conditions. This theorem lays the foundation for the algorithms proposed in this paper. Although there is clearly no actual time stepsize in the matrix multiplication context, we can draw an analogy between the term \textit{time stepsize} in numerical analysis for differential equations and the term \textit{the size of the sampled index set} in randomised linear algebra. As anticipated for a convergent MLMC scheme, the numerical estimation error shrinks with decreasing time stepsize. Similarly, due to the law of large numbers, increasing the size of index samples will decrease the expected squared Frobenius approximation error as shown in Lemma 4 of \cite{2}. Therefore we will say that a random strategy for matrix multiplication with a smaller size of index samples can be seen as analogous to using a “coarser grid”. This observation is crucial to our construction of MLMC estimators for matrix multiplication.

In Section 2 below we discuss first the simpler case of calculating ‘on the fly’ the expectation of the inner product of extremely large random vectors. We first consider the \textsc{BasicMatrixMultiplication} algorithm with uniform probability and proceed to review the main results for the inner product from \cite{3}. We then introduce the base number $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and the level size $L \in \mathbb{N}$ based on which the MLMC estimator (c.f. (9) and (10)) is constructed via inner product approximations with index sample sizes
\[ M^0, M^1, \ldots, M^L. \] In this context, the approximation on the ‘finest grid’ corresponds to the inner product realization on \( M^L \) indices. Given that the variance of the approximated inner product is proportional to \( M^{-l} \) for \( l \in \{1, \ldots, L\} \) (c.f. Theorems 2.1 and Theorem 2.2), the complexity of the proposed MLMC estimator for a functional of the inner product conditioned on certain features of the underlying approximation can be treated similarly as the case \( \beta = 1 \) of Theorem 3.1 in [4]. This result is revisited in Theorem 2.2 where a comparison with standard MC is attempted. Corollary 2.4 discussed the computational complexity of our MLMC estimator using Theorem 2.2. At the end of Section 2, we comment on the optimal choice for base number \( M \) in a similar fashion to [4], and present Algorithm 1 that implements a MLMC algorithm for the inner product.

In Section 3 we extend our approach to matrix multiplication where Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 are also extended for this purpose. It is worth mentioning that, because the approximation error (c.f. Theorems 3.1 and 3.2) is measured in expectation as a Frobenius norm, for the analysis the matrices are considered transformed in vector form and hence a new definition of ‘variance” for the vectorized matrices is assumed (denoted as \( V \)). Further, Theorem 3.3 discusses the complexity and Corollary 3.4 validates the complexity of the MLMC estimator for matrix multiplication. Algorithm 2 is presented at the end for implementation purposes. Finally, in Section 4 we perform two simple numerical experiments to illustrate the performance of the MLMC estimator and compare it with the MC one. By selecting the appropriate \( M \) and \( L \) parameters, the MLMC estimator outperforms the MC estimator in terms of accuracy as well as speed and computational efficiency.

2 Inner product

Define \( T \) as some countable collection of discrete time points and \( t \in T \). Let \( a(t) \) and \( b(t) \) be two random vectors of length \( n \), whose elements are drawn from some unknown, perhaps different, probability distributions. In particular \( a(t)_j \sim \mathcal{L}_{a(t)_j} \) and \( b(t)_j \sim \mathcal{L}_{b(t)_j} \), where \( j \in [n] \) with \([n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \). Here, as indeed throughout this paper, \( n \) is assumed to be extremely large such that evaluating the inner product of \( a(t)^T b(t) \) is deemed impractical if at all possible. Assuming that there is a need to compute \( \mathbb{E}_{a(t),b(t)}[f(a(t)^T b(t))] \) on demand, at different times, where \( f \) is a Lipchitz function with Lipchitz constant \( C_f \) and \( \mathbb{E}_{a(t),b(t)} \) is the expectation under \( \mathcal{L}_{a(t)} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_{b(t)} \). For the sake of notational simplicity, the notation \((t)\) is omitted but assumed implicitly in all of the quantities introduced above.

Indeed the problem consists of two main parts: approximating \( a^T b \) in an efficient and accurate manner and approximating its expected value in the spirit of Monte Carlo methods. To tackle the first issue, the random sampling method for inner product presents a viable option. Suppose there is a sampling distribution \( \xi := \{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^n \) with \( \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j = 1 \) such that each index \( j \in [n] \) can be drawn with the assigned positive probability \( \xi_j \). Further suppose choosing a ‘base’ number \( M \in \mathbb{N} \) and collect \( M^L, L \in \mathbb{N} \), independent and identically distributed index samples \( \{r_1, \ldots, r_{M^L}\} \) according to \( \xi \), where we shall refer to the collected \( M^L \) indices as a sample realisation. Then denote
by $S$ the sampling-and-rescaling matrix of size $n \times M^L$ such that elements of $a$ and $b$ with $M^L$ index samples will be used for approximating the inner product of $a^Tb$, that is,

$$a^Tb = a^T S L S^T L b = \frac{1}{M^L} \sum_{i=1}^{M^L} \xi_i a_i b_i.$$  \hfill (1)

Previous research have shown that $\hat{a^Tb}$ is an unbiased estimator for $a^Tb$, that is,

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi[a\hat{T}b] = a^Tb,$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\xi$ is the expectation under the sampling probability $\xi$. The performance of approximation can be estimated through quantifying the variance of the estimator. The minimum variance is attained when sampling according to the distribution given by the following theorem from [2].

**Theorem 2.1.** If the vector elements $a_j$ and $b_j$ are independent random variables, $j \in [n]$, with finite and nonzero moments $\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[a_j^2 b_j^2]$, then the probability $\xi^*$

$$\xi_j^* = \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[a_j^2 b_j^2]}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[a_i^2 b_i^2]}},$$

minimizes the expected value of the variance in (1), that is,

$$\min_{\xi} \mathbb{E}_{a,b}[\mathbb{V}_\xi[a\hat{T}b]] = \mathbb{E}_{a,b}[\mathbb{V}_{\xi^*}[a\hat{T}b]] = \frac{1}{M^L} \mathbb{E}_{a,b}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i^2 b_i^2}{\xi^*} - (a^T b)^2\right] := \frac{\mu}{M^L},$$

where $\mu = \mathbb{E}_{a,b}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i^2 b_i^2}{\xi^*} - (a^T b)^2\right]$.

Sampling with $\xi^*$ is clearly not practical when we have no knowledge about the distributions of $a$ and $b$ in advance, hence a plausible convenient alternative is to use a uniform probability over the index set

$$\xi^u_j = \frac{1}{n}, \quad j \in [n],$$  \hfill (4)

with variance as follows.

**Theorem 2.2.** Assume the same setting as in Theorem 2.1 but with probability $\xi^u$ defined in (4), then the variance is

$$\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[\mathbb{V}_{\xi^u}[a\hat{T}b]] = \mathbb{E}_{a,b}[\mathbb{V}_{\xi^*}[a\hat{T}b]] + \frac{n\nu}{M^L} = \frac{n\nu + \mu}{M^L},$$

where

$$\nu = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[a_i^2 b_i^2]} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{a,b}[a_j^2 b_j^2]}\right)^2.$$
Typically we may approximate the expectation using a standard MC method that simulates \( E_{a,b}[f(a^T b)] \). The quantity of interest, say \( P \), can then be estimated by (1) with a uniform probability (4) and MC as

\[
E_{a,b}[P] := E_{a,b}[f(a^T b)] \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} f((a^{(k)})^T b^{(k)})
\]

where \( N \) is the number of realizations for \( M^L \) many index samples. The mean square error (MSE) for the estimate \( \hat{P} \) would be

\[
\]

\[
= E[(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}])^2] + (E[f(a^T b)] - E[f(a^T S_L S_L^T b)])^2
\]

where \( E \), and also \( V \) that appears in the sequel, (without subscripts) denote respectively the expectation and the variance under \( \mathcal{L}_a, \mathcal{L}_b \) and \( \xi^u \). The last term in (7), for a fixed \( L \), characterizes the bias and can be bounded by

\[
(E[f(a^T b)] - E[f(a^T S_L S_L^T b)])^2 \leq E[(f(a^T b) - f(a^T S_L S_L^T b))^2] \leq C_I^2 E[a^T(I - S_L S_L^T)b]^2 \leq \frac{C_I^2}{M^L(n\nu + \mu)},
\]

where the first inequality is due to Jensen’s inequality and the last one due to (5). The first term in (7) is simply the variance due to the MC simulation and can be bounded in terms of \( N \) as

\[
E[(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}])^2] = \frac{1}{N} V[f(a^T S_L S_L^T b)] \leq \frac{1}{N} \left( \frac{C_I}{M^{L^2}}(n\nu + \mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} + V[a_{a,b}[f(a^T b)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 \sim O(N^{-1}).
\]

Overall, as in [4], the MSE varies in terms of \( \frac{1}{M^L} \) and \( \frac{1}{N} \). Meanwhile, the complexity is in terms of \( N2^L \), for integer \( N \) to be determined.

Alternatively, it may be possible to obtain the same accuracy at a reduced computational cost, by considering a multilevel MC simulation [4]. For \( l \in [L] \cup \{0\} \), and define as \( \hat{P}_l \) the approximation to \( f(a^T b) \) from \( M^l \) sampled indices. Further define \( \hat{Y}_l \) for an estimator of \( E[\hat{P}_l - \hat{P}_{l-1}] \) using \( N_l \) realizations with \( l > 0 \) and similarly \( \hat{Y}_0 \) to be an estimator of \( E[\hat{P}_0] \) using \( N_0 \) samples, that is

\[
\hat{Y}_l := \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{k=1}^{N_l} (\hat{P}_l^{(k)} - \hat{P}_{l-1}^{(k)}).
\]
A key point to note is that both \( \hat{P}_l^{(k)} \) and \( \hat{P}_{l-1}^{(k)} \) emerge from the same realization, which we discuss in more detail when we describe our algorithm. By the linear property of the expectation we immediately have that

\[
\mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_L] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_0] + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_l - \hat{P}_{l-1}] \approx \hat{Y}_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{L} \hat{Y}_l := \hat{Y},
\]

where clearly \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_L] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}] \). To investigate the performance of the proposed MLMC estimator \( \hat{Y} \) in (10) we compare the complexity of two estimators \( \hat{Y} \) and \( \hat{P} \) at the same accuracy level.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( \mathbf{a} \) and \( \mathbf{b} \) be two random vectors with length \( n \) drawn from different unknown distributions, that is \( a_j \sim \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a}_j} \) and \( b_j \sim \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{b}_j} \), and let \( f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \) be a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz number \( C_f \). Denote by \( P \) the term of interest as in (6), and define \( \hat{P}_l \) the corresponding approximation to \( f(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{b}) \) based on the sketched version of matrix multiplication via \( M \) many index samples like in (1).

If there exist independent estimators \( \hat{Y}_l \) as in (9) based on \( N_l \) Monte Carlo samples, and positive constants \( c_1, c_2, c_3 \) such that

1. \( \mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_l - P] \leq c_1 M^{-\frac{1}{2}} \),
2. \( \mathbb{V}[\hat{Y}_l] \leq c_2 N_l^{-1} M^{-1} \),
3. the complexity of \( \hat{Y}_l \), denoted by \( C_l \), is bounded by \( C_l \leq c_3 N_l M^L \),

then there exists a positive constant \( c_4 \) such that for \( \epsilon < e^{-1} \), there are values \( L \) and \( N_l \) for which the multilevel estimator \( \hat{Y} = \sum_{l=0}^{L} \hat{Y}_l \) has an MSE \( \mathbb{E}[(\hat{Y} - P)^2] \) with bound \( \epsilon^2 \), and computational complexity

\[
C(\hat{Y}) := \sum_{l=0}^{L} C_l \leq c_4 \epsilon^{-2} (\log \epsilon)^2.
\]

Furthermore, define the estimator based on the finest level \( L \) and \( N \) realisations as in (6), and suppose

1. the variance for \( \hat{P} \) is bounded by the same constant \( c_2 \), i.e., \( \mathbb{V}[\hat{P}] \leq c_2 N^{-1} \),
2. the complexity for \( \hat{P} \) is bounded by the same constant \( c_3 \), i.e., \( C(\hat{P}) \leq c_3 N M^L \),

then at the same accuracy \( \epsilon^2 \), \( C(\hat{P}) \leq c_6 \epsilon^{-4} \) which is much larger than \( C(\hat{Y}) \).

**Proof.** The proof is based on [4]. Accordingly, the MSE for \( \hat{Y} \) is

\[
\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[P] - \hat{Y})^2] = (\mathbb{E}[P] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}])^2 + \mathbb{E}[(\hat{Y} - \mathbb{E}[\hat{Y}])^2]
= (\mathbb{E}[P] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_L])^2 + \mathbb{V}[(\hat{Y})],
\]
where \( L \) is to be determined. If choosing the ceiling
\[
L = \left\lfloor \frac{\log(2c_2^2\epsilon^{-2})}{\log M} \right\rfloor, \tag{11}
\]
then its bias component can be bounded via condition 1 as
\[
(E[P] - E[\hat{P}_L])^2 \leq c_1^2 M^{-L} \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2.
\]

On the other hand, choosing
\[
N_l = \lceil r_2^c \epsilon^{-2} M^{-l} \rceil
\]
(12)
together with condition 2 gives that
\[
\forall [\hat{Y}] \leq \sum_{l=0}^{L} \forall [\hat{Y}_l] \leq c_2 \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l^{-1} M^{-l}
\leq c_2 \sum_{l=0}^{L} (2(L + 1)c_2 \epsilon^{-2} M^{-l})^{-1} M^{-l}
= c_2 \sum_{l=0}^{L} \frac{\epsilon^2}{2(L + 1)c_2} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2.
\]

To bound the complexity \( C \), let us first find the bound for \( L \) in terms of \( \log \epsilon^{-1} \). Indeed, \( L + 1 \), defined in (11) is bounded by
\[
L + 1 \leq \frac{2 \log(\epsilon^{-1})}{\log M} + \frac{\log(2c_1^2)}{\log M} + 2 \leq c_5 \log \epsilon^{-1}, \tag{13}
\]
where \( c_5 = \frac{1+(0.5 \log(2c_1^2))}{\log M} + 2 \) given that \( \log \epsilon^{-1} > 1 \) (\( \epsilon \leq \epsilon^{-1} \)). Besides, from (11) we can get an upper bound for \( M^{L-1} \) as
\[
M^{L-1} \leq M^{\frac{\log(2c_1^2 \epsilon^{-2})}{\log M}} = e^{\log M \frac{\log(2c_1^2 \epsilon^{-2})}{\log M}} = 2c_2^2 \epsilon^{-2}. \tag{14}
\]

Therefore the computational complexity \( C \) is bounded through
\[
C = \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l M^l \leq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} (2(L + 1)c_2 \epsilon^{-2} M^{-l} + 1) M^l
= c_3 \left( 2(L + 1)^2 c_2 \epsilon^{-2} + \frac{M^2 M^{L-1} - 1}{M - 1} \right) \leq c_4 \epsilon^{-2} (\log \epsilon)^2,
\]
where \( c_4 = 2c_2 c_3 c_5^2 + \frac{2c_1 c_2^2 M^2}{M - 1} \).

For both estimators \( \hat{Y} \) and \( \hat{P} \), the bias is fixed for the same choice of \( L \) in (11). Now let us choose an appropriate \( N \) such that \( \forall [\hat{P}] \leq \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \). Let \( N = \lceil 2c_2 \epsilon^{-2} \rceil \) to meet
Corollary 2.4. Assume the setting in Theorem 2.3. Then we have

1. $c_1 = C_f^2(n\nu + \mu)$,
2. $c_2 = 2C_f^2(M + 1)(n\nu + \mu) + 2V_{a,b}[P]$,
3. $c_3 = 1 + M^{-1}$.

Proof. 1. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ we have that

\[
(\mathbb{E}[f(a^T b)] - \mathbb{E}[f(a^T S_l S_l^T b)])^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[(f(a^T b) - f(a^T S_l S_l^T b))^2] \\
\leq C_f^2 \mathbb{E}[|a^T (I - S_l S_l^T) b|^2] \leq C_f^2 M^{-l}(n\nu + \mu),
\]

where the last inequality holds because of (5).

2. For any $l > 0$ we have that

\[
\mathbb{V}[\hat{P}_l - \hat{P}_{l-1}] \leq (\mathbb{V}[\hat{P}_l - P]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}[P - \hat{P}_{l-1}]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq (\mathbb{E}[(\hat{P}_l - P)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{E}[(\hat{P}_{l-1} - P)^2]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq C_f^2(\mathbb{E}[|a^T (I - S_l S_l^T) b|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{E}[|a^T (I - S_{l-1} S_{l-1}^T) b|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq 2C_f^2(M^{-l} + M^{-l+1})(n\nu + \mu) \leq 2C_f^2(M + 1)(n\nu + \mu)M^{-l}.
\]

For $l = 0$ we have that

\[
\mathbb{V}[\hat{P}_0] = \mathbb{V}[f(a^T S_0 S_0^T b)] \\
\leq (\mathbb{V}[f(a^T S_0 S_0^T b) - P]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}[P]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq (C_f \mathbb{E}[|a^T (I - S_0 S_0^T) b|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}_{a,b}[P]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq (C_f (n\nu + \mu)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}_{a,b}[P]^{\frac{1}{2}})^2 \\
\leq 2C_f^2(n\nu + \mu) + 2\mathbb{V}_{a,b}[P].
\]

Besides, from (8) we can see that $\mathbb{V}[\hat{P}]$ is bounded by the same $c_2$. 

3. For any $l > 0$ we can see easily the complexity is roughly
\[ C_l \leq N^l (M^l + M^{l-1}) = (1 + M^{-1}) N^l M^l, \]
while
\[ C_0 \leq N^0 M^0 \leq (1 + M^{-1}) N^0 M^0. \]
Besides, we have for the complexity of $\hat{P}$ that
\[ C(\hat{P}) \leq N M^L \leq (1 + M^{-1}) N M^L. \]
Thus $c_3$ can be set as $1 + M^{-1}$.

\[ \square \]

2.1 Optimal $M$

This part explores the methods in [4] in order to find an optimal $M$ such that the computational complexity of the estimator is reduced further. With $c_2$ given by Corollary 2.4, $L$ and $N_l$ given in the proof of Theorem 2.3, we can express the complexity of $\hat{Y}$ in terms of $M$ as
\begin{align*}
C(\hat{Y}) &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{L} C_l \approx \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l (M^l + M^{l-1}) \overset{(12)}{\approx} \sum_{l=0}^{L} c_2 (L + 1) (M^l + M^{l-1}) \epsilon^{-2} M^{-l} \\
&\approx \sum_{l=0}^{L} (L + 1) (M + 1)^2 M^{-1} \epsilon^{-2} = (L + 1)^2 (M + 1)^2 M^{-1} \epsilon^{-2} \\
&\overset{(11)}{\approx} M^{-1} (M + 1)^2 \log(M)^{-2} \log(\epsilon)^2 \epsilon^{-2} = f(M) \log(\epsilon)^2 \epsilon^{-2},
\end{align*}

where
\[ f(M) := M^{-1} (M + 1)^2 \log(M)^{-2}. \] (15)

As illustrated in figure 1 where we plot $f(M)$ against $M$, $f(M)$ drops sharply for $M < 6$ and then starts growing slightly again between $M = 10$ and $M = 20$. The minimum (optimum) is attained at $M = 11$, however from our experience using either $M = 10$ or $M = 12$ does not make a significant difference. We remark that our definition of $f(M)$ in (15) differs somewhat from that used in [4], i.e. in the term $(M + 1)^2$, but this does not affect the general trend of $f(M)$ as described above. However, in the numerical experiments shown Section 4.1, a choice of $M = 7$ was used as it was deemed more appealing in terms of both the performance and time cost.

2.2 MLMC sketching algorithm

Based on the discussions in the beginning of Section 2, we propose an algorithm for estimating the inner product based on MLMC method in Algorithm 1. This approximates $E[f(a^T b)]$ through (10) under uniform probability (4). Although the outline in
Figure 1: The plot the dominant complexity term $f(M)$ against the base number $M$, indicating the existence of an optimal $M$ at the minimum point.
Algorithm 1 is simple to follow we draw the reader’s attention to Line 16 describing how \( \hat{P}^{(k)}_l \) and \( \hat{P}^{(k)}_{l-1} \) are computed based on (9) through the common realization of \( M^l \) indices. Indeed, the procedure for getting \( \hat{P}^{(k)}_l \) is by random sampling as in (1) via the indices of a sample realization of size \( M^l \) under uniform probability, and likewise \( \hat{P}^{(k)}_{l-1} \) via \( M^{l-1} \) of those \( M^l \) indices. That is, if \( \{r_1, \ldots, r_{M^l}\} \) is the realization, then

\[
\hat{P}^{(k)}_l = f \left( \frac{n}{M^l} \sum_{j=1}^{M^l} (a_{r_j}^{(k)})^T b_{r_j}^{(k)} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}^{(k)}_{l-1} = f \left( \frac{n}{M^{l-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{M^{l-1}} (a_{r_j}^{(k)})^T b_{r_j}^{(k)} \right).
\]

**Algorithm 1** The MLMC estimator for \( E[f(a^T b)] \).

1. **input:** \( a \) and \( b \), the targeted random vectors in the inner product;
2. \( L \), the level size;
3. \( N_l \), sample size of each level \( l \in [L] \cup \{0\} \).
4. **output:** \( \hat{Y} \), the approximated version of \( E[f(a^T b)] \).
5. **initialization:** \( \hat{Y} \) and \( \hat{Y}_l \) for \( l \in [L] \cup \{0\} \).
6. for \( \ell = 1 \cdots N_0 \) (the number of iterations) do
7. get a pair of samples \( a^{(\ell)} \) and \( b^{(\ell)} \);
8. random pick one index \( r \) from 1 to \( n \) based on uniform probabilities \( \xi^u \);
9. set \( \hat{Y}_0 = \hat{Y}_0 + \frac{1}{N_0} f \left( n(a^{(\ell)})^T b^{(\ell)} \right) \);
10. end for
11. set \( \hat{Y} = \hat{Y} + \hat{Y}_0 \);
12. for \( l = 1 \cdots L \) (the number of levels) do
13. for \( k = 1 \cdots N_l \) (the number of iterations) do
14. get a pair of samples \( a^{(k)} \) and \( b^{(k)} \);
15. random pick \( M^l \) many indices \( r_j \) with \( j \in [M^l] \) from 1 to \( n \) with \( \xi^u \);
16. set \( \hat{Y}_l = \hat{Y}_l + \frac{1}{N_l} \left( f \left( \frac{n}{M^l} \sum_{j=1}^{M^l} (a_{r_j}^{(k)})^T b_{r_j}^{(k)} \right) - f \left( \frac{n}{M^{l-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{M^{l-1}} (a_{r_j}^{(k)})^T b_{r_j}^{(k)} \right) \right) \),
17. end for
18. set \( \hat{Y} = \hat{Y} + \hat{Y}_l \);
19. end for
20. return: \( \hat{Y} \).

### 3 Matrix multiplication

We now extend our approach to matrix multiplication and thus we consider \( A(t) \) and \( B(t) \) to be two random matrices of size \( m \times n \) and \( n \times d \) respectively, drawn from different distributions, elementwise, in the sense \( A(t)_{ij} \sim \mathcal{L}_{A(t)_{ij}} \) and \( B(t)_{jk} \sim \mathcal{L}_{B(t)_{jk}} \), with \( i \in [m], j \in [n] \) and \( k \in [d] \), where \( A(t)_{ij} \) is the \( ij \) entry of \( A(t) \), and again we suppress \( t \) in the notation as in Section 2 and assume that \( n \) is extremely large such that computing directly \( AB \) is prohibitively expensive. Recall that \( f \) is a Lipchitz function
with Lipschitz constant $C_f$, and define $f^\odot(AB)$ the elementwise operator on $AB$, that is,

$$(f^\odot(AB))_{ik} = f((AB)_{ik}).$$

Suppose there is a need to compute $E_{A,B}[f^\odot(AB)]$ where $E_{A,B}$ is the expectation under $L_A$ and $L_B$.

As in the inner product case, in order to simulate $E_{A,B}[f^\odot(AB)]$ we first approximate $AB$ by random sampling (sketching) for matrix multiplication and then approximate the expectation through a Monte Carlo method. Recall that $\xi := \{\xi_j\}_{j=1}^n$ with $\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j = 1$ is a sampling probability such that an index $j \in [n]$ can be drawn with positive probability $\xi_j$ and $S_L$ a sampling-and-rescaling matrix of size $n \times M^L$ such that

$$\tilde{AB} = A S_L S_L^T B = \frac{1}{M^L} \sum_{i=1}^{M^L} \frac{1}{\xi_i} A_{:,r_i} B_{r_i,:},$$

where $A_{:,j}$ indicates the $j$th row of $A$ and $B_{:,j}$ indicates the $j$th column of $B$. It can be easily shown that $E_\xi[\tilde{AB}] = AB$. Besides, following the same argument of the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [3] and Lemma 4 in [2], we can conclude that the minimum of the expected squared Frobenius error can be achieved by the following result.

**Theorem 3.1.** If the matrix elements $A_{ij}$ and $B_{jk}$ are independent random variables, $i \in [m]$, $j \in [n]$ and $k \in [d]$, with finite and nonzero moments $E_A[\|A_{ij}\|_2^2]$ and $E_B[\|B_{jk}\|_2^2]$. Then the probability $\xi^*$, which is defined as

$$\xi_j^* = \frac{\sqrt{E_A[\|A_{ij}\|_2^2]E_B[\|B_{jk}\|_2^2]}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{E_A[\|A_{ij}\|_2^2]E_B[\|B_{jk}\|_2^2]}},$$

minimizes the expected value of the variance in (1), that is,

$$\min_{\xi} E_{A,B}[E_\xi[\|AB - \tilde{AB}\|_F^2]] = E_{A,B}[E_{\xi^*}[\|AB - \tilde{AB}\|_F^2]] = \frac{1}{M^L} \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^{M^L} \sqrt{E_A[\|A_{ij}\|_2^2]E_B[\|B_{jk}\|_2^2]} \right)^2 - E_{A,B}[\|AB\|_F^2] \right) = \frac{\mu}{M^L},$$

where $\mu = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{E_A[\|A_{ij}\|_2^2]E_B[\|B_{jk}\|_2^2]} \right)^2 - E_{A,B}[\|AB\|_F^2]$, and $E_{A,B}[\cdot]$ is the expectation with respect to the (element-wise) probabilities of $A$ and $B$.

The proof is omitted here as it is quite similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [3]. Besides, as discussed in Section 2, it is impractical to use $\xi^*$ for random sampling. A simpler option would be to use a uniform probability $\xi^u$ as defined in (4).

**Theorem 3.2.** Assume the same setting as in Theorem 3.1 but with probability $\xi^u$ as defined in (4), then the expected squared Frobenius error is

$$E_{A,B}[E_{\xi^u}[\|AB - \tilde{AB}\|_F^2]] = E_{A,B}[E_{\xi^*}[\|AB - \tilde{AB}\|_F^2]] + \frac{n\tilde{\nu}}{M^L} = \frac{n\tilde{\nu} + \mu}{M^L},$$

(19)
where
\[
\bar{\nu} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \sqrt{E_A[\| A_{i,:} \|^2_2]} \sqrt{E_B[\| B_{i,:} \|^2_2]} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sqrt{E_A[\| A_{j,:} \|^2_2]} \sqrt{E_B[\| B_{j,:} \|^2_2]} \right)^2.
\]

The proof is omitted here as it follows the proof of Theorem 2.3.

In this context, a quantity of interest \( \nu \) can be approximated with standard MC coupled to a random sampling method for matrix multiplication via uniform probability (4)

\[
E_{A,B}[P] := E_{A,B}[f^\circ(AB)] \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(AS_L^{(j)}(S_L^{(j)})^T B) := \hat{P},
\]

where \( N \) is the number of realizations for \( M_L \) many index samples. To consider the MSE for the estimate \( \hat{P} \), we apply a matrix vectorization: for instance, if \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \),

\[
\text{vec}(A) = \text{vec}([A_{1,:} \cdots A_{n,:}]) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,:} \\ \vdots \\ A_{n,:} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{mn},
\]

is the column concatenation of \( A \) into a vector. Then the MSE would be

\[
E[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P} - E[P]) \|^2_2] = E[\| \text{vec}(E[\hat{P}] - E[P]) \|^2_2] + E[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}]) \|^2_2]
\]
\[
= \| \text{vec}(E[A(I - S_L S_L^T)B]) \|^2_2 + E[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}]) \|^2_2]
\]
\[
= \| \text{vec}(E[A(I - S_L S_L^T)B]) \|^2_2 + \nu_1[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P}) \|],
\]

where \( E \) is short for \( E_{A,B,\xi} \) and \( \nu_1[\| \text{vec}(X) \|] := E[\| \text{vec}(X - E[X]) \|^2_2] \) for any random matrix \( X \). Besides, it is easy to verify that

\[
\nu_1[\| X + Y \|] \leq \nu_1[\| X \|] + \nu_1[\| Y \|],
\]

for any random vectors \( X, Y \). Note that the variance of a vectorized random matrix is indeed the variance of the random matrix in Frobenius norm. For example,

\[
\nu_1[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P}) \|] = E[\| \text{vec}(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}]) \|^2_2] = E\left[ \sum_{h=1}^{md} \text{vec}(\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}])_{h}^2 \right]
\]
\[
= E\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{d} (\hat{P} - E[\hat{P}])_{ik}^2 \right] = E[\| \hat{P} - E[\hat{P}] \|^2_F].
\]

Now let us extend the approach of Section 2.2 to matrix multiplication. For \( l \in \{L\} \cup \{0\} \), define \( \hat{P}_l \) as the approximation to \( f^\circ(AB) \) with \( M_l \) many index samples. Recall that \( \hat{Y}_l \) is an estimator of \( E[\hat{P}_l - \hat{P}_{l-1}] \) using \( N_l \) realizations with \( l > 0 \) and \( \hat{Y}_0 \) the respective estimator of \( E[\hat{P}_0] \) using \( N_0 \) samples, as defined in (9). From (10), we have that \( E[\hat{P}_L] = E[\hat{Y}] \).
**Theorem 3.3.** Let $A$ and $B$ be two random matrices with sizes $m \times n$ and $n \times d$ respectively, drawn from different distributions, namely $A_{ij} \sim \mathcal{L}_{A_{ij}}$ and $B_{jk} \sim \mathcal{L}_{B_{jk}}$, with $i \in [m]$, $j \in [n]$ and $k \in [d]$. Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipchitz function with Lipchitz number $C_f$. Denote by $P$ the term of interest as in (20). Define $\hat{P}$ the corresponding approximation to $f(AB)$ based on the sketched version of matrix multiplication via $M$ many index samples like in (16).

If there exist independent estimators $\hat{Y}_l$ as in (9) based on $N_l$ Monte Carlo samples, and positive constants $c_1$, $c_2$, $c_3$ such that

1. $\|\vec{\text{vec}}(\mathbb{E}[\hat{P}_l - P])\|_2^2 \leq c_1^2 M^{-1}$,
2. $\mathbb{V}[\vec{\text{vec}}(\hat{Y}_l)] \leq c_2 N_l^{-1} M^{-1}$,
3. the complexity of $\hat{Y}_l$, denoted by $C_l$, is bounded by $C_l \leq c_3 N_l M^L$,

then there exists a positive constant $c_4$ such that for $\epsilon < e^{-1}$, there are values $L$ and $N_l$ for which the multilevel estimator $\hat{Y} = \sum_{l=0}^L \hat{Y}_l$ has an MSE $\mathbb{E}[\|\vec{\text{vec}}(\hat{Y} - \mathbb{E}[P])\|_2^2]$ with bound $\epsilon^2$, with computational complexity

$$C(\hat{Y}) := \sum_{l=0}^L C_l \leq c_4 \epsilon^{-2} (\log \epsilon)^2.$$  

Furthermore, define the estimator based on the finest level $L$ and $N$ realisations as in (6). Suppose

1. the variance for $\hat{P}$ is bounded by the same constant $c_2$, i.e., $\mathbb{V}[\hat{P}] \leq c_2 N^{-1}$,
2. the complexity for $\hat{P}$ is bounded by the same constant $c_3$, i.e., $C(\hat{P}) \leq c_3 NM^L$,

then with the same accuracy $\epsilon^2$, $C(\hat{P}) \leq c_6 \epsilon^{-4}$ which is much larger than $C(\hat{Y})$.

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.3, expect from the decomposition of MSE,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\vec{\text{vec}}(\hat{Y} - \mathbb{E}[P])\|_2^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\vec{\text{vec}}(\mathbb{E}[\hat{Y} - P])\|_2^2] + \mathbb{V}[\vec{\text{vec}}(\hat{Y})],$$  

so we omit the proof. An more important issue is to verify our proposed MLMC satisfy the conditions in Theorem 3.3.

**Corollary 3.4.** Assume the same setting in Theorem 3.3. Then we have

1. $c_1 = C_f^2(n \nu + \mu)$,
2. $c_2 = 2C_f^2(M + 1)(n \nu + \mu) + 2\mathbb{V}[f(AB)]$,
3. $c_3 = md(1 + M^{-1})$.  
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Proof. 1. For any \( l \in \mathbb{N} \) we have that
\[
\| \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[f^\circ(AB) - f^\circ(AS_iS_i^T B)]) \|_2^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\| \text{vec}(f^\circ(AB) - f^\circ(AS_iS_i^T B)) \|_2^2]
= \mathbb{E}[\| f^\circ(AB) - f^\circ(AS_iS_i^T B) \|_{\vec{F}}^2]
\leq C_f^2 \mathbb{E}[\| AB - AS_iS_i^T B \|_{\vec{F}}^2]
\leq C_f^2 M^{-l}(n\nu + \mu),
\]
where the last inequality comes from Theorem 3.2.

2. For any \( l > 0 \) we have that
\[
\mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(\hat{P}_l - \hat{P}_{l-1})] \leq \left( \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(\hat{P}_l - f^\circ(AB))] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(\hat{P}_{l-1} - f^\circ(AB))] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq \left( \mathbb{E}[\| \text{vec}(f^\circ(AB) - f^\circ(AS_iS_i^T B)) \|_2^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
+ \mathbb{E}[\| \text{vec}(f^\circ(AB) - f^\circ(AS_iS_i^T B)) \|_2^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq 2C_f^2 \mathbb{E}[\| AB - AS_iS_i^T B \|_{\vec{F}}^2] \leq 2C_f^2 (M^{-1} + M^{-l+1})(n\nu + \mu)
\leq 2C_f^2 (M + 1)(n\nu + \mu)M^{-l}.
\]

For \( l = 0 \) we have that
\[
\mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(\hat{P}_0)] = \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(f^\circ(A^T S_0^T S_0^T B))]
\leq \left( \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(f^\circ(A^T S_0^T S_0^T B)) - f^\circ(AB))] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(f^\circ(AB))] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
\leq 2C_f^2 \mathbb{E}[\| A(I - S_0S_0^T B) \|_{\vec{F}}^2] + 2\mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(f^\circ(AB))]
\leq 2C_f^2 (n\nu + \mu) + 2\mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(f^\circ(AB))].
\]

Besides, it is easy to see that \( \mathbb{V}_l[\text{vec}(\hat{P})] \) can be bounded by the same \( c_2 \) together with \( N^{-1} \).

3. For any \( l > 0 \) we can see easily the complexity is roughly
\[
C_l \leq mdN^l(M^l + M^{l-1}) = md(1 + M^{-1})N^1M^l,
\]
while
\[
C_0 \leq mdN^0M^0 \leq md(1 + M^{-1})N^0M^0.
\]

Besides, we have for the complexity of \( \hat{P} \) that
\[
C(\hat{P}) \leq mdNM^L \leq md(1 + M^{-1})NM^L.
\]
Thus \( c_3 \) can be set as \( md(1 + M^{-1}) \).
On choosing optimally the value of $M$, the argument follows similarly to that in Section 2.1, that is, $M = 11$ leads to the least computational complexity among between all choices of $M$. In the numerical experiment (Section 4.2), it turns out $M = 10$ gives the best approximation.

Algorithm 2 lists the steps for approximating quantities of the form $\mathbb{E}[f^\circ(AB)]$, of which the product $AB$ is special case. As in Section 2.2, it is critical that $\hat{P}^{(l)}_l$ and $\hat{P}^{(l-1)}_{l-1}$, for the $N_l$ copies at level $l$ are obtained through the same realization of $M^l$ indices. That is, if $\{r_1, \ldots, r_{M^l}\}$ is the realization, then

$$
\hat{Y}^{(l)}_l = f^\circ \left( \frac{n}{M^l} \sum_{j=1}^{M^l} A^{(k)}_{r_j} B^{(k)}_{r_j} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{Y}^{(l-1)}_{l-1} = f^\circ \left( \frac{n}{M^{l-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{M^{l-1}} A^{(k)}_{r_j,M^l} B^{(k)}_{r_j,M^l} \right),
$$

as shown at Line 16 of the algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2** The MLMC estimator for $\mathbb{E}[f^\circ(AB)]$.

1: **input:** $A$ and $B$, the targeted random matrices to multiply;
2: $L$, the level size;
3: $N_l$, sample size of each level $l \in [L] \cup \{0\}$.
4: **output:** $\hat{Y}$, the approximated version of $\mathbb{E}[f^\circ(AB)]$.
5: **initialization:** $\hat{Y}$ and $\hat{Y}_0$ for $l \in [L] \cup \{0\}$.
6: **for** $\ell = 1 \cdots N_0$ (the number of iterations) **do**
7: get a pair of samples $A^{(\ell)}$ and $B^{(\ell)}$;
8: random pick one index $r$ from 1 to $n$ based on equal probabilities $\xi^u$;
9: set $\hat{Y}_0 = \hat{Y}_0 + \frac{1}{N_0} f^\circ(n A^{(\ell)} B^{(\ell)})$;
10: **end for**
11: set $\hat{Y} = \hat{Y} + \hat{Y}_0$;
12: **for** $l = 1 \cdots L$ (the number of levels) **do**
13: **for** $k = 1 \cdots N_l$ (the number of iterations) **do**
14: get a pair of samples $A^{(k)}$ and $B^{(k)}$;
15: random pick $M^l$ many indices $r_i$ with $i \in [M^l]$ from 1 to $n$ based on $\xi^u$;
16: set

$$
\hat{Y}_l = \hat{Y}_l + \frac{1}{N_l} \left( f^\circ \left( \frac{n}{M^l} \sum_{j=1}^{M^l} A^{(k)}_{r_j} B^{(k)}_{r_j} \right) - f^\circ \left( \frac{n}{M^{l-1}} \sum_{j=1}^{M^{l-1}} A^{(k)}_{r_j,M^l} B^{(k)}_{r_j,M^l} \right) \right),
$$

17: **end for**
18: set $\hat{Y} = \hat{Y} + \hat{Y}_l$;
19: **end for**
20: **return:** $\hat{Y}$.
Table 1: Numerical results from the implementation of our method on approximating the inner product. These include records of the relative errors (RE) and computational times for Algorithm 1 under different choices of $M$ and the corresponding $L$ obtained from (11) with $c_1 = 1$. For comparison we provide also the results from standard MC based on finest level $L$.

4 Numerical experiments

In this part, we present some numerical experiments designed to test the performance of Algorithms 1 and 2 in comparison with a standard MC method.

4.1 Example for the inner product

Set $n = 1000$ with $a_j \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(0.5 - N(0, 1))$ and $b_j \sim \cos\left(\text{Poi}(10) + 2\text{Exp}(1)\right)$, $j \in [n]$. The targeted function is simply $f(x) := |x|H(x - 10)$, where $H(\cdot)$ is an Heaviside step function. It is easy to verify that in this case $C_f = 1$.

We run Algorithm 1 with parameters $(M, L)$ determined beforehand. Here $M \in \{2, 3, \ldots, 12\}$ and the corresponding $L$ is determined by (11) with $c_1$ assigned to 1 for simplicity. In order to incorporate the information of vector length into the algorithm, we modify the formula of (11) as follows:

$$L = \max\left\{\left\lfloor \frac{\log(2c_1^2\epsilon^{-2})}{\log M} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{\log M} \right\rfloor\right\}. \quad (25)$$

The number of realizations for each level $l \leq L$, is determined from (12) with $c_2$ set to 1 for simplicity. Meanwhile, for each pair $(M, L)$, a standard MC simulation is conducted with number of copies $N$ determined by $\lceil 2c_2\epsilon^{-2} \rceil$ as in the proof of Theorem 2.3. The results obtained are recorded in Table 1.

From Table 1, the MLMC estimator in general outperforms the MC one. In terms of the elapsed time, with $L$ fixed, we compare performance across different $M$, for example, among $M = 12$ (row 1), $M = 11$ (row 2) and $M = 10$ (row 3), and note that the time
Table 2: Numerical results from the implementation of our method on approximating the inner product. These include records of the relative errors (RE) and cost of time from Algorithm 2 under different choices of $M$ and the corresponding $L$ obtained from (11) with $c_1 = 1$. For the sake of comparison we provide also the results from a standard MC simulation based on finest level $L$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$(M, L)$ pair</th>
<th>$M^L$</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>RE (MC)</th>
<th>time (MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M = 32, L = 2$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1.56 s</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>20.01 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 31, L = 2$</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1.55 s</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.11 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 12, L = 3$</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12.03 s</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>30.98 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 10, L = 3$</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.67 s</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>18.51 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 9, L = 4$</td>
<td>6561</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>54.14 s</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>194.17 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 6, L = 4$</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16.89 s</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>24.73 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 4, L = 5$</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28.33 s</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>17.34 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M = 3, L = 7$</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>456.58 s</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>43.34 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Example for the matrix multiplication

In this case we consider a setup with $n = 1000$, $m = d = 10$ using $A_{ij} \sim g_1(\frac{1}{100}(0.5 - N(0,1)))$, where $g_1(x) := \sin(x) + N(0,1)x$, and $B_{jk} \sim g_2(\text{Poi}(10))$, where $g_2(x) := \cos(x)H(5 - x)$ for $i \in [m], j \in [n]$ and $k \in [d]$. The targeted function is set to $f(x) := x^2\sin\left(\frac{1}{|x_1|+\zeta}\right)$, where $\zeta$ is an extremely small positive constant to dampen the singularity in $f$.

Similar to the inner product example, we run Algorithm 2 with pairs $(M, L)$ determined beforehand. Here we use the range $M \in \{3, \ldots, 50\}$ and the corresponding $L$ is determined by (11), which is valid for matrix case too, and we take $c_1$ equal to 1 for simplicity. The number of realisations for each level $l \leq L$ is determined by (12) with $c_2$ set to 1 for simplicity. Meanwhile, for each pair $(M, L)$, a standard MC simulation is conducted with a number of copies $N$ determined by $[2c_2\epsilon^{-2}]$. For clarity in the presen-
tation, the results tabulated in Table 2 are those for the value of $M$ corresponding to either the best relative error or the shortest time among all $M$ that share the same $L$.

From the Table 2 we can observe that for $L > 4$ although the relative error is relatively small, it is more time consuming to conduct MLMC algorithm than the MC one. On the other hand, for $L$ as small as 2, the MLMC algorithm is not so computationally expensive but this comes at a higher error compared to the results from $L = 3, 4$. This affirms that there exists a trade-off between computational cost and accuracy. Indeed, when $L$ is small, the information obtained for recovering the true solution is much less, thus we cannot expect a better result in this case. On the contrary, larger $L$ implies more information content, which in turn requires longer for the algorithm to process. The best performance is obtained at $M = 10, L = 3$, when both RE and the time elapsed can be deemed acceptable.

5 Conclusions

We have presented a new approach for computing arbitrary vector and matrix products ‘on-the-fly’ that combines ideas from sketching in randomized numerical linear algebra and multilevel Monte Carlo approaches for estimating high-dimensional integrals. Our approach is simple to implement and, subject to optimizing some algorithmic parameters, it outperforms the standard Monte Carlo scheme in both the accuracy of the estimator and the time required to compute it.
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