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Abstract

The estimation of the probability of rare events is an important task in reliability and risk assessment. We consider failure events that are expressed in terms of a limit-state function, which depends on the solution of a partial differential equation (PDE). In many applications, the PDE cannot be solved analytically. We can only evaluate an approximation of the exact PDE solution. Therefore, the probability of rare events is estimated with respect to an approximation of the limit-state function. This leads to an approximation error in the estimate of the probability of rare events. Indeed, we prove an error bound for the approximation error of the probability of failure, which behaves like the discretization accuracy of the PDE multiplied by an approximation of the probability of failure. Hence, we derive a relationship between the required accuracy of the probability of rare events estimate and the PDE discretization level. As our error bound depends on a computable approximation of the failure probability, it is applicable in practicable reliability analyses and, for instance, in multilevel methods.
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1 Introduction

The distinction of safe and failure events is a crucial topic in reliability analysis and risk management. The occurrence of failure events cannot always be avoided; therefore, the estimation of the probability of such occurrences is of high significance. Indeed, failure probabilities are usually small; hence, the denomination probability of rare events is commonly used. The failure event can be defined in terms of a limit-state function (LSF). The LSF is a function of a set of uncertain parameters and the failure event is defined by the collection of parameter values for which the LSF takes non-positive values.

In this work, we consider settings where the LSF is based on the solution of an elliptic partial differential equation (PDE) with random diffusion coefficient. These situations frequently arise in engineering risk settings. For example, the authors in [4, 19] consider radioactive waste repositories. Therein, the departure of radioactive particles and their travel paths through the subsurface are of high relevance. The goal is to determine the probability that radioactive particles come back to the human environment. Since the exact subsurface properties and exact travel paths of the particles are unknown, the porosity of the soil is modelled as a random field while the particle flow is simulated by a finite element method (FEM) approximation of the groundwater flow and transport equation.
The application of discretization schemes, such as Finite Differences [17], Finite Volumes [9] or FEM [2], introduce a PDE discretization error in the evaluation of the LSF. Consequently, this leads to an approximation error of the probability of rare events. The accuracy of the approximation depends on the discretization size of the spatial or temporal domain. In previous years, many methods have been developed for rare event estimation, which are based on a sequence of discretization levels with increasing accuracy. Examples are Multilevel Subset Simulation [27], Multilevel Monte Carlo [7], Multilevel Sequential Importance Sampling [29] or a multifidelity approach in [22]. However, only the sampling error of the methods has been considered so far. In contrast, we do not consider the sampling error and focus on the PDE discretization error.

There is a large amount of literature available, which derive error bounds for the PDE discretization error. However, there are few publications which consider the induced approximation error of rare event probabilities. The authors in [7] derive an upper bound for the absolute approximation error of the probability of failure which behaves as the PDE discretization error. However, the absolute error is of limited interest since failure probabilities are usually small. This manuscript closes this gap for LSFs which are based on elliptic PDEs. Indeed, the work of [7] forms the starting point for our contributions. We derive an error bound for the probability of rare events which behaves as the PDE discretization error multiplied by the first order reliability method (FORM) [14, 16] estimate. The FORM estimate is determined by the minimum distance of the failure domain to the origin of an independent standard Gaussian input space. If the failure domain is a convex set, the FORM estimate is an upper bound for the probability of the rare event. We use this condition as an assumption for the derived error bound. Indeed, if the FORM estimate is equal to the probability of failure, our error bound gives an upper bound for the relative error. An example for this case is a LSF which is affine linear with respect to Gaussian stochastic parameters.

The manuscript is structured as follows. In Section 2, we present the main theorem, underlying setting and relevant assumptions. The proof of the theorem is given in the subsequent sections. First, we show that the absolute error is bounded by the PDE discretization error multiplied by the local Lipschitz constant associated with the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the LSF. In Section 3, we show that for affine linear LSFs, the upper bound of the local Lipschitz constant depends linearly on the probability of failure. This gives an upper bound for the relative error. If the LSF is based on the solution of an elliptic PDE with stochastic diffusion coefficient, we show in Section 4 that the distance of the exact and approximate failure domains behaves as the PDE discretization error. Thereafter, we show that the Gaussian measure of the symmetric difference of the failure domains can be bounded by the Gaussian measure of an interval in 1D. Using this fact, the LSF is linearized around the FORM point and the results for affine linear LSFs are applied. This proves the main theorem. In Section 5, we consider three numerical examples, two in low dimensions with analytical solutions, and one high-dimensional example.

2 Problem Setting and Main Result

Even though many of our results are applicable to more general settings, we focus in this work on failure events that are based on the solution of an elliptic PDE with random diffusion coefficient and Dirichlet boundary conditions. In the following subsections, we first introduce this setting more particularly. Then, we briefly describe the FORM approach to the estimation of rare event probabilities. The FORM estimate is part of the error
bound that forms the main result of this work and that we summarise in Section 2.3.

2.1 Elliptic PDE, failure events, and their approximation

Let \((\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})\) be a probability space and \(D \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) be an open, bounded, connected, polygonal domain. The given quantities are a real-valued random field \(a : D \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\) and a real valued function \(f \in L^2(D)\). We seek a random field \(y : D \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\), such that for \(\mathbb{P}\)-almost every (a.e.) \(\omega \in \Omega\) it holds

\[
-\nabla_x \cdot (a(x,\omega)\nabla_x y(x,\omega)) = f(x) \quad \forall x \in D, \\
y(x,\omega) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \partial D.
\]

(2.1)

(2.2)

In practice, we employ a FEM discretization to solve (2.1). Thus, we consider the weak discretized pathwise variational formulation typically the mesh size. We define the variational formulation where \(V\) is a suitable function space. Let \(h > 0\) denote a discretization parameter, implicitly depends on an \(n\)-dimensional parameter given by the outcomes \(u \in \mathcal{V}_h\) as

\[
\int_D a(x,\omega)\nabla_x y_h(x,\omega) \cdot \nabla_x v_h(x)dx = \int_D f(x)v_h(x)dx \quad \forall v_h \in V_h.
\]

(2.3)

(2.4)

Here, \(V_h \subset V\) is a finite dimensional vector space. Under the following pathwise boundedness assumption, \cite[Theorem 9.9]{18} ensures existence and uniqueness of a solution for (2.3) and (2.4) for \(V := H^1_0(D)\).

Assumption 2.1 (Pathwise ellipticity and boundedness). There exists real-valued random variables \(a_{\text{min}}, a_{\text{max}} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}\) such that \(a(\cdot,\omega) \in L^\infty(D)\) for \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.e. \(\omega \in \Omega\) and

\[
0 < a_{\text{min}}(\omega) \leq a(x,\omega) \leq a_{\text{max}}(\omega) < \infty \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in D.
\]

We assume that the diffusion coefficient \(a\) implicitly depends on an \(n\)-dimensional random variable \(U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n\), where \(U\) follows the \(n\)-variate independent standard normal distribution. Therefore, \(a(x,\omega)\) can be viewed as a function in space depending on a \(n\)-dimensional parameter given by the outcomes \(u \in \mathbb{R}^n\) of \(U\). If a non-Gaussian random variable \(\tilde{U}\) is required, an isoprobabilistic transformation \(U = T(\tilde{U})\) is applied; see \cite[15] for details. Moreover, we require the following regularity assumption to guarantee that the solution \(y\) is sufficiently smooth.

Assumption 2.2 (Regularity of the diffusion coefficient). For the random field \(a\) we assume that:

(i) \(1/a_{\text{min}} \in L^p(\Omega)\) for all \(p \in (0, \infty)\) where \(a_{\text{min}}(\omega) := \min_{x \in D} a(x,\omega)\),

(ii) \(a \in L^p(\Omega, C^1(\bar{D}))\) for all \(p \in (0, \infty)\), i.e., the realisations \(a(\cdot,\omega)\) are continuously differentiable,

(iii) \(a(x,\cdot)\) is three times continuously differentiable with respect to outcomes \(u \in \mathbb{R}^n\) of \(U\) for all \(x \in D\).
Under Assumptions \ref{ass:cont} and \ref{ass:cont2} \((i), (ii)\), the authors in \cite[Theorem 3.4]{3} show that \(y \in L^p(\Omega, H^2(D))\) for any \(p \in (0, \infty)\), where \(y\) is the solution of the pathwise variational formulation \eqref{eq:2.3}. We require that \(y(\cdot, \omega) \in H^2(D)\) and Assumption \ref{ass:cont2} \((iii)\) in the proof of Theorem \ref{thm:4.2}

Based on the elliptic PDE, we now define the LSF, the failure event, the failure probability, and their approximations. Failure is defined in terms of an LSF \(G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) such that \(G(U(\omega)) \leq 0\) for \(\omega \in \Omega\). Furthermore, we assume that the LSF \(G\) and the PDE solution \(y\) are related via a linear and twice continuously Fréchet differentiable operator \(F : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\)

\[
G(U(\omega)) := y_{\text{max}} - F(y(\cdot, \omega)),
\]

where \(y_{\text{max}} \in \mathbb{R}\) is a constant. Analogously, we define the discretized LSF \(G_h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) as

\[
G_h(U(\omega)) := y_{\text{max}} - F_h(y_h(\cdot, \omega)),
\]

where \(F_h : V_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is the induced discretization of \(F\). The probability of failure is defined as the probability mass of the failure domain \(A := \{\omega \in \Omega : G(U(\omega)) \leq 0\}\), which is expressed as

\[
P_f := \mathbb{P}[A] = \mathbb{P}[G(U) \leq 0] = \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} I(G(u) \leq 0) \varphi_n(u) du,
\]

where \(I\) denotes the indicator function; i.e., \(I(\text{true}) = 1\) and \(I(\text{false}) = 0\). The function \(\varphi_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) denotes the probability density function (PDF) of the \(n\)-variate independent standard normal distribution, which we denote by \(N(0, \text{Id}_n)\). Replacing \(G\) by \(G_h\) in \eqref{eq:2.7} gives the approximation

\[
P_{f,h} := \mathbb{P}[A_h] = \mathbb{P}[G_h(U) \leq 0] = \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} I(G_h(u) \leq 0) \varphi_n(u) du,
\]

where \(A_h = \{\omega \in \Omega : G_h(U(\omega)) \leq 0\}\). Since \(P_{f,h}\) includes numerical errors due to approximating the exact LSF \(G\), we cannot expect equality of \(P_f\) and \(P_{f,h}\). The main contribution of this work is the derivation of an upper bound for the error

\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \mathbb{P}[A \triangle A_h],
\]

where \(A \triangle A_h := (A \setminus A_h) \cup (A_h \setminus A) = \{\omega \in \Omega : \text{either } \omega \in A \text{ or } \omega \in A_h\}\) is the symmetric difference of \(A\) and \(A_h\). This upper bound behaves as a certain approximation to the rare event probability with the approximate model multiplied with the discretization error of \(|Fy - F_hy_h|\). For the latter, we assume the following approximation property.

**Assumption 2.3.** There exists constants \(C_{FE} > 0\) and \(s > 0\) independent of \(h\), such that the discretization error with respect to the solution of \eqref{eq:2.3} and \eqref{eq:2.4} satisfies for \(\mathbb{P}\)-a.e. \(\omega \in \Omega\)

\[
|G(U(\omega)) - G_h(U(\omega))| = |Fy(\cdot, \omega) - F_hy_h(\cdot, \omega)| \leq C_{FE} h^s.
\]

Moreover, the CDFs of the random variables \(G(U)\) and \(G_h(U)\) are local Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constants \(C_L > 0\) and \(C_{L,h} > 0\), i.e., for \(a, b \in [-C_{FE} h^s, C_{FE} h^s]\) with \(a < b\) it holds

\[
\mathbb{P}[G(U) \in [a, b]] = \mathbb{P}[G(U) \leq b] - \mathbb{P}[G(U) \leq a] \leq C_L |a - b|,
\]

\[
\mathbb{P}[G_h(U) \in [a, b]] = \mathbb{P}[G_h(U) \leq b] - \mathbb{P}[G_h(U) \leq a] \leq C_{L,h} |a - b|,
\]
we consider finitely many KL terms and the eigenfunctions $z_m$ the flow rate $y$ differentiable. Failure occurs if the flow rate $y$ at $x = 1$ is larger than $q_{\text{max}}$ at $x = 1$. Hence, the operator $F$ is given as the point evaluation of the flow rate $q$ at $x = 1$, which yields the LSF $G(U(\omega)) = q_{\text{max}} - q(1, \omega)$. Linear FEs are applied to derive a discretization. By [25, Section 1.6] it follows that
\[
\|y(\cdot, \omega) - y_h(\cdot, \omega)\|_{W^{1, \infty}} \leq C_{\text{FE}} h \|y(\cdot, \omega)\|_{W^{2, \infty}}.
\]
Hence, Assumption 2.3 holds for $s = 1$.

2.2 FORM probability of failure

We derive an upper bound for the error given in (2.9) which depends on the PDE discretization error and on an approximation of the probability of failure. This approximation will be given by the FORM estimate of the probability of failure; see [14, 16] for details. We now briefly introduce the FORM method.
We define the most probable failure point \( u_\text{FORM} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) as the solution of the minimization problem

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_2^2, \quad \text{such that} \quad G(u) = 0.
\]

Hence, \( u_\text{FORM} \) is the element of the set \( \{G = 0\} \) that has smallest distance to the origin and, thus, maximizes the Gaussian density \( \varphi_n \). Accordingly, we denote the most probable failure point with respect to the discretization \( G_h \) as \( u_\text{FORM}^h \). We require that \( G(0) > 0 \) and \( G_h(0) > 0 \), since we are generally interested in estimating failure probabilities which are in the tail of the densities. Using the FORM points, we obtain an estimate for the probability of failure via

\[
P_f = \Phi(-\|u_\text{FORM}\|_2) \quad \text{and} \quad P_{f,h} = \Phi(-\|u_\text{FORM}^h\|_2),
\]

where \( \Phi \) is the CDF of the one-dimensional standard normal distribution. The FORM estimate is equal to the probability mass of the half-space which is defined through the hyperplane at the FORM point with direction perpendicular to the surface of the failure domain. Thus, the FORM estimate is an upper bound for the probability of failure, if the failure domain is convex. We use the convexity of the failure domains as an assumption on the LSF. Moreover, we require the following assumption on the gradient of the LSF, which is relevant for the proof of Theorem 4.2.

**Assumption 2.4.**

(i) The failure domains \( A \) and \( A_h \) are unbounded, convex sets.

(ii) For all \( h > 0 \) there exists \( \nu_h > 0 \) such that for almost every \( u \in \partial A \) it holds \( \nabla_u G(u) \neq 0, \nabla_u G_h(u) \neq 0 \) and \( |\cos(\angle(u - u_h, \nabla_u G(u)))| \geq \nu_h \), where \( u_h \in \partial A_h \) is the point that has minimal distance to \( u \) and \( \angle(\cdot, \cdot) \) denotes the angle between two vectors.

Assumption 2.4 (ii) states that the direction from a point \( u \in \partial A \) to its nearest neighbour \( u_h \in \partial A_h \) is not orthogonal to the gradient \( \nabla_u G(u) \).

### 2.3 Error bound for the probability of failure

The following theorem is the main statement of this manuscript and states an error bound for the probability of failure in dependence of the discretized FORM estimate \( P_{f,h} \).

**Theorem 2.1.** Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 hold. Then for \( h > 0 \) sufficiently small, the error of the exact and approximate probability of failure is upper bounded by

\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \hat{C} h^s P_{f,h} \FORM,
\]

where \( P_{f,h} \FORM \) is the FORM probability of failure estimate.

We note that the constant \( \hat{C} \) depends on \( C \FORM, h, n \) and \( \|u_h\FORM\|_2 \). We will discuss the behaviour of \( \hat{C} \) with respect to its dependencies in the following sections.

The outline of the proof is as follows:

(P1) For the absolute error, we derive the bound

\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq C_1 h^n,
\]

where \( C_1 \) depends on the local Lipschitz constant \( C_L \) of the CDF of \( G(U) \).
Under the assumption that $G$ is affine linear with respect to $U$, we derive an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant of the CDF of $G(U)$ which depends linearly on $P_f$. This yields an upper bound for the relative error $|P_f - P_{f,h}| / P_f \leq C_2 h^s$.

For LSFs of the form (2.5) and (2.6), we prove that the distance between the exact limit-state surface $\partial A := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : G(u) = 0\}$ and its approximation $\partial A_h := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : G_h(u) = 0\}$ has order $O(h^s)$ of convergence for $h > 0$ sufficiently small, i.e., for all $u \in \partial A$ it holds $\text{dist}(u, \partial A_h) \leq C_3 h^s$.

We apply the derived bound of the linear case (P2) to the linearization of $G_h$ around the FORM point $u_{h}^{\text{FORM}}$ to derive an upper bound for the Gaussian measure of the symmetric difference $A \triangle A_h$ in the form $|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \mathbb{P}[A \triangle A_h] \leq C_4 h^s P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}}$.

In the following sections, we provide full details of the steps (P1)–(P4). This proves Theorem 2.1.

Remark 2.2. We note that the approximation property of the LSF given in Assumption 2.3 determines the approximation property of the probability of failure. If the approximation error of the LSF behaves in a more general form, (P1) and (P2) can be directly applied to show that the approximation error of the probability of failure behaves in the same manner. However, (P3) is only applicable for LSFs stemming from an elliptic PDE and satisfying the regularity assumptions. Indeed, if it is possible to show that (P3) holds for more general approximation properties of the LSF, then (P4) is directly applicable.

2.4 Absolute error bound

Under Assumption 2.3 we prove that the upper bound for the absolute error of the probability of failure behaves as the approximation error of the LSF, which proves (P1). This result and proof technique is similar to [7, Lemma 3.4]. Considering equations (2.7) and (2.8), the approximation error is based on the symmetric difference $A \triangle A_h$. The following lemma gives an upper bound for the absolute error.

Lemma 2.1. Under Assumption 2.3, the absolute approximation error of the probability of failure is bounded in the following way:

$$|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \mathbb{P}[G(U) \in [-C_{FE} h^s, C_{FE} h^s]] \leq 2C_L C_{FE} h^s =: C_1 h^s.$$  (2.12)

Proof. Inserting the definitions of $P_f$ and $P_{f,h}$ given in (2.7) and (2.8) in the left hand side of (2.12) we get

$$|P_f - P_{f,h}| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I(G(u) \leq 0) - I(G_h(u) \leq 0)) \varphi_n(u) du \right|$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (I(G(u) \leq 0 \land G_h(u) > 0) - I(G(u) > 0 \land G_h(u) \leq 0)) \varphi_n(u) du$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}[\{G(U) \leq 0\} \cap \{G_h(U) > 0\}] + \mathbb{P}[\{G(U) > 0\} \cap \{G_h(U) \leq 0\}]$$

$$= \mathbb{P}[A \triangle A_h],$$

$$\leq C_1 h^s.$$
where \([2.14]\) follows from the triangle inequality. Using Assumption \([2.3]\) we know that
the case \([G(u) \leq 0 \wedge G_h(u) > 0]\) only occurs if \(G(u) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0] \cap G_h(u) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]\).
Similarly, the case \([G_h(u) \leq 0 \wedge G(u) > 0]\) only occurs if \(G_h(u) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0] \text{ and } G(u) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]\).
Therefore, the absolute approximation error is bounded by
\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq P[G(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0] \cap G_h(U) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]]
+ P[G_h(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0] \cap G(U) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]].
\]
Applying the multiplication rule \(P[B_1 \cap B_2] = P[B_1 \mid B_2]P[B_2]\) for \(B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{A}\) we get that
\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq P[G_h(U) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s] \mid G(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0]] \cdot P[G(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0]]
+ P[G_h(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, 0] \mid G(U) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]] \cdot P[G(U) \in [0, C_{FE}h^s]]
\leq P[G(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, C_{FE}h^s]],
\]
where the last step follows from the fact that probabilities are always bounded by one.
This proves inequality \([2.12]\). To prove \([2.13]\), we use the assumption on the local Lipschitz continuity of \(P[G(U) \leq \cdot]\)
\[
P[G(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, C_{FE}h^s]] \leq 2C_L C_{FE} h^s.
\]

**Remark 2.3.** By switching the roles of \(G\) by \(G_h\) in Lemma \([2.1]\), we obtain
\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq P[G_h(U) \in [-C_{FE}h^s, C_{FE}h^s]] \leq 2C_L h C_{FE} h^s.
\]

### 3. Affine linear limit-state function

The next step of the proof of Theorem \([2.1]\) is (P2). Here, we need to find an upper bound
for the local Lipschitz constant \(C_L\) of Assumption \([2.3]\) around the limit-state surface \(\partial A\)
for the case that \(G\) is affine linear with respect to \(U\).

**Assumption 3.1.** The LSF \(G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is affine linear in the Gaussian random variable \(U\), i.e., \(G(U) = \alpha^T U + \beta\) where \(\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n\), \(\beta > 0\) and \(U \sim N(0, \text{Id}_n)\). Therefore, the probability of failure is given as
\[
P_f = P[G(U) \leq 0] = P[\alpha^T U \leq -\beta] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \|\alpha\|^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2\|\alpha\|^2}\right) du = F_W(-\beta),
\]
where \(W := \alpha^T U\) is distributed according to \(N(0, \|\alpha\|^2)\) and \(F_W(\cdot)\) is the CDF of \(W\).
The shift parameter \(\beta\) is assumed to be positive which yields that \(G(0) > 0\). Under Assumptions \([2.3]\) and \([3.1]\) we prove statement (P2).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let Assumptions \([2.3]\) and \([3.1]\) hold. Then the relative approximation error of the probability of failure is bounded by
\[
\frac{|P_f - P_{f,h}|}{P_f} \leq C_{FE} \cdot C_2(\beta, \sigma, h^s, C_{FE}) \cdot h^s,
\]
where \(\sigma^2 = \|\alpha\|^2_2\).

By Assumption \([3.1]\) the probability of failure is directly given in terms of the CDF \(F_W\).
The goal is to derive an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant \(C_L\) in Assumption \([2.3]\)
which depends linearly on the probability of failure. By Lemma \([2.1]\), this is equivalent
to deriving an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant of \(F_W(\cdot)\) in the interval
\([-\beta - C_{FE}h^s, -\beta + C_{FE}h^s]\). We distinguish two cases in the proof. First, we assume
that the approximation \(G_h\) is one-sided, i.e., \(G(U) \leq G_h(U)\) almost surely. Secondly, we consider the non-one-sided case.
3.1 One-sided approximation

**Assumption 3.2.** The approximation \( G_h \) of the LSF is one-sided with respect to the exact LSF \( G \), that means
\[
G(u) \leq G_h(u)
\]
for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( h > 0 \).

Under Assumption 3.2, it follows that \( P_{f,h} \leq P_f \) and \( \mathbb{P}[G_h(U) \in \left] -C_{FE}h^s,0 \right[ | G(U) \in \left[0,C_{FE}h^s \right]) = 0 \). Hence, the bound for the absolute approximation error in Lemma 2.1 simplifies to
\[
|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \mathbb{P}[G(U) \in \left] -C_{FE}h^s,0 \right[ ] \leq C_L C_{FE}h^s.
\]

Therefore, it suffices to derive an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant of \( F_W(\cdot) \) within the interval \( ] - \beta - C_{FE}h^s, -\beta \). Observe that the derivative of the CDF \( F_W(w) \) with respect to \( w \) is the PDF of the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma^2 \), denoted by \( \varphi_W(w) = \exp(-w^2/(2\sigma^2)) / \sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2} \), which is strictly increasing for \( w \in ] -\infty, 0[ \). Therefore, the local Lipschitz constant of \( F_W \) on the interval \( ] - \beta - C_{FE}h^s, -\beta \) is given by \( \varphi_W(-\beta) \). The goal is to derive an upper bound for \( C_L \) in the form \( C_L \leq C_2 P_f \) for \( C_2 > 0 \). In order to derive this result, we consider the following bounds for the CDF.

**Proposition 3.1.** An upper and lower bound for the CDF \( F_W(\cdot) \) on the interval \( ] -\infty, 0[ \) are given by
\[
F_l(w) := - \frac{\sigma \exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{w}{w^2 + 1} \leq F_W(w) \leq - \frac{\sigma \exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{w \sqrt{2\pi}} =: F_u(w). \quad (3.1)
\]

The derivation of these bounds is given in [12].

With these bounds, we derive an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant \( C_L \) having the desired form.

**Lemma 3.1.** Under Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, it holds that the local Lipschitz constant \( C_L \) within the interval \( ] - \beta - C_{FE}h^s, -\beta \) is bounded by
\[
C_L \leq \left( \frac{\beta}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\beta} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^3} \right) P_f.
\]

**Proof.** 1. The derivative of \( F_u \) is given by
\[
F_u'(w) = \frac{\exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} + \frac{\sigma \exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{w^2 \sqrt{2\pi}} = \frac{\exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \left( 1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{w^2} \right).
\]
Hence, the derivative \( F_u' \) is also an upper bound for the PDF \( \varphi_W(w) \). Moreover, \( F_u'(w) \) is an increasing function for \( w < 0 \) since
\[
F_u''(w) = -\frac{w \exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma^3} - \frac{\exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{w \sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} - \frac{2\sigma \exp \left( - \frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2} \right)}{w^3 \sqrt{2\pi}} > 0, \quad \text{for all } w < 0.
\]
Therefore, the derivative \( F_u' \) at \( w = -\beta \) gives us an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant \( C_L \).
2. $F_u'$ can be written in terms of $F_u$:

$$F_u'(-\beta) = -\frac{\sigma \exp\left(-\frac{\beta^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{\beta \sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{-\beta - \frac{1}{\beta}}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{\beta}\right) = F_u(-\beta) \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^3}\right).$$

Since $F_u$ is an upper bound for $F_W$, we know that $F_u(-\beta) \geq F_W(-\beta) = P_f$. Since $F_l$ is a lower bound for $F_W$, we know that $F_l(-\beta) \leq P_f$. Combining these two statements, we get

$$1 \leq \frac{F_u(-\beta)}{P_f} \leq \frac{F_u(-\beta)}{F_l(-\beta)} = \frac{\beta^2 + 1}{\beta^2},$$

(3.3)

which yields $F_u(-\beta) \leq \left(1 + 1/\beta^2\right) P_f$.

Given (3.2) and (3.3), we conclude that

$$C_L = \varphi_W(-\beta) \leq F_u'(-\beta) = F_u(-\beta) \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\beta}\right) \leq \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^3}\right) P_f.$$

Combining the statements of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 3.1, we conclude the proof of Theorem 3.1 with the constant

$$C_{2,1}(\beta, \sigma) := \left(\frac{\beta}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} + \frac{1}{\beta^3}\right).$$

(3.4)

**Remark 3.1** (Sharper bounds). Applying the bounds of [1, 7.1.13], we can derive the following sharper upper and lower bounds of $F_W(w)$ for $w \in ]-\infty, 0]$:

$$\sqrt{2} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{\sqrt{4 + w^2/\sigma^2 - w/\sigma}} \leq F_W(w) \leq \sqrt{2} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{w^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{\sqrt{2 + w^2/\sigma^2 - w/\sigma}}.$$

(3.5)

Using (3.5), we derive a sharper bound for the Lipschitz constant $C_L$ of the form

$$C_L \leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{4 + \beta^2/\sigma^2 + \beta/\sigma}}{\sqrt{2 + \beta^2/\sigma^2 + \beta/\sigma}}\right) \left(\frac{\beta^2 + \beta/\sqrt{2 + \beta^2/\sigma^2 + \sigma}}{\sigma^2 \sqrt{2 + \beta^2/\sigma^2 + \beta\sigma}}\right) P_f =: \tilde{C}_{2,1}(\beta, \sigma) P_f.$$

The proof works in a similar way as the proof of Lemma 3.1.

Figure 1 shows the constants $C_{2,1}$ and $\tilde{C}_{2,1}$ for varying $\beta$ and $\sigma^2 \in \{0.1, 1.0, 10.0\}$. The x-axis shows the probability of failure $P_f = F_W(-\beta)$. We observe that the constants are large for small variances $\sigma^2$. Since $F_u(0)$ is not defined and $F_l(0) = 0$, the constant $C_{2,1}$ explodes to $+\infty$ for large probability of failures, i.e., $\beta \to 0$ while $\tilde{C}_{2,1}$ yields a small constant in this case. In both plots, we infer that the variance $\sigma^2$ has the main influence on the behaviour of the constants. The probability of failure has only a small influence. For the FORM estimate, the variance of the linearized LSF is the square of the norm of the gradient at the most probable failure point.
Unfortunately, \( C \) is the local Lipschitz constant. By Assumption 2.3, we derive an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant within the first half \([-\beta - C_{FE} h^s, -\beta + C_{FE} h^s]\). Due to the fact that the bounds in (3.1) are not defined for \( w \geq 0 \), \( h \) must be chosen sufficiently small such that \(-\beta + C_{FE} h^s < 0\). Since we have already derived an upper bound for the local Lipschitz constant within the first half \([-\beta - C_{FE} h^s, -\beta]\), we derive an upper bound for the second half \([-\beta, -\beta + C_{FE} h^s]\). In this case, the local Lipschitz constant can be expressed by the derivative of the CDF \( \varphi_W(z) \) at \( z = -\beta + C_{FE} h^s \). Applying the same steps as for the one-sided case, yields the following bound

\[
C_L \leq F_u'(-\beta + C_{FE} h^s) \\
\leq \left( \frac{\beta + 1}{\beta} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{(\beta - C_{FE} h^s)^2} \right) \exp \left( \frac{2\beta C_{FE} h^s - C_{FE}^2 h^{2s}}{2\sigma^2} \right) P_f \\
=: C_{2,2}(\beta, \sigma, h^s, C_{FE})P_f. \tag{3.6}
\]

Unfortunately, \( C_{2,2} \) depends on the error bound \( C_{FE} h^s \) of the LSF approximation. We observe that \( C_{2,2} \) converges to \( C_{2,1} \) for \( h \to 0 \). We illustrate this in the following. Figure 2 displays the constant \( C_{2,2} \) while varying the step size \( h \). The order of convergence is either \( s = 1 \) or \( s = 2 \). Moreover, different values for \( C_{FE} \) are considered. The variance is \( \sigma^2 = 1 \) and \( \beta = 4 \). This yields a probability of failure of order \( 10^{-5} \). We observe that the constant \( C_{2,2} \) is large for large values of \( C_{FE} \). For the convergence order \( s = 1 \), the step size \( h \) should be smaller than \( 10^{-2} \) to ensure a small constant even for large \( C_{FE} \). For \( s = 2 \), the step size should be smaller than \( 10^{-1} \).

\textbf{Remark 3.2.} Following the same steps to derive the constant \( C_{2,2} \), one could also derive a constant \( \hat{C}_{2,2} \) which is based on the sharper CDF bounds (3.5). This constant also depends on \( C_{FE} h^s \).
Finally, we note that the result above allows us to prove Theorem 3.1. Combining the constants in (3.4) and (3.6), we obtain the asserted inequality with

$$C_2(\beta, \sigma, h^s, C_{FE}) := C_{2,1}(\beta, \sigma) + C_{2,2}(\beta, \sigma, h^s, C_{FE}).$$

### 4 Error Analysis with Optimal Control and FORM

In this section, we prove statements (P3) and (P4) which will conclude the proof of Theorem 2.1. In the affine linear case, we know that the error of the LSF in Assumption 2.3 is directly related to the distance between the exact and approximate limit-state surface. However, this direct relation is not obvious in a more general setting.

In the subsequent step, we derive an upper bound for the distance between the exact and approximate limit-state surface $\partial A$ and $\partial A_h$, respectively, in the case where the LSF satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. This upper bound is based on results from optimal control theory. Finally, we estimate the Gaussian measure of the symmetric difference of the failure domains $A$ and $A_h$ by the FORM approximation $P_{\tilde{A} | \tilde{A}_h}^{\text{FORM}}$.

#### 4.1 Theoretical results from optimal control

We will formulate item (P3) in Theorem 4.2. For the proof of this result, we require several concepts from the theory of optimal control. We discuss those results below; based on the works [23, 28].

We commence with the unconstrained optimal control problem. It is given by

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad J(u) := \frac{1}{2} \| B(u) - \bar{b} \|_2^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| u - \bar{u} \|_2^2, \quad (4.1)$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unknown parameter and $B : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is the observation operator. The observation operator implicitly depends on the solution $y \in V = H_0^1(D)$ of the weak
formulation of an elliptic PDE
\[
\int_D a(x, u) \nabla_x y(x) \cdot \nabla_x v(x) dx = \int_D f(x)v(x) dx \quad \forall v \in V,
\] (4.2)
where \(u \in \mathbb{R}^n\) is a fixed parameter, \(f \in L^2(D)\), and \(D \subset \mathbb{R}^d\) is a polygonal domain. The function \(a(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}\) is assumed to be three times continuously differentiable for all \(x \in D\) and \(a(\cdot, u) \in L^\infty(D)\) for all \(u \in \mathbb{R}^n\). The discretized unconstrained optimal control problem is denoted as
\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} J_h(u) := \frac{1}{2} \|B_h(u) - \bar{b}\|^2_2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|u - \bar{u}\|^2_2,
\] (4.3)
where \(B_h\) is the discretized observation operator. Additionally, we assume that \(B\) and \(B_h\) are linear with respect to \(y\) and \(y_h\) and are both twice continuously Fréchet differentiable. The parameters \(\alpha \geq 0\) and \(\bar{u}\) are regularizing parameters, while \(\bar{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}\) is a given vector of, e.g., measurements.

In the following, we derive the necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for (4.1). The first-order necessary optimality condition is given as
\[
\nabla_u J(u) = 0 \iff (DB(u))^T B(u) + \alpha u = (DB(u))^T b + \alpha \bar{u},
\]
where \(DB\) is the Jacobian of the observation operator \(B\) with respect to \(u\). The second-order optimality condition is satisfied, if some coercivity parameter \(\gamma > 0\) exists, with
\[
z^T \nabla^2_u J(u^*) z \geq \gamma \|z\|^2_2 \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^n,
\]
where \(\nabla^2_u J(u^*)\) denotes the Hessian of \(J\) with respect to \(u\). We call \(u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n\) a stable solution of (4.1), if it satisfies both, the first and second-order optimality conditions.

**Assumption 4.1.** We make the following three assumptions:

(i) the discretization error is bounded by \(\|B(u) - B_h(u)\|_2 \leq Ch^s\),

(ii) the solution \(y\) of (4.2) satisfies \(y \in H^2(D) \cap H^1_0(D)\), and

(iii) for all \(i = 1, \ldots, n_m\) it holds that \(z_i \in H^2(D) \cap H^1_0(D)\) where \(z_i\) is the solution of the dual problem
\[
\int_D a(x, u) \nabla_x v(x) \cdot \nabla_x z_i(x) dx = B_i(v) \quad \forall v \in H^1_0(D),
\]
and \(B_i(v)\) is the \(i\)-th component of \(B(v)\).

**Theorem 4.1.** Let Assumption 4.1 hold. Let \(u^* \in \mathbb{R}^n\) be a stable solution of (4.1) such that \(\nabla^2_u J(u)\) is coercive with parameter \(\gamma > 0\). Then for \(h > 0\) sufficiently small, there exists a stable solution \(u_h^* \in \mathbb{R}^n\) of the discrete problem (4.3) such that the following a priori error estimate holds
\[
\|u^* - u_h^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \|\nabla_u J(u^*) - \nabla_u J_h(u^*)\|_2.
\]

**Proof.** The proof is given in [28, Theorem 3.4.1 and 3.4.2].
4.2 Back to rare event estimation

We now apply Theorem 4.1 to prove statement (P3).

**Theorem 4.2.** Let Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 hold. Then for all \( u \in \partial A \) is holds that

\[
\text{dist}(u, \partial A_h) \leq C_{FE} \cdot C_3(h) \cdot h^\alpha,
\]

for \( h > 0 \) sufficiently small.

**Proof.** We apply Theorem 4.1 to an appropriate optimal control problem with \( \alpha > 0 \) to show that for \( u^* \in \partial A \) exists a \( \hat{u}_h \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that the distance between these points behaves as \( O(h^\alpha) \). Then, we consider the limit \( \alpha \to 0 \).

Let \( u^* \in \partial A \) be a point on the exact limit-state surface, i.e., \( G(u^*) = 0 \). We investigate the following optimal control problem

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \ J_\alpha(u) := \frac{1}{2} G(u)^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| u - u^* \|^2_2, \tag{4.4}
\]

where we set \( \tilde{b} = 0 \) and \( \alpha > 0 \). For \( \alpha = 0 \), there is no stable solution since for all \( u \in \partial A \) it holds that \( J_0(u) = 0 \). Hence, the second order sufficient condition is violated. For \( \alpha > 0 \), the gradient and Hessian matrix of \( J_\alpha \) are given as

\[
\begin{align*}
\nabla_u J_\alpha(u) &= G(u) \nabla_u G(u) + \alpha (u - u^*), \\
\nabla^2_u J_\alpha(u) &= G(u) \nabla^2_u G(u) + \nabla_u G(u)(\nabla_u G(u))^T + \alpha I.
\end{align*}
\]

The point \( u^* \) is the unique global minimizer of (4.4) since \( J_\alpha(u^*) = 0 \) and \( J_\alpha(u) > 0 \) for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{u^*\} \). Hence, \( u^* \) is a stable solution. For the discretization parameter \( h > 0 \), we define the discretized version of (4.4) as

\[
\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} \ J_{h,\alpha}(u) := \frac{1}{2} G_h(u)^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \| u - u^* \|^2_2. \tag{4.5}
\]

By Theorem 4.1, there exists a point \( \tilde{u}_h \) in a neighborhood of \( u^* \) such that \( \tilde{u}_h \) is a stable solution of (4.5). Thus, we know that \( \nabla_u J_{h,\alpha}(\tilde{u}_h) = 0 \), which yields

\[
G_h(\tilde{u}_h) \nabla_u G_h(\tilde{u}_h) + \alpha (\tilde{u}_h - u^*) = 0.
\]

If \( G_h(\tilde{u}_h) = 0 \) we get that \( \tilde{u}_h = u^* \) and the claim is proved. Now, we consider the case \( G_h(\tilde{u}_h) \neq 0 \) and we denote \( u^*_h \in \partial A_h \) as the point on \( \partial A_h \) that has minimal distance to the point \( u^* \). Moreover, we define the set of points

\[
E := \{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \left| \cos (\langle p, \nabla_u G(u^*) \rangle) \right| \geq \left| \cos (\langle u^* - \tilde{u}_h, \nabla_u G(u^*) \rangle) \right| \},
\]

where \( \langle a, b \rangle := \arccos (\langle a b \rangle / (\| a \|_2 \| b \|_2)) \), for \( a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n \). The set \( E \) contains all directions \( p \in \mathbb{R}^n \), which admit a smaller or equal angle with \( \nabla_u G(u^*) \) than the direction pointing from \( u^* \) to \( \tilde{u}_h \). For all \( p \in E \) we conclude that

\[
p^T \nabla^2_u J_\alpha(u^*) p = p^T \nabla_u G(u^*) (\nabla_u G(u^*))^T p + \alpha \| p \|_2^2 \\
\geq \left( \cos^2 (\langle u^* - \tilde{u}_h, \nabla_u G(u^*) \rangle) \| \nabla_u G(u^*) \|_2^2 + \alpha \right) \| p \|_2^2.
\]

Thus, the Hessian matrix \( \nabla^2_u J_\alpha(u^*) \) is coercive for all \( p \in E \) with parameter

\[
\gamma = \cos^2 (\langle u^* - \tilde{u}_h, \nabla_u G(u^*) \rangle) \| \nabla_u G(u^*) \|_2^2 + \alpha.
\]
Since \( u^* - \hat{u} \in E \), we can perform the proof of Theorem 4.1 only for directions \( p \in E \) which yields that
\[
\|u^* - \hat{u}_h\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\nabla_u J_{\alpha}(u^*) - \nabla_u J_{\alpha}(u^*)\|_2}{\cos^2 \left(<(u^* - \hat{u}_h, \nabla_u G(u^*))>\right) \frac{\|\nabla_u G(u^*)\|_2}{2} + \alpha} 
\leq \frac{\|\nabla_u G_h(u^*)\|_2}{\cos^2 \left(<(u^* - \hat{u}_h, \nabla_u G(u^*))>\right) \frac{\|\nabla_u G(u^*)\|_2}{2} + \alpha} C_{\text{FE}} h^s,
\]
since it holds \( \|\nabla_u J_{\alpha}(u^*)\|_2 = \|G_h(u^*)\| \|\nabla_u G_h(u^*)\|_2 \leq C_{\text{FE}} h^s \|\nabla_u G_h(u^*)\|_2 \) and \( \nabla_u J_{\alpha}(u^*) = 0 \). Applying the limit, \( \alpha \to 0 \) we conclude that \( G_h(\hat{u}_h) \to 0 \) and, thus, \( \hat{u}_h \to u_h^* \in \partial A_h \). By Assumption 2.4, it holds that \( \cos^2 \left(<(u^* - u_h^*, \nabla_u G(u^*))>\right) \geq \nu_h^2 \) and we conclude that
\[
\|u^* - u_h^*\| \leq \frac{\|\nabla_u G_h(u^*)\|_2}{\nu_h^2\|\nabla_u G(u^*)\|_2} C_{\text{FE}} h^s.
\]
Since this holds true for all \( u^* \in \partial A \), we define
\[
C_3(h) := \sup_{u \in \partial A} \frac{\|\nabla_u G_h(u)\|_2}{\nu_h^2\|\nabla_u G(u)\|_2}
\]
and the desired statement is proved.

**Remark 4.1.** For the limit \( h \to 0 \), it holds that \( G_h(u) \to G(u) \) for all \( u \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Therefore, the limit-state surface \( \partial A_h \) converges to \( \partial A \) and \( u_h \to u \). Hence, it holds \( \left| \cos \left(<(u - u_h, \nabla_u G(u))>\right) \right| \to 1 \), where \( u_h \in \partial A_h \) is the point on \( \partial A_h \) that has smallest distance to \( u \in \partial A \). Thus, \( \nu_h \to 1 \), as \( h \to 0 \). If in addition \( \nabla_u G_h(u) \) converges uniformly to \( \nabla_u G(u) \), it yields that
\[
\lim_{h \to 0} C_3(h) = \sup_{u \in \partial A} 1/\|\nabla_u G(u)\|_2.
\]
Since the Gaussian measure of the set \( S := A \triangle A_h \) is an upper bound of the absolute error \( |P_f - P_{f,h}| \), we use the previous result to prove statement (P4) which is stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.3.** We assume that the failure domains \( A, A_h \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) are two unbounded convex sets such that for all \( u_h \in \partial A_h \) it holds that
\[
\text{dist}(u_h, \partial A) \leq \bar{C} h^s.
\]
The distance between the origin and \( \partial A_h \) is denoted as \( b_h \). Then, an upper bound for the Gaussian measure of the symmetric difference of \( A \) and \( A_h \) is given by
\[
\mathbb{P}[U \in A \triangle A_h] \leq C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U_1 \in ] - b_h - \bar{C} h^s, -b_h + \bar{C} h^s]],
\]
where \( U_1 \) is distributed according to \( N(0, 1) \).

**Proof.** For \( n = 1 \) the statement directly follows from assumption 1.6 with \( C_4(n) = 1 \). Consider \( n > 1 \). By the rotation invariance of the Gaussian measure \( \mathbb{P}[U \in ] = N(0, I_n) \), we assume, without loss of generality, that the point with smallest distance to the origin is given by \( b_h^* = (0, \ldots, 0, -b_h)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \), thus, \( u_h^\text{FORM} = b_h^* \). We denote the sets of interest by \( D_1 := A \triangle A_h \) and \( D_2 := \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n : u_h \in ] - b_h - \bar{C} h^s, -b_h + \bar{C} h^s] \} \).
First, we consider the closed ball around the origin \( B_R := \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|u\| \leq R \} \) and we show that \( \mathbb{P}[U \in D_1 \cap B_R] \leq C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U \in D_2 \cap B_R] \). Afterwards, we consider the limit
Figure 3: Illustration of the limit-state surfaces $\partial A$ and $\partial A_h$ in 2D. The illustrations show that the Gaussian measure of $A \Delta A_h$ can be translated to a Gaussian measure at the FORM point $u_h^{\text{FORM}}$.

$R \to \infty$.
For $R \leq b_h$, it follows that $D_1 \cap B_R = \emptyset$, and the statement is valid. Therefore, we consider $R > b_h$. First, we determine the scaling factor of the $n-1$ dimensional Lebesgue measure of the transformation of a convex curve to a hyperplane. Therefore, we consider the sets $E_1 = B_R \cap \partial A_h$ and $E_2 = B_R \cap \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : u_n = -b_h\}$. Note that $E_2$ is an $n-1$-dimensional ball centred in $b_h^*$. We visualize this in Figure 3. We call the radius of this ball $r := \sqrt{R^2 - b_h^2}$. Thus, the $n-1$-dimensional Lebesgue measure of $E_2$ is equal to the volume of the ball $B_r$ in $n-1$ dimensions, which is given by

$$\lambda_{n-1}(E_2) = \frac{\pi^{(n-1)/2} r^{n-1}}{\Gamma((n+1)/2)}.$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the Gamma function. By the convexity of $A_h$, we conclude that an upper bound for the $n-1$ dimensional Lebesgue measure of $E_1$ is given by the surface measure of the set $B_R \cap \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : u_n \leq -b_h\}$. This surface measure is bounded from above by the sum of the volume of the ball $B_r$ in $n-1$ dimensions and $1/2$ of the surface of the ball $B_r$ in $n$ dimensions which yields

$$\lambda_{n-1}(E_1) \leq \frac{\pi^{(n-1)/2} r^{n-1}}{\Gamma((n+1)/2)} + \frac{\pi^{n/2} r^{n-1}}{\Gamma(n/2)}.$$

Hence, the fraction of the two $n-1$ dimensional Lebesgue measures is bounded by

$$\frac{\lambda_{n-1}(E_1)}{\lambda_{n-1}(E_2)} \leq 1 + \pi^{1/2} \frac{\Gamma((n+1)/2)}{\Gamma(n/2)} := C_4(n). \quad (4.7)$$

The formulas for the volume and surface of a ball in $n$ dimensions are given in [20, 5.19(iii)]. Inequality (4.7) bounds the scaling factor of the length of the curve $E_1$ with respect to the hyperplane $E_2$. Applying this result, we can transform the set $D_1$ into $D_2$.

The probability of interest is given by

$$\mathbb{P}[U \in D_1 \cap B_R] = \int_{u \in \mathbb{R}^n} I(u \in D_1 \cap B_R) \varphi_n(u) du$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{B_R} I(u \in D_1) \exp \left( -\frac{\|u\|^2}{2} \right) du$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{r=0}^{r=R} \int_{S_{n-1}(r)} I(u \in D_1) \exp \left( -\frac{r^2}{2} \right) ds dr,$$
where \( S_{n-1}(r) = \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^n : \| u \|_2 = r \} \) is the surface of \( B_r \). Since the distance of \( A \) and \( A_h \) is always smaller than \( \tilde{C} h^s \), the \( n - 1 \) dimensional Lebesgue measure of the intersection \( D_1 \cap S_{n-1}(r) \) is smaller or equal than the \( n - 1 \) dimensional Lebesgue measure of the intersection \( D_2 \cap S_{n-1}(r) \). Hence, since the standard Gaussian density is constant on \( S_{n-1}(r) \) for all \( r \geq 0 \) and applying the transformation of variables

\[
\mathbb{P}[U \in D_1 \cap B_R] \leq C_4(n) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} \int_{r=0}^{r=R} \int_{S_{n-1}(r)} I(u \in D_2) \exp \left( \frac{-r^2}{2} \right) \, ds \, dr
\]

\[
= C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U \in D_2 \cap B_R]
\]

\[
\leq C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U \in D_2]
\]

\[
= C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U_1 \in] - b_h - \tilde{C} h^s, - b_h + \tilde{C} h^s].
\]

Taking the limit \( R \to \infty \) we get the desired statement, due to the continuity of measures.

\[\Box\]

**Remark 4.2.** Unfortunately, taking the limit \( n \to \infty \) yields \( C_4(n) \to \infty \). Thus, this result does not easily generalise with respect to infinite-dimensional settings. However, the growth of \( C_4(n) \) is \( O(n^{1/2}) \) as visualised in Figure 4. Hence, even in high dimensions, the constant is reasonably small.

![Figure 4: Behaviour of \( C_4(n) \) for varying the stochastic dimension \( n \).](image)

Having collected the proofs for (P1)–(P4), we can now give the proof of our main result.

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** We denote the distance of the FORM point to the origin as \( b_h = \| u_h^{\text{FORM}} \|_2 \). By definition we know that \( P_{f, h}^{\text{FORM}} = \Phi(-b_h) = \mathbb{P}[U_1 \leq -b_h] \), where \( U_1 \) is distributed according to \( N(0, 1) \). From Theorem 4.2, we know that the distance between \( \partial A \) and \( \partial A_h \) is bounded from above by \( C_{\text{FE}} \cdot C_3(h) h^s \). Applying Theorem 4.3 with \( \tilde{C} = C_{\text{FE}} \cdot C_3(h) \) we know that the absolute error of the probability of failure is bounded by

\[
|P_f - P_{f, h}| \leq C_4(n) \mathbb{P}[U_1 \in] - b_h - C_{\text{FE}} \cdot C_3(h) h^s, - b_h + C_{\text{FE}} \cdot C_3(h) h^s].
\]

The probability term on the right hand side is equal to \( \mathbb{P}[\tilde{G_h}(U_1) \in] - \tilde{C} h^s, \tilde{C} h^s] \) where the LSF \( \tilde{G_h}(U_1) := U_1 + b_h \) satisfies 2.10 in Assumption 2.3 with \( \tilde{C} = C_{\text{FE}} \cdot C_3(h) \). By definition it holds \( P_{f, h}^{\text{FORM}} = \mathbb{P}[\tilde{G_h}(U_1) \leq 0] \). Since \( \tilde{G_h} \) is affine linear, we apply Theorem 3.1 to the LSF \( \tilde{G_h} \) with \( \sigma = 1 \) and \( \beta = b_h \) which yields

\[
\mathbb{P}[\tilde{G_h}(U_1) \in] - \tilde{C} h^s, \tilde{C} h^s]] \leq \tilde{C} \cdot C_2(b_h, 1, h^s, \tilde{C}) h^s P_{f, h}^{\text{FORM}}.
\]

\[17\]
Finally, combining (4.8) and (4.9) we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.1 with
\[ |P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq C_{FE} \cdot C_2(b_h, 1, h^s, \tilde{C}) \cdot C_3(h) \cdot C_4(n) h^s P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} := \hat{C} P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}}. \]

We end this section with two remarks.

**Remark 4.3.** Theorem 4.2 implies that the distance between the FORM points \( u^{\text{FORM}} \) and \( u_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \) behaves as the PDE discretization error \( O(h^s) \). Hence, the relative error of the FORM estimates can be bounded by
\[ \frac{|P_f^{\text{FORM}} - P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}}|}{P_f^{\text{FORM}}} \leq C_{FE} \cdot C_2(b, 1, h^s, \tilde{C}) \cdot C_3(h) h^s, \]
where \( b = \|u^{\text{FORM}}\|_2 \). By symmetry, we have switched the roles of \( P_f^{\text{FORM}} \) and \( P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \) which yields \( P_f^{\text{FORM}} \) in the denominator.

**Remark 4.4.** We note that the assumptions on the ellipticity of the PDE and regularity of the diffusion coefficient, as given in Assumption 2.1 and 2.2, are only relevant to prove Theorem 4.1 and 4.2, respectively. If the approximation error bound of the LSF behaves in another manner as in Assumption 2.3 and if it is possible to show that the distance between \( \partial A \) and \( \partial A_{f,h} \) behaves in the same manner, then the error bound in Theorem 2.1 holds for this error bound.

## 5 Numerical Experiments

We now illustrate and verify our results in several numerical experiments. We start with a one-dimensional parameter space example where the LSF involves an ordinary differential equation (ODE), not a PDE. Then, we consider rare events that depend on elliptic PDEs with stochastic spaces of different dimensions.

### 5.1 ODE, 1-dimensional parameter space

In the following example, which is also considered in [27], the LSF depends on the solution of an ODE with a one-dimensional Gaussian random parameter. Hence, this example does not actually depend on an elliptic PDE. We study it, since we can compute all quantities of interest analytically.

Let \( y : [0, 1] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that for \( \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega \), we have
\[ \frac{\partial y(t, \omega)}{\partial t} = -U(\omega) y(t, \omega), t \in [0, 1], \] with initial condition \( y(0, \omega) = 1 \),
where \( U \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \) is a stochastic parameter. The exact solution to this ODE is given by
\[ y(t, \omega) = \exp(-U(\omega)t) - \log(y_{max}) \]
where \( y_{max} = 40 \) at \( t = 1 \), which can be written in terms of the LSF \( G(u) = y_{max} - \exp(-u) \leq 0 \). Hence, failure occurs if \( u \leq -\log(y_{max}) \) and the exact probability of failure is equal to \( P_f = \Phi(-\log(y_{max})) \approx 1.13 \cdot 10^{-4} \). The FORM point is given by \( u^{\text{FORM}} = -\log(y_{max}) \).

Using the explicit Euler scheme to solve the ODE numerically, we derive the approximate solution \( y_h(t = 1, \omega) = (1 - U(\omega)h)^{1/h} \), where \( h > 0 \) is the time step size. The explicit
Euler scheme is convergent of order one, see [17, Section 6.3], i.e., \( |y(t, \omega) - y_h(t, \omega)| = \mathcal{O}(h) \) for a fixed \( \omega \in \Omega \). The approximate LSF is \( G_h(u) = y_{\max} - (1 - uh)^{1/h} \). Hence, failure occurs if \( u \leq (1 - y_{\max}^h)/h \) and the approximate probability of failure is equal to \( P_{f,h} = \Phi((1 - y_{\max}^h)/h) \). The approximate FORM point is given by \( u_{h,\text{FORM}} = (1 - y_{\max}^h)/h \).

Since the space of the stochastic parameter space is one-dimensional and the exact and approximate failure domains are half-rays, it holds \( P_f = P_{f,\text{FORM}} \) and \( P_{f,h} = P_{f,\text{FORM}} \). Thus, the error bound of Theorem 2.1 yields a bound for the relative error \( |P_f - P_{f,h}|/P_f \). As mentioned, the setting of this example is different to the setting of Theorem 2.1. However, the approximation of the LSF satisfies Assumption 2.3 with \( s = 1 \) and we expect that the relative error of the probability of failure approximations has order \( \mathcal{O}(h^2) \) of convergence for \( h > 0 \) sufficiently small.

As a second time stepping method, we consider the Crank–Nicolson scheme as given in [17, Chapter 9]. Applying the discretization rule, we get the approximate solution

\[
\tilde{y}_h(t = 1, \omega) = \left( \frac{1 - hU(\omega)/2}{1 + hU(\omega)/2} \right)^{1/h}.
\]

Hence, the approximate probability of failure is given by \( \tilde{P}_{f,h} = \Phi(2h^{-1}(1 - y_{\max}^h)/(1 + y_{\max}^h)) \). Since the Crank–Nicolson scheme is convergent of order 2, we expect that the relative error of the probability of failure approximations has order \( \mathcal{O}(h^2) \) of convergence for \( h > 0 \) sufficiently small.

Figure 5 shows the approximate probability of failure by the explicit Euler and the Crank–Nicolson scheme for the step sizes \( h^\ell = 1/2^\ell \), for \( \ell = 0, \ldots, 9 \). We observe that the approximations computed with both these methods approach the exact probability of failure as \( h \) decreases. Moreover, we observe that the distance between the exact and approximate FORM points converges in the same order as the PDE discretization error. Hence, the statement of Theorem 4.2 is also valid and we conclude that Theorem 2.1 is also applicable for this setting. On the right plot, we observe that the relative error of the explicit Euler approximations has order \( \mathcal{O}(h) \) of convergence while the relative error of the Crank–Nicolson approximations has order \( \mathcal{O}(h^2) \) of convergence. These are exactly the bounds which we get from theoretical discussions. For large \( h \), we observe a plateau behaviour for the explicit Euler scheme. This is due to the fact that the Euler approximation \( P_{f,h} \) is much smaller than \( P_f \) for large \( h \). Hence, the relative error is nearly equal to one for large time step sizes \( h \), until the convergence sets in.

### 5.2 2-Dimensional parameter space

The following example considers an LSF which depends on a two-dimensional stochastic parameter and is also considered in [8, 10]. In this case, the FORM estimate is not equal to the exact probability of failure. However, we can still derive analytical expressions for the exact and approximate LSF as well as for the exact and approximate limit-state surfaces. On the domain \( D = [0, 1] \), we seek a solution \( y : D \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) that solves the following elliptic boundary value problem

\[
-\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( \exp \left( \frac{U_1(\omega)}{3} - 3 \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} y(x, \omega) \right) = 1 - x, \quad \text{for} \; x \in [0, 1], \tag{5.1}
\]

such that \( y(0, \omega) = 0 \) and \( y(1, \omega) = U_2(\omega) \) \( \mathbb{P} \)-a.e. \( \omega \in \Omega \). The random variables \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are independent and standard normally distributed. The exact solution of this problem is

\[
y(x, \omega) = U_2(\omega)x + \exp \left( -U_1(\omega)/3 + 3 \right) (x^3/6 - x^2/2 + x/3).
\]
Failure is defined as the event that the solution $y(\cdot, \omega)$ is smaller than $y_{\text{max}} = -1/3$ at $\hat{x} = 1/3$. Hence, we express the LSF as $G(U_1(\omega), U_2(\omega)) = y(1/3, \omega) - y_{\text{max}}$.

Applying linear FEs with mesh size parameter $h > 0$, we compute the approximate solution to (5.1) and (5.2) which we denote by $y_h: D \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Accordingly, the approximate LSF is given by $G_h(U_1(\omega), U_2(\omega)) = y_h(1/3, \omega) - y_{\text{max}}$.

Figure 6 shows the exact limit-state surface and the limit-state surfaces given by the linear FE approximations. We observe that the exact as well as the approximate failure domains are convex. Moreover, the distances between the exact and approximate surfaces decrease for decreasing mesh size $h$. Since the limit-state surface is not a straight line, the FORM estimates of the probability of failure are not equal to the true ones, i.e., $P_f \neq P_{f,h}^\text{FORM}$ and $P_{f,h} \neq P_{f,h}^\text{FORM}$. The quantities $P_f$ and $P_{f,h}$ are calculated by integrating numerically the standard normal PDF within the failure domain. We obtain the values $P_f \approx 1.71 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $P_{f,h}^\text{FORM} \approx 2.08 \cdot 10^{-4}$.

Following the theoretical discussions, we expect that

$$|P_f - P_{f,h}| \leq \hat{C} h^s P_{f,h}^\text{FORM},$$

for $h > 0$ sufficiently small and $\hat{C}$ given in the proof of Theorem 2.1. The order of convergence $s$ is equal to the order of convergence of the FE discretization. The point evaluation of a linear FE approximation introduces an error of order two, since by [6, Theorem 1.1] it holds that the $L^\infty$-error is bounded by

$$\| y(\cdot, \omega) - y_h(\cdot, \omega) \|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{\text{FE}} h^2 \| y(\cdot, \omega) \|_{W^{2,\infty}}$$

for a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$. Hence, we expect that the error bound in Theorem 2.1 holds for $s = 2$.

As another discretization, we apply FEs with quadratic basis functions. In this case, the $L^\infty$-error of the exact and FE solution converges with order $O(h^3)$; see [6, Theorem 1.1]. Hence, we expect that the error bound in Theorem 2.1 holds for $s = 3$. 
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Figure 6: On the left: the black line shows the exact limit-state surface and the black cross denotes the exact FORM point. The red lines show the approximate limit-state surfaces given by the linear FE discretization for different choices of the mesh size $h$. The red crosses denote the approximate FORM points. On the right: zoom-in of the left plot near the FORM points.

Figure 7 shows the error of the probability of failure by linear and quadratic FEs for the mesh sizes $h_{\ell} = 1/2^\ell$, for $\ell = 1, \ldots, 9$. We observe that the approximate probability of failure $P_{f,h}$ converges to the exact probability of failure $P_f$ for both discretizations. Similarly, $P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}}$ converges to $P_f^{\text{FORM}}$. The true relative error $|P_f - P_{f,h}|/P_f$ as well as the relative error of the FORM estimates $|P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} - P_f^{\text{FORM}}|/P_f^{\text{FORM}}$ behaves as the discretization error of the FEM approximations. Moreover, the proved error bound in Theorem 2.1 behaves as the discretization error.

5.3 High-dimensional parameter space

In the following, we consider Example 2.1 of Section 2 for which it is not possible to calculate analytic expressions of the exact and approximate PDE solutions $y$ and $y_h$, respectively. Moreover, the limit-state surfaces $A$ and $A_h$ cannot be expressed explicitly. Therefore, we estimate $P_f$ and $P_{f,h}$ with Sequential Importance Sampling (SIS) [21].

On the domain $D = [0, 1]$, we seek a solution $y : D \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ which solves

$$-rac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( a(x, \omega) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} y(x, \omega) \right) = 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq x \leq 1,$$

such that $y(0, \omega) = 1$ and $y(1, \omega) = 0$, for $\mathbb{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. The random field $a(x, \omega) = \exp(Z(x, \omega))$ is a log-normal random field and the underlying Gaussian field $Z(x, \omega)$ has constant mean $\mu_Z = 0.1$ and variance $\sigma_Z^2 = 0.04$. The covariance function of $Z$ is $c(x_1, x_2) = \sigma_x^2 \exp(-\|x_1 - x_2\|_1/\lambda)$, with correlation length $\lambda = 0.3$. The random field $Z$ is approximated via its truncated KLE with 10 leading terms, which captures around 93% of the variability of the random field.

Failure is defined as the event that the flow rate $q(\cdot, \omega)$, given in (2.11), is larger than $q_{\max} = 1.7$ at $\hat{x} = 1$. Hence, we express the LSF as $G(U(\omega)) = q_{\max} - q(\omega, 1)$. 
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Figure 7: On the left: relative error of the approximate probability of failure \( P_{f,h} \) with respect to the exact probability of failure \( P_f \). In the middle: relative error of the approximate FORM estimate \( P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \) with respect to the exact FORM estimate \( P_f^{\text{FORM}} \). On the right: bound of the error \( |P_f - P_{f,h}| \). The black lines show the order of convergence.

Linear FEs are applied with mesh size parameter \( h > 0 \) to obtain the approximate solution \( y_h : D \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R} \) of (5.3). Accordingly, the approximate LSF is given by \( G_h(U(\omega)) = q_{\text{max}} - q_h(\omega, 1) \). As discussed in Example 2.1, linear FEs yield a PDE discretization error of order one. Hence, by Theorem 2.1 we expect that our error bound holds for \( s = 1 \).

The references \( P_f \) and \( P_{f,h} \) are obtained by averaging over 100 SIS simulations with \( 10^4 \) samples, target coefficient of variation equal to 0.25 and using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) with sampling from the von Mises–Fisher–Nakagami distribution. No burn-in is applied within the MCMC sampling and 10% of the samples are chosen as seeds of the simulated Markov chains via multinomial resampling. Details are given in [29]. We note that the coefficient of variation of the 100 probability of failure estimates is \( 10^{-2} \). Hence, we expect that the sampling bias is negligible. The reference probability of failure is estimated as \( P_f \approx 3.38 \cdot 10^{-4} \) on a mesh with discretization size \( h = 2^{-12} \). Similar, the reference FORM estimate \( P_f^{\text{FORM}} \approx 4.66 \cdot 10^{-4} \) is obtained by FORM with mesh size \( h = 2^{-12} \). The reference \( P_{f,h} \) and \( P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \) are obtained on a sequence of mesh sizes \( h_\ell = 1/2^\ell \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, 11 \).

The upper left plot of Figure 8 shows the reference probability of failure \( P_f \), approximations \( P_{f,h} \) and FORM estimates \( P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \). We observe that \( P_{f,h}^{\text{FORM}} \) is always larger than \( P_{f,h} \) for a fixed mesh size \( h \). This is a necessary condition for convex failure domains. However, we cannot show that the failure domains are indeed convex and unbounded. The upper right plot shows that the relative error \( |P_f - P_{f,h}|/P_f \) behaves as the discretization error of the LSF. The same holds true for the relative error with respect to the FORM estimates, which is illustrated in the lower left plot. Moreover, the lower right plot shows the convergence of our error bound. We also observe that the error bound gives an order one approximation which we have expected by Theorem 2.1.
5.3.1 50-dimensional parameter space

We consider the problem setting of (5.3) with correlation length \( \lambda = 0.1 \). A smaller correlation length requires a larger number of leading KLE terms to acquire a similar resolution of the random field. Therefore, we consider 50 leading KLE terms, which captures around 96% of the variability of the random field. We adjust the threshold \( q_{\text{max}} = 1.5 \) to achieve a similar order of the probability of failure. As in the previous example, the references for the probability of failure are obtained by SIS and the settings as described above. The reference probability of failure is estimated as \( P_f = 7.18 \cdot 10^{-5} \) on a mesh with discretization size \( h = 2^{-12} \). The reference FORM estimate \( P_{\text{FORM}} = 1.52 \cdot 10^{-4} \) is obtained on the same discretization level. The reference \( P_{f,h} \) and \( P_{\text{FORM},h} \) are obtained on a sequence of mesh sizes \( h_\ell = 1/2^\ell \) for \( \ell = 1, \ldots, 11 \).

The upper left plot of Figure 8 shows that \( P_{\text{FORM},h} \) is always larger than \( P_{f,h} \) for a fixed mesh size \( h \). The upper right plot shows that the relative error \( |P_f - P_{f,h}|/P_f \) has order \( \mathcal{O}(h) \) of convergence for small discretization sizes \( h \). For large \( h \), we observe a plateau behaviour and then a fast decay until it converges with the expected order. The relative error with respect to the FORM estimates, which is illustrated in the lower left plot, has order \( \mathcal{O}(h) \) of convergence and, hence, is the same as the convergence property of the LSF. Moreover, the lower right plot shows the convergence of our error bound. We also observe that the error bound gives an order one approximation for small \( h \). This is exactly the order of convergence we expect from Theorem 2.1.

6 Conclusion and Outlook

In this manuscript, we have considered the approximation error of the probability of failure, which is induced through the approximation error of the LSF. We assume that the
LSF depends on the evaluation of an elliptic PDE with stochastic diffusion parameter and Dirichlet boundary condition. We have shown in Theorem 2.1 under certain assumptions, that the approximation error of the probability of failure behaves as the PDE discretization error multiplied by the FORM estimate of the probability of failure. If the LSF is affine linear with respect to the stochastic parameter, the derived error bound gives an upper bound for the relative approximation error of the probability of failure.

In several numerical experiments, we have shown that the approximation error of the probability of failure indeed behaves as the derived error bound given in Theorem 2.1. The manuscript can be used as a starting point to derive an error bound, which is applicable for a broader range of LSFs. The derivation of an error bound for the relative error, which does not consist of the FORM estimate, is still of high interest.
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