

EXACT SIMULATION OF EXTRINSIC STRESS-RELEASE PROCESSES

YOUNG LEE
Harvard

PATRICK J. LAUB
Melbourne

THOMAS TAIMRE
Queensland

HONGBIAO ZHAO
Shanghai

JIANCANG ZHUANG
Tokyo

ABSTRACT. We present a new and straightforward algorithm that simulates exact sample paths for a generalized stress-release process. The computation of the exact law of the joint interarrival times is detailed and used to derive this algorithm. Furthermore, the martingale generator of the process is derived and induces theoretical moments which generalize some results of [Borovkov & Vere-Jones \(2000\)](#) and are used to demonstrate the validity of our simulation algorithm.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stress-release processes are a class of point processes, the first of which were self-correcting processes ([Isham & Westcott, 1979](#)). Intuitively, a process is self-correcting if the occurrence of past points inhibits the occurrence of future points. The stress-release processes are a generalization of self-correcting processes and was introduced in a series of papers by Vere-Jones and others ([Zheng & Vere-Jones, 1991, 1994](#)) as well as extensions to coupled stress-release processes ([Liu et al., 1998](#); [Shi et al., 1998](#); [Lu et al., 1999](#)) and further developments ([Bebbington & Harte, 2001, 2003](#)).

In this study, we work with a *generalization* of the stress-release process which includes an exogenous point process term whose values upon arrivals are modeled by a *positive* real-valued random variable. We call our model the *extrinsic stress-release processes*.

We present a new formula for the law of the joint interarrival times for extrinsic stress-release processes. As a natural consequence, an exact simulation algorithm is then proposed which gives an alternative method to generating sample paths relative to standard methods ([Lewis & Shedler, 1979](#)). Our exact simulation algorithm naturally extends the results of [Wang et al. \(1991\)](#) as a special case. The extension of our model is

Date: December 15, 2021. To appear in Journal of Applied Probability, **59**(1), 2022.

motivated by the influence of exogenous geophysical data on earthquake occurrence (see e.g., [Zhuang & Ma, 1998](#); [Ogata, 2017](#)). Point process models of this kind are typically used to describe the evolution of stochastic phenomena in earthquake modeling and it is important to be able to simulate them for reliable predictions of damage due to a range of earthquake scenarios. Thinning algorithms ([Ogata, 1981](#)) have been successfully employed to simulate a wide range of point processes, such as inhomogeneous point processes (pp. 270–271 of [Daley & Vere-Jones, 2003](#); [Zammit-Mangion et al., 2012](#)), or Hawkes processes ([Veen & Schoenberg, 2008](#)). Indeed the same idea can be applied to the generalized stress-release process proposed here. In this paper, simulation of the extrinsic stress-release process by our exact algorithm will be compared with the standard thinning algorithm.

Finally, we present the infinitesimal generator for extrinsic stress-release processes. This generator is intimately linked to the martingale problem which is used to characterize the weak solutions of partial integro-differential equations ([Liptser & Shiryaev, 1977](#)), and it allows us to derive the theoretical reciprocal moments of the intensity function. In [Section 6](#), these reciprocal moments are used to demonstrate the correctness of our simulation algorithms. Basic notions and results in stochastic calculus are taken as prerequisites throughout the present text (confer e.g., [Protter, 2005](#)).

2. EXTRINSIC STRESS-RELEASE MODEL

At the base of everything is some filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We assume that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial, and the filtration $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ fulfills the usual conditions and is generated by a point process $N(\cdot)$ on \mathbb{R}_+ where $0 < T_1 < T_2 < \dots$ denote the occurrence times of the events. Let $N_t = \#\{T_i : 0 < T_i \leq t\}$ be the number of the occurrence points in the time interval $(0, t]$ with $N_0 = 0$. Furthermore, we let $N'_t = \#\{T'_j : 0 < T'_j \leq t\}$ be a Poisson process on \mathbb{R}_+ with arrival times $0 < T'_1 < T'_2 < \dots$ endowed with intensity ρ and is independent of N_t , with $N'_0 = 0$.

Definition 2.1. *The proposed extrinsic stress-release process $N(\cdot)$ is a point process on \mathbb{R}_+ with conditional intensity function given by*

$$\lambda_t := \lambda(t | \mathcal{F}_t) = \lambda_0 \exp(\beta t - S_t - S'_t), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where $S_t = \sum_{i: T_i < t} X_i$ and $S'_t = \sum_{j: T'_j < t} Y_j$ are the compound point process and compound Poisson process, respectively. The X_i 's and Y_j 's are i.i.d. positive random variables, with distribution functions F_X and F_Y respectively, and the stress accumulation rate is the constant $\beta > 0$. \diamond

Between jumps, λ_t increases exponentially with a positive rate of $\beta > 0$. Jumps are downward multiplicative factors of size $e^{-X_i} < 1$ for a self-arrival at time T_i , or of size $e^{-Y_j} < 1$ for an external arrival at time T'_j . When a self-arrival occurs at time T_i ,




FIGURE 1. An example realization of an extrinsic stress-release process, with $\lambda_0 = 1$, $\beta = 1.5$, $\rho = 2$, and $X_i \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ and $Y_j \sim \text{Exp}(2)$. Note that N is càdlàg while λ is càglàd.

N_t increases by one, hence (N_t, λ_t) is a Markov process. Instead of separating the self-arrivals of N_t and the external arrivals of N'_t , it is sometimes convenient to consider all the arrivals indiscriminately. As such, we label the k -th arrival as T_k° , and it can correspond either to some self-arrival T_i or some external arrival T'_j . See Figure 1 for an example realization of the extrinsic stress-release process, with the effects of the self-arrivals and external arrivals on the conditional intensity function λ_t highlighted.

Remark 2.2. Our proposed extrinsic stress-release process differs slightly from the coupled stress-release model of Liu et al. (1998). Their equivalent of the X_i and Y_j variables in Definition 2.1 are not unobserved random variables, they are deterministic functions of the observed earthquake magnitudes. In our proposed model, we allow for these quantities to take any i.i.d. random variables which are positive and unobserved, so our formulation generalizes theirs. Differently from ours, they allow for model parameters c and c' in the exponent of equation (2.1) of the form

$$-cS_t - c'S'_t \quad (2.2)$$

where c and c' can either take negative or positive values, thereby allowing for both damping and excitation. We only consider the inhibitory regime, i.e. $c = c' = 1$, hence in this case, their formulation for general c and c' subsumes ours. In either formulation, little or no work has appeared on exact simulation strategies for the coupled stress-release model. We further add some new aspects to the computation of explicit generators which facilitates moment computations. For other theoretical and stationary moment calculations without the exogenous term S' , see Vere-Jones & Ogata (1984); Ogata & Vere-Jones (1984); Vere-Jones (1988); Borovkov & Vere-Jones (2000). \diamond

3. THE LAW OF JOINT INTERARRIVAL TIMES

In this section, we present the explicit law of the joint interarrival times for extrinsic stress-release processes. This terminology, ‘joint interarrival time’, refers to the time between each of T_k° arrivals (defined in Section 2). Itô’s formula (Jacod & Shiryaev, 2003) splits λ_t into continuous and jump components,

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 + \int_0^t \beta \lambda_s ds + \sum_{i: T_i \leq t} \lambda_{T_i} (e^{-X_i} - 1) + \sum_{j: T'_j \leq t} \lambda_{T'_j} (e^{-Y_j} - 1).$$

Between consecutive jumps the λ process evolves according to its continuous part. In particular, conditioned on T_k° and $\lambda_{T_k^\circ+}$, we have

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_{T_k^\circ+} \exp(\beta(t - T_k^\circ)) \quad \text{for } t \in (T_k^\circ, T_{k+1}^\circ). \quad (3.1)$$

The intensity of the T_k° arrivals is the combination of the T_i and T'_j arrival intensities $\lambda_t + \rho$. Let the k -th joint interarrival time be denoted by $\tau_k := T_k^\circ - T_{k-1}^\circ$ with cumulative density function F_{τ_k} . With (3.1), we can simplify the point process relation

$$F_{\tau_{k+1}}(t) = 1 - \exp\left(-\int_{0+}^t (\lambda_{T_k^\circ+s} + \rho) ds\right) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_{T_k^\circ+}}{\beta} (e^{\beta t} - 1)\right) e^{-\rho t}, \quad (3.2)$$

which is the law of the joint interarrival times.

4. SIMULATION METHODS

The law of the joint interarrival times in (3.2) can be used to derive a simulation method for extrinsic stress-release processes. To simulate we need to: (i) generate T_k° joint interarrival times, and (ii) be able to attribute each arrival as being either a self-arrival from N_t or an external arrival from N'_t . By the inverse probability integral transform, we have $\tau_{k+1} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} F_{\tau_{k+1}}^{-1}(U)$, $U \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$ where $\stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution. The inverse $F_{\tau_{k+1}}^{-1}$ does have an analytic solution (which is somewhat rare) in terms of the Lambert W function, so we can generate joint interarrival times by the inverse transform method. However the Lambert W function is relatively slow in many software packages, and this calculation does not perform the second attribution step. A faster alternative, which solves both problems at once, is to use the *composition method*.

4.1. Exact simulation of stress-release model. The composition method (Devroye, 1986, Section VI.2.3) simulates τ_{k+1} from two simpler independent random variables $\tau_{k+1}^{(1)}$ and $\tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$ by taking

$$\tau_{k+1} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \tau_{k+1}^{(1)} \wedge \tau_{k+1}^{(2)} \quad (4.1)$$

where the notation $\tau_{k+1}^{(1)} \wedge \tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$ is simply shorthand for $\min\{\tau_{k+1}^{(1)}, \tau_{k+1}^{(2)}\}$. One way to satisfy this relation is for $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{k+1}^{(1)} > s) = \exp(-\lambda_{T_k^\circ} \beta^{-1} (e^{\beta s} - 1))$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tau_{k+1}^{(2)} > s) = e^{-\rho s}$, so

$$\tau_{k+1}^{(1)} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \frac{1}{\beta} \log\left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\lambda_{T_k^\circ}} \log(U_1)\right), \quad \tau_{k+1}^{(2)} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} -\frac{1}{\rho} \log(U_2), \quad U_1, U_2 \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]. \quad (4.2)$$

This is the key step in the composition algorithm, presented in full in [Algorithm 1](#).

Algorithm 1: Generate an extrinsic stress-release process by composition.

Input: start intensity λ_0 , stress rate β , external arrival rate ρ , jump size distributions F_X and F_Y , end time T

```

1 begin
2   Initialize  $T_0^\circ \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\epsilon \leftarrow 10^{-10}$  or similar,  $\lambda_\epsilon \leftarrow \lambda_0$ ,  $i \leftarrow 0$ ,  $j \leftarrow 0$ ,  $k \leftarrow 0$ ;
3   Simulate  $\tau_{k+1}^{(1)}$  and  $\tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$  via equation (4.2) and let  $T_{k+1}^\circ \leftarrow T_k^\circ + \tau_{k+1}^{(1)} \wedge \tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$ ;
4   if  $T_{k+1}^\circ > T$  then
5     | return self-arrivals  $\{T_1, \dots, T_i\}$  and, if desired, external arrivals  $\{T'_1, \dots, T'_j\}$ 
6   end
7   Calculate  $\lambda_{T_{k+1}^\circ} \leftarrow \lambda_{T_k^\circ + \epsilon} \exp(\beta(T_{k+1}^\circ - T_k^\circ))$  by (3.1);
8   if  $\tau_{k+1}^{(1)} < \tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$  then
9     | Update  $i \leftarrow i + 1$  and  $T_i \leftarrow t + \tau_{k+1}^{(1)}$ ; ▷ Self-arrival
10    | Simulate  $X_i \sim F_X$  and update  $\lambda_{T_{k+1}^\circ + \epsilon} \leftarrow \lambda_{T_{k+1}^\circ} e^{-X_i}$ ;
11  else
12    | Update  $j \leftarrow j + 1$  and  $T'_j \leftarrow t + \tau_{k+1}^{(2)}$ ; ▷ External arrival
13    | Simulate  $Y_j \sim F_Y$  and update  $\lambda_{T_{k+1}^\circ + \epsilon} \leftarrow \lambda_{T_{k+1}^\circ} e^{-Y_j}$ ;
14  end
15  Update  $k \leftarrow k + 1$  and go to line 3;
16 end

```

4.2. Simulation by thinning. Extrinsic stress-release processes can also be simulated via the *thinning algorithm*. The basic idea in this method is to generate a point process which has more arrivals than the model dictates, then probabilistically remove the excess




FIGURE 2. Example $\bar{\lambda}_{t|\tau}$ upper bounds on the intensity function λ_t . This is the same realization of the generalized stress-release process from Figure 1.

points. The result can be computationally inefficient, and we compare the runtime of the thinning and composition simulation methods in Section 6.

The first step in the thinning algorithm is to generate the N'_t and S'_t processes. The self-arrivals are then generated conditional on these external arrivals. Each self-arrival is generated sequentially, and requires a local upper bound on the intensity process. If we know S'_t for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we obviously have

$$\lambda_t \leq \lambda_0 \exp(\beta t - S'_t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

though as t increases this becomes an extremely loose bound. However, if we also know the process S_t up until time τ , then

$$\bar{\lambda}_{t|\tau} := \lambda_0 \exp(\beta t - S_{t \wedge \tau} - S'_t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (4.3)$$

is a much tighter upper bound on the intensity, at least for $t \in (\tau, \tau + \Delta)$ for moderately small Δ 's. Figure 2 shows some example realizations of (4.3).

With this definition, we can describe the thinning algorithm for the generalized stress-release process in Algorithm 2. In particular, line 5 of the algorithm uses (4.3) to find an upper bound of λ_t over a small region $t \in (\tau, \tau + \Delta]$; these maximum values are not too tedious to find, as they occur either at the end time $\tau + \Delta$ or at one of the external arrival times T'_j which arrives inside the region.

Algorithm 2: Generate an extrinsic stress-release process by thinning.

Input: start intensity λ_0 , stress rate β , external arrival rate ρ , jump size distributions F_X and F_Y , end time T , step size Δ

```

1 begin
2   Simulate the external arrivals  $\{T'_1, \dots, T'_{N'_T}\}$  at rate  $\rho$  by standard Poisson process
   methods ;
3   Simulate i.i.d. external jump sizes  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_{N'_T}\}$  from  $F_Y$  and construct the
    $(S'_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  process ;
4   Initialize  $i = 0$ ,  $t = 0$ ,  $\epsilon \leftarrow 10^{-10}$  or similar ;
5   Set  $M$  to be the maximum value of  $\bar{\lambda}_{s|t+\epsilon}$ , cf. (4.3), over  $s \in (t, t + \Delta]$  ;
6   Generate a proposal self-arrival  $T^* = t + E$  where  $E \sim \text{Exp}(M)$  ;
7   if  $T^* > T$  then
8     | return self-arrivals  $\{T_1, \dots, T_i\}$ 
9   else if  $T^* > t + \Delta$  then
10    | Reject the proposal, set  $t \leftarrow t + \Delta$ , go to line 5 ;
11  end
12  Sample  $U \sim \text{U}[0, 1]$  ;
13  if  $U \leq \bar{\lambda}_{T^*|t} / M$  then
14    | Accept the proposal:  $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ,  $T_i \leftarrow T^*$  ;
15    | Simulate a jump size  $X_i \sim F_X$  and update  $\lambda_{T_i+\epsilon} \leftarrow \lambda_{T_i} e^{-X_i}$  ;
16    | Set  $t \leftarrow T^*$ , go to line 5 ;
17  else
18    | Reject the proposal:  $t \leftarrow t + \Delta$ , go to line 5 ;
19  end
20 end

```

5. THE GENERATOR

In this section, we derive the explicit form of the infinitesimal generator for our process. With this, we are able to find reciprocal moments which is then used to confirm the validity of our simulation algorithm.

5.1. Constructing the infinitesimal generator. Let us introduce the integro-differential operator \mathcal{L}^{sr} of our extrinsic stress-release process (λ_t, N_t, t) which acts on a function $f(\lambda, n, t)$ within its domain $\Omega(\mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} f := & \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \beta \lambda \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda e^{-x}, n+1, t) - f(\lambda, n, t)] F_X(dx) \\
 & + \rho \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda e^{-y}, n, t) - f(\lambda, n, t)] F_Y(dy).
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

From Propositions II.1.16 & II.1.15 in [Jacod & Shiryaev \(2003\)](#), the conditional intensity function in equation (2.1) can be recast as

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 \exp \left(\beta t - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} x \mu(dx, ds) - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} y \mu'(dy, ds) \right) \quad (5.2)$$

where μ and μ' are the jump measures associated with S and S' , respectively. Their associated predictable compensators are $\nu(dx, dt) = F_X(dx) \lambda_t dt$ and $\nu'(dy, dt) = F_Y(dy) \rho dt$. We now state the following result:

Proposition 5.1. *Let the integro-differential operator for our stress-release process be defined as in equation (5.1). Then for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the following holds*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\lambda_t, N_t, t)] = f(0, N_0, \lambda_0) + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} f(\lambda_s, N_s, s) ds \right] \quad (5.3)$$

if the following f -integrability conditions hold:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \lambda_s ds \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)]^2 F_X(dx) \right] < \infty \quad (5.4)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^t \rho ds \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)]^2 F_Y(dy) \right] < \infty. \quad (5.5)$$

Moreover, f satisfies the following partial integro-differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \beta \lambda \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda e^{-x}, n+1, t) - f(\lambda, n, t)] F_X(dx) \\ + \rho \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda e^{-y}, n, t) - f(\lambda, n, t)] F_Y(dy) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Proof. First note that λ_t can be recast as

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_0 + \int_0^t \beta \lambda_s ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda_s (e^{-x} - 1) \mu(dx, ds) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lambda_s (e^{-y} - 1) \mu'(dy, ds). \quad (5.7)$$

Invoking Itô's formula (confer [Medvegyev, 2007](#), Chapter VI) on the arbitrary function $f(\lambda_t, N_t, t)$ yields

$$f(\lambda_t, N_t, t) = f(\lambda_0, N_0, 0) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial f}{\partial s} ds + \int_0^t \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} d\lambda_s^c + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)]$$

where λ^c denotes the continuous part of the semimartingale. We can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{0 < s \leq t} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] \\
&= \sum_{0 < s \leq t} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] \cdot \Delta N_s \\
&\quad + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] \cdot \Delta N'_s \\
&= Q_t(f) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] \nu(dx, ds) \\
&\quad + Q'_t(f) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] \nu'(dx, ds)
\end{aligned}$$

with $Q_t(f)$ and $Q'_t(f)$ being defined by $Q_t(f) := \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] (\mu - \nu)(dx, ds)$ and $Q'_t(f) := \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(\lambda_{s+}, N_s, s) - f(\lambda_s, N_{s-}, s)] (\mu' - \nu')(dx, ds)$, respectively. The integrability conditions in equations (5.4) and (5.5) guarantee that $Q(f)$ and $Q'(f)$ are square integrable martingales (Brémaud, 1981, Theorem VIII of Chapter II). Hence we conclude that the process $(f(\lambda_t, N_t, t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is a special semimartingale (Protter, 2005) which can be decomposed into a martingale and a predictable finite variation process

$$f(\lambda_t, N_t, t) - f(\lambda_0, N_0, 0) = Q_t(f) + Q'_t(f) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} f(\lambda_s, N_s, s) ds. \quad (5.8)$$

Since $Q(f)$ and $Q'(f)$ are square-integrable martingales, the process defined by

$$\left(f(\lambda_t, N_t, t) - f(\lambda_0, N_0, 0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} f(\lambda_s, N_s, s) ds \right)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \quad (5.9)$$

is also a square-integrable martingale. Taking the expected value of both sides on equation (5.8) yields the result. For the subsequent expression, first define $T > t$ and $g_t := \mathbb{E}[h(\lambda_T, N_T, T) | t, \lambda_t = \lambda, N_t = n]$ for some function h such that g satisfies the g -integrability conditions (5.4) and (5.5). Then by construction, g_t is a martingale. By similar arguments, we see that $g - Q(g) - Q'(g)$ is a square-integrable martingale, but $g - Q(g) - Q'(g) = \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} g ds$ is also a continuous process with finite variation. It must therefore be a continuous martingale with finite variation (Jacod & Shiryaev, 2003, Corollary I-3.16), hence, we must have $\mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} g = 0$ \mathbb{P} -almost surely which yields the partial integro-differential equation in (5.6). \square

5.2. Reciprocal moments. Consistent with the observation in Vere-Jones & Ogata (1984), we are unable to find moments of λ_t but we can find moments of its reciprocal. Throughout Sections 5.2 and 5.3 we assume that $\lambda_0 = 1$, though the same arguments can be made in the general λ_0 case.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $m_1^S := \int (e^x - 1) F_X(dx)$ and $m_1^E := \int (e^y - 1) F_Y(dy)$. We assume that $\beta > \rho m_1^E$, and $\lambda_0 = 1$. Then the expectation of λ_t^{-1} is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}] = e^{-\psi_1 t} + \frac{m_1^S}{\psi_1} (1 - e^{-\psi_1 t}) \quad (5.10)$$

where $\psi_1 := \beta - \rho m_1^E$.

Proof. From [Proposition 5.1](#), we have for $f \in \Omega(\mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}})$ that

$$f(\lambda_t, N_t, t) - f(\lambda_0, N_0, 0) - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}} f(\lambda_s, N_s, s) ds$$

is an \mathcal{F} -martingale. Setting $f = \lambda^{-1}$ in the generator yields

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}}(\lambda^{-1}) = -\beta \lambda^{-1} + m_1^S + \rho \lambda^{-1} m_1^E, \quad (5.11)$$

and $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} - \lambda_0^{-1} - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}}(\lambda_s^{-1}) ds] = 0$. Differentiating $\theta_1(t) := \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}]$ with respect to t yields the non-linear inhomogeneous ODE

$$\theta_1' + \psi_1 \theta_1 = m_1^S, \quad \theta_1(0) = 1 \quad (5.12)$$

whose solution is given in equation [\(5.10\)](#). \square

By a similar token, and setting $f = \lambda^{-2}$, we state the following:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $m_2^S := \int (e^{2x} - 1) F_X(dx)$, $m_2^E := \int (e^{2y} - 1) F_Y(dy)$. We assume that $\beta > \rho m_1^E$, $2\beta > \rho m_2^E$, and $\lambda_0 = 1$. Then the expectation of λ_t^{-2} is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-2}] = e^{-\psi_2 t} + m_2^S \left\{ \frac{e^{-\psi_1 t} - e^{-\psi_2 t}}{\psi_2 - \psi_1} + \frac{m_1^S}{\psi_1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\psi_2} - \frac{e^{-\psi_1 t}}{\psi_2 - \psi_1} \right) - e^{-\psi_2 t} \left(\frac{1}{\psi_2} - \frac{1}{\psi_2 - \psi_1} \right) \right] \right\} \quad (5.13)$$

where $\psi_2 := 2\beta - \rho m_2^E$.

We end this section by giving some recursive relationships related to the inverse moments of our process. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_k^S := \int (e^{kx} - 1) F_X(dx)$, $m_k^E := \int (e^{ky} - 1) F_Y(dy)$ and $\psi_k := k\beta - \rho m_k^E$. We further assume that $k\beta > \rho m_k^E$. Then the generator for the function $f = \lambda^{-k}$ is readily computed as follows

$$\mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}}(\lambda^{-k}) = m_k^S \lambda^{k-1} - \psi_k \lambda^k.$$

By the martingale property we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\lambda_t^{-k} - \lambda_0^{-k} - \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{\text{sr}}(\lambda_s^{-k}) ds \right] = 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Define the quantity $\theta_k(t) := \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-k}]$ and differentiating equation (5.14) with respect to t , we arrive at the recursive non-linear inhomogeneous ODE

$$\theta'_k(t) + \psi_k \theta_k(t) = m_k^S \theta_{k-1}(t)$$

where $\theta_0 \equiv 1$, which can be solved in a recursive fashion to obtain further reciprocal moments.

5.3. Covariance process. We provide an expression for the mean of the product of two reciprocals of intensities for our process. This can be used to compute the covariance process. For $s < t$, it holds true that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} \lambda_s^{-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} \lambda_s^{-1} | \lambda_s^{-1}]] \\ &= e^{-\psi_1(t-s)} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-2}] + \frac{m_1^S}{\psi_1} (1 - e^{-\psi_1(t-s)}) \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-1}]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

To see why this is true, note that the inner expectation can be computed as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} \lambda_s^{-1} | \lambda_s^{-1}] = \lambda_s^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} | \lambda_s^{-1}] = \lambda_s^{-2} e^{-\psi_1(t-s)} + \lambda_s^{-1} \frac{m_1^S}{\psi_1} (1 - e^{-\psi_1(t-s)}).$$

Therefore, for $s < t$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\lambda_s^{-1}, \lambda_t^{-1}) &= \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1} \lambda_s^{-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}] \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-1}] \\ &= e^{-\psi_1(t-s)} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-2}] + \frac{m_1^S}{\psi_1} (1 - e^{-\psi_1(t-s)}) \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-1}] - \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}] \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-1}] \end{aligned}$$

where the remaining expectations are given by (5.10) and (5.13). Furthermore, when we set $S' = 0$ in equation (2.1), we retrieve the covariance results in (Borovkov & Vere-Jones, 2000, Theorem 2, p. 317) upon substituting the results of Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 to get an expression for equation (5.15) and subsequently subtracting the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\lambda_s^{-1}]$.

6. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To confirm that the simulation algorithms of Section 4 agree with the reciprocal moments derived in Section 5, we compare the first reciprocal moments given by the theory to Monte Carlo estimates. The results are given in Figure 3. The theory and the simulated values agree nicely. This example is also used to illustrate the speed benefits to the composition simulation method over the thinning method. In particular, Table 1 shows how long the two algorithms took to generate a fixed number of realizations of the extrinsic stress-release process. The difference in the performance can be explained by: (i) the fact that the composition method is easily vectorized while thinning is not, and (ii) the thinning algorithm is inherently inefficient as it intentionally generates too many points and discards a possibly large fraction of them.




FIGURE 3. First reciprocal moments $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-1}]$ and second reciprocal moments $\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^{-2}]$ for $t \in [0, 50]$ of an extrinsic stress-release process with $\lambda_0 = 1$, $\beta = 0.25$, $\rho = 1.25$, and $X_i \sim \text{Exp}(3)$ and $Y_j \sim \text{Exp}(10)$. The theoretical values, given by (5.10) and (5.13), are compared with crude Monte Carlo estimates using the two simulation methods from Section 4. Both simulation methods were allocated the same amount of computation time (55–60 seconds); as such, Algorithm 1 generated 375,000 sample paths of λ_t , whereas Algorithm 2 generated 25,000. The shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals of the Monte Carlo estimates.

Algorithm	Number of realizations			
	10^2	10^3	10^4	10^5
Composition	0.0205	0.0544	0.3600	3.2992
Thinning	0.3026	3.0329	30.761	310.32

TABLE 1. Comparison of runtime (in seconds) to simulate a number of realizations of the extrinsic stress-release process until time $T = 100$ using Algorithms 1 and 2. The fastest time of 3 attempts is recorded. A grid search is performed to select the optimal step size $\Delta = 1.86$ for Algorithm 2 (this search is not included in the runtimes). The specification of the process (λ_0 , β , ρ etc.) is the same as in Figure 3.

The Python code used to generate these numerical results is available on Github: <https://github.com/Pat-Laub/exact-simulation-of-extrinsic-stress-release-processes>.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article we have introduced a straightforward but computationally efficient way of simulating exactly for a class of generalized stress-release process. The idea stems from the observation that between contiguous jumps at points in time, the process satisfies the continuous part of the semimartingale and thus is governed by an ordinary differential equation. This permits us to derive an expression for the distribution between events. The end result is that we are able to sidestep the need to resort to thinning algorithms for the simulation of this class of point processes.

The explicit form of the infinitesimal generator for the extrinsic stress-release process is given. Theoretical reciprocal moments are derived which are then used to establish the validity of our simulation algorithms.

We envisage that the approach outlined in this paper extends naturally to the general coupled stress release models, i.e. the linked stress-release model (Bebbington & Harte, 2001, 2003) with appropriate structures satisfying the martingale generators. Ongoing work is investigating such a problem.

REFERENCES

- Bebbington, M., & Harte, D. S. (2001). On the statistics of the linked stress release model. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 38(A), 176–187. doi: 10.1239/jap/1085496600
- Bebbington, M., & Harte, D. S. (2003). The linked stress release model for spatio-temporal seismicity: formulations, procedures and applications. *Geophysical Journal International*, 154(3), 925–946.
- Borovkov, K., & Vere-Jones, D. (2000). Explicit formulae for stationary distributions of stress release processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 37(2), 315–321.
- Brémaud, P. (1981). *Point processes and queues*. Springer New York.
- Daley, D., & Vere-Jones, D. (2003). *An introduction to the theory of point processes* (2nd ed.). Springer-Verlag New York.
- Devroye, L. (1986). *Non-uniform random variate generation*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-8643-8> doi: 10.1007/978-1-4613-8643-8
- Isham, V., & Westcott, M. (1979). A self-correcting point process. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 8(3), 335–347.
- Jacod, J., & Shiryaev, A. N. (2003). *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. Springer-Verlag.
- Lewis, P. A. W., & Shedler, G. S. (1979). Simulation of nonhomogeneous Poisson processes by thinning. *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, 26(3), 403–413.
- Liptser, R. S., & Shiryaev, A. N. (1977). *Statistics of random processes*. Springer-Verlag New York.
- Liu, J., Vere-Jones, D., Ma, L., Shi, Y.-L., & Zhuang, J. (1998). The principle of coupled stress release model and its application. *Acta Seismologica Sinica*, 11(3), 273–281.

- Lu, C., Harte, D., & Bebbington, M. (1999). A linked stress release model for historical Japanese earthquakes: coupling among major seismic regions. *Earth, Planets, and Space*, 51, 907–916.
- Medvegyev, P. (2007). *Stochastic integration theory* (No. 14). Oxford University Press.
- Ogata, Y. (1981). On Lewis’ simulation method for point processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 27(1), 23–31.
- Ogata, Y. (2017). Statistics of earthquake activity: Models and methods for earthquake predictability studies. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 45(1), 497–527.
- Ogata, Y., & Vere-Jones, D. (1984). Inference for earthquake models: a self-correcting model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 17(2), 337–347.
- Protter, P. (2005). *Stochastic integration and differential equations*. Springer-Verlag.
- Shi, Y.-L., Liu, J., Vere-Jones, D., Zhuang, J., & Ma, L. (1998). Application of mechanical and statistical models to the study of seismicity of synthetic earthquakes and the prediction of natural ones. *Acta Seismologica Sinica*, 11(4), 421–430.
- Veen, A., & Schoenberg, F. P. (2008). Estimation of space–time branching process models in seismology using an EM-type algorithm. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482), 614–624.
- Vere-Jones, D. (1988). On the variance properties of stress release models. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 30A(1), 123–135.
- Vere-Jones, D., & Ogata, Y. (1984). On the moments of a self-correcting process. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 21(2), 335–342.
- Wang, A.-L., Vere-Jones, D., & Zheng, X.-G. (1991). Simulation and estimation procedures for stress release model. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 370, 11–27.
- Zammit-Mangion, A., Dewar, M., Kadiramanathan, V., & Sanguinetti, G. (2012). Point process modelling of the Afghan War Diary. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(31), 12414–12419.
- Zheng, X., & Vere-Jones, D. (1991). Applications of stress release models to earthquakes from North China. *Pure and Applied Geophysics*, 135, 559–576.
- Zheng, X., & Vere-Jones, D. (1994). Further applications of the stochastic stress release model to historical earthquake data. *Tectonophysics*, 229(1), 101–121.
- Zhuang, J.-C., & Ma, L. (1998). The stress release model and results from modelling features of some seismic regions in China. *Acta Seismologica Sinica*, 11, 59–70.