

# BOUNDS OF STAR DISCREPANCY FOR HSFC-BASED SAMPLING

XIAODA XU, JUN XIAN

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we focus on estimating the probabilistic upper bounds of star discrepancy for Hilbert's space filling curve (HSFC) sampling. The main idea is the stratified random sampling method, but the strict condition for sampling number  $N = m^d$  of jittered sampling is removed. We inherit the advantages of this sampling and get better results than Monte Carlo (MC) sampling.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Among various techniques for solving multivariate integration problems, such as light transport evaluation in complex scenes, rendering applications, variance analysis [16–18] or risk management, derivatives pricing model, portfolio optimization [14, 15], the sample mean method has proven to be one of the most efficient approaches. The canonical form of multivariate integration can be expressed as

$$(1.1) \quad I(f) = \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x) dx.$$

The sample mean method can be applied to give an approximation to  $I(f)$  by

$$(1.2) \quad \tilde{I}(f, \mathbf{P}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i),$$

where  $\mathbf{P} = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\} \subset [0, 1]^d$ .

It is sometimes necessary to estimate approximation error, the famous Koksma-Hlawka inequality presents the exact approximation upper bound, which is,

---

*Date:* January 24, 2023.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65C10, 11K38, 65D30.

*Key words and phrases.* Star discrepancy; Stratified sampling; isometric grid partition; Sampling with noise;  $\delta$ -covers.

$$(1.3) \quad \left| \int_{[0,1]^d} f(x)dx - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t \in P_{N,d}} f(t) \right| \leq D_N^*(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) V(f),$$

where  $D_N^*(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N)$  is a **star discrepancy** of  $P_{N,d}$  and  $V(f)$  is the total variation of  $f$  in the sense of Hardy and Krause.

From (1.3), in bounded total variation functional space, acquiring smaller star discrepancy upper bounds means obtaining better approximation error.

The initial purpose of star discrepancy research is to obtain a measure of the uniformity of the point set, which can be clearly seen from the definition, the star discrepancy of a sampling set  $P_{N,d} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$  is:

$$(1.4) \quad D_N^*(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N) := \sup_{B \subset \mathcal{B}} \left| \frac{A(B; N; P_{N,d})}{N} - \lambda(B) \right|,$$

where  $A(B; N; P_{N,d})$  denotes the number of from  $P_{N,d}$  that located in rectangle  $B$  anchored at 0 and  $\lambda(B)$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of  $B$ .

There are lots of constructions of so-called **low discrepancy point sets**, which have a satisfactory convergence rate for the star discrepancy bounds. For a point set  $\mathcal{P}$ , the convergence order could reach  $O((\ln N)^{\alpha_d}/N)$  for fixed dimension  $d$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\alpha_d \geq 0$  are constants depending on dimension  $d$ , see [7]. These point sets have many applications in sever areas as well, see [1, 5, 14, 15].

In recent years, many researchers study pre-asymptotic star discrepancy bounds, which gives helpful information for moderate values of sampling number  $N$ . In [13], Heinrich, Novak, etc. have obtained the result that the inverse of star discrepancy depends linearly on the dimension. This also means an existing result for star discrepancy upper bound  $c \cdot \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{N}}$ , where  $c$  is an unknown constant. In [3], Aistleitner has adopted techniques of  $\delta$ -covers and dyadic chaining to obtain  $c = 10$ . The constant  $c$  has been improved to 2.53 in [10]. The sampling process of these results happens to use simple random sampling(MC point set), from a practical applications point of view, the following probability bound can be obtained

$$(1.5) \quad D_N^*(X) \leq 5.7 \sqrt{4.9 - \frac{\ln(1-q)}{d}} \frac{\sqrt{d}}{\sqrt{N}},$$

with probability at least  $q$  for MC point set  $X$ . This result has been improved by [10] using the refinement of  $\delta$ -cover bounds. Improving the order of convergence rate of (1.5) remains an open problem. One may use the jittered sampling to finish this

work, but it is necessary to keep in mind the strict condition of sampling number  $N = m^d$ . Jittered sampling sets encounter the curse of dimensionality.

The main purpose of this paper is to give an explicit probabilistic upper bound of star discrepancy for a new stratified sampling manner, this result, on the one hand, improves the bound using MC point set, on the other hand, removes the condition  $N = m^d$ , which is the strict dependence of sampling number  $N$  on the dimension  $d$ .

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we outline some preliminaries. The main results of this paper are summarized in Section 3. In Section 4, we give some conclusions.

## 2. HSFC-BASED SAMPLING AND SOME ESTIMATIONS

### 1. Hilbert space filling curve-based sampling

We first introduce the Hilbert space filling curve-based sampling, that is abbreviated as HSFC-based sampling, and we mainly adopt the definition and notations in [11, 12]. Hilbert space filling curve-based sampling (HSFC-based sampling) is actually a kind of stratified sampling formed by a special partition manner.

Let  $a_i$  be the first  $N = b^m$  points of the van der Corput sequence (van der Corput 1935) in base  $b \geq 2, m = 0, 1, \dots$ . The integer  $i - 1 \geq 0$  is written in base  $b$  as

$$(2.1) \quad i - 1 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} b^{j-1}$$

for  $a_{ij} \in \{0, \dots, b - 1\}$ . Then,  $a_i$  is defined by

$$(2.2) \quad a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_{ij} b^{-j}.$$

The scrambled version of  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$  is  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$  written as

$$(2.3) \quad x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{ij} b^{-j},$$

where  $x_{ij}$  are defined through random permutations of the  $a_{ij}$ . These permutations depend on  $a_{ik}$ , for  $k < j$ . More precisely,  $x_{i1} = \pi(a_{i1})$ ,  $x_{i2} = \pi_{a_{i1}}(a_{i2})$  and generally for  $j \geq 2$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad x_{ij} = \pi_{a_{i1} \dots a_{ij-1}}(a_{ij}).$$

Each random permutation is uniformly distributed over the  $b!$  permutation of  $\{0, \dots, b-1\}$ , and is mutually independent from the others. Thanks to the nice property of nested uniform scrambling, the data values in the scrambled sequence can be reordered such that

$$(2.5) \quad x_i \sim U(I_i),$$

independently with

$$I_i = \left[ \frac{i-1}{N}, \frac{i}{N} \right]$$

for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N = b^m$ .

Let

$$E_i = H(I_i) := \{H(x) | x \in I_i\},$$

where  $H$  is a mapping.

Then

$$X_i = H(x_i) \sim U(E_i), i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N = b^m$$

is the corresponding stratified samples. Set  $r_i$  be the diameter of  $E_i$ , according to the property of HSFC-based sampling, the following estimation holds,

$$(2.6) \quad r_i \leq 2\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{-\frac{1}{d}}.$$

## 2. Minkowski content

We use the definition of Minkowski content in [2], which provides convenience for analyzing the boundary characteristics of the test set  $B$  in (1.4), that is, for a set  $\Omega \subset [0, 1]^d$ , define

$$(2.7) \quad \mathcal{M}(\partial\Omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\lambda((\partial\Omega)_\epsilon)}{2\epsilon},$$

where  $(\partial\Omega)_\epsilon = \{X \in \mathbb{R}^d | \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \leq \epsilon\}$ . If  $\mathcal{M}(\partial\Omega)$  exists and is finite, then  $\partial\Omega$  is said to admit  $(d-1)$ -dimensional Minkowski content. If  $\Omega$  is a convex set, then it is easy to see that  $\partial\Omega$  admits  $(d-1)$ -dimensional Minkowski content, furthermore,  $\mathcal{M}(\partial\Omega) \leq 2d$  as the outer surface area of a convex set in  $[0, 1]^d$  is bounded by the surface area of the unit cube  $[0, 1]^d$ , which is  $2d$ .

## 3. $\delta$ -covers

To discretize the star discrepancy, we use the definition of  $\delta$ -covers as in [8].

**Definition 2.1.** For any  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ , a finite set  $\Gamma$  of points in  $[0, 1]^d$  is called a  $\delta$ -cover of  $[0, 1]^d$ , if for every  $y \in [0, 1]^d$ , there exist  $x, z \in \Gamma \cup \{0\}$  such that  $x \leq y \leq z$  and

$\lambda([0, z]) - \lambda([0, x]) \leq \delta$ . The number  $\mathcal{N}(d, \delta)$  denotes the smallest cardinality of a  $\delta$ -cover of  $[0, 1]^d$ .

From [9], combining with Stirling's formula, the following estimation for  $\mathcal{N}(d, \delta)$  holds, that is, for any  $d \geq 1$  and  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{N}(d, \delta) \leq 2^d \cdot \frac{e^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} \cdot (\delta^{-1} + 1)^d.$$

Furthermore, the following lemma provides convenience for estimating the star discrepancy with  $\delta$ -covers.

**Lemma 2.2.** [8] *Let  $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\} \subset [0, 1]^d$  and  $\Gamma$  be  $\delta$ -covers, then*

$$(2.9) \quad D_N^*(P) \leq D_\Gamma(P) + \delta,$$

where

$$(2.10) \quad D_\Gamma(P) := \max_{x \in \Gamma} \left| \lambda([0, x]) - \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N I_{[0, x]}(p_n)}{N} \right|.$$

#### 4. Bernstein inequality

At the end of this section, we will restate the Bernstein inequality which will be used in the estimation of star discrepancy bounds.

**Lemma 2.3.** [6] *Let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_N$  be independent random variables with expected values  $\mathbb{E}(Z_j) = \mu_j$  and variances  $\sigma_j^2$  for  $j = 1, \dots, N$ . Assume  $|Z_j - \mu_j| \leq C$  ( $C$  is a constant) for each  $j$  and set  $\Sigma^2 := \sum_{j=1}^N \sigma_j^2$ , then for any  $\lambda \geq 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{j=1}^N [Z_j - \mu_j] \right| \geq \lambda \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda^2}{2\Sigma^2 + \frac{2}{3}C\lambda} \right).$$

### 3. PROBABILISTIC STAR DISCREPANCY BOUND FOR HSFC-BASED SAMPLING

**Theorem 3.1.** *For integer number  $b \geq 1$ ,  $m \geq 1$  and  $N = b^m$ , then for the well defined  $d$ -dimensional stratified samples  $X_i \sim U(E_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N = b^m$  in Section 2, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N) \leq \frac{6d^{\frac{3}{4}}}{N^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}}} \cdot \sqrt{d \ln(N+1) + c(d, q)} + \frac{2c(d, q)}{3N}.$$

holds with probability at least  $q$ , where

$$c(d, q) = \ln \frac{(2e)^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d} \cdot (1 - q)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be a subset of  $E_i$ , then according to  $X_i \sim U(E_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , it follows that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{P}(X_i \in A) = \frac{\lambda(A)}{\lambda(E_i)} = N\lambda(A).$$

Now, for an arbitrary  $d$ -dimensional rectangle  $R = [0, x] \in [0, 1]^d$  with diameter  $\kappa$ , when  $x$  runs through the unit cube  $[0, 1]^d$ , we can assign two points  $y, z$  such that  $y \leq x \leq z$  and  $\lambda([0, z]) - \lambda([0, y]) \leq \frac{1}{N}$ . Let  $R_0 = [0, y]$  and  $R_1 = [0, z]$ , then we have

$$R_0 \subseteq R \subset R_1,$$

and

$$(3.3) \quad \lambda(R_1) - \lambda(R_0) \leq \frac{1}{N}.$$

We know that the diameter of  $R_0$  is less than  $\kappa$ , we set it  $\kappa_0$ , the diameter of  $R_1$  is more than  $\kappa$ , we set it  $\kappa_1$ , this forms a bracketing cover for the set  $R$ , and from (2.8) and (3.3), we can give the upper bound for the bracketing cover pair  $(R_0, R_1)$ , which has a cardinality at most  $2^{d-1} \frac{\epsilon^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} (N+1)^d$ . Besides, from Lemma 2.2, we get

$$(3.4) \quad D_N^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N; R) \leq \max_{i=0,1} D_N^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N; R_i) + \frac{1}{N}.$$

For an anchored box  $R$  in  $[0, 1]^d$ , it is easily to check that  $R$  is representable as disjoint union of  $E'_i$ 's entirely contained in  $R$  and the union of  $l$  pieces which are the intersections of some  $E'_j$ 's and  $R$ , i.e.,

$$(3.5) \quad R = \bigcup_{i \in I} E_i \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} (E_j \cap \partial R),$$

where  $I, J$  denote the index-sets.

By the definition of Minkowski content, for any  $\sigma > 2$ , there exists  $\epsilon_0$  such that  $\lambda((\partial R)_\epsilon) \leq \sigma \epsilon \mathcal{M}(\partial R)$  whenever  $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$ .

From (2.6), the diameter for each  $E_i$  is at most  $2\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{-\frac{1}{d}}$ , we can assume  $N > (\frac{2\sqrt{d+3}}{\epsilon_0})^d$ , then  $2\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{-\frac{1}{d}} := \epsilon < \epsilon_0$  and  $\bigcup_{j \in J} (E_j \cap \partial R) \subseteq (\partial R)_\epsilon$ , therefore

$$|J| \leq \frac{\lambda((\partial R)_\epsilon)}{\lambda(E_i)} \leq \frac{\sigma \epsilon \mathcal{M}(\partial R)}{N^{-1}} = 2\sqrt{d+3}\sigma \mathcal{M}(\partial R) N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}.$$

Without loss of generality, we can set  $\sigma = 3$ , combining with the fact  $\mathcal{M}(\partial R) \leq 2d$ , it follows

$$(3.6) \quad |J| \leq 12d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}.$$

The same argument (3.6) holds for test sets  $R_0$  and  $R_1$ .

For  $R_0$  or  $R_1$ , set

$$(3.7) \quad D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R') = \max_{i=0,1} D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R_i).$$

$R'$  is also a test rectangle, which can be broken up into two part

$$(3.8) \quad R' = \bigcup_{k \in K} E_k \cup \bigcup_{l \in L} (E_l \cap R'),$$

and the cardinality of  $R' \subset [0, 1]^d$  is at most  $2^{d-1} \frac{e^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} (N+1)^d$  according to the  $\delta$ -cover estimation.

Let

$$(3.9) \quad T = \bigcup_{l \in L} (E_l \cap R'), |L| = |\{1, 2, \dots, l\}|.$$

If we define new random variables  $\chi_j, 1 \leq j \leq l$  as follows

$$(3.10) \quad \chi_l = \begin{cases} 1, & X_l \in E_l \cap R' \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

then from the above discussions, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & N \cdot D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R') \\ &= N \cdot D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; T) \\ &= \left| \sum_{l=1}^{|L|} \chi_l - N \left( \sum_{l=1}^{|L|} \lambda(E_l \cap R') \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(\chi_l = 1) = \frac{\lambda(E_l \cap R')}{\lambda(E_l)} = N \cdot \lambda(E_l \cap R'),$$

hence

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbf{E}(\chi_l) = N \cdot \lambda(E_l \cap R').$$

Thus, from (3.11) and (3.13), we obtain

$$(3.14) \quad N \cdot D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R') = \left| \sum_{l=1}^{|L|} (\chi_l - \mathbb{E}(\chi_l)) \right|.$$

Let  $\sigma_l^2 = \mathbb{E}(\chi_l - \mathbb{E}(\chi_l))^2$  and  $\Sigma^2 = (\sum_{l=1}^{|L|} \sigma_l^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , then we have

$$(3.15) \quad \Sigma^2 \leq |L| \leq 12d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}.$$

Therefore, from Lemma 2.3, for every  $R'$ , we have,

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \sum_{l=1}^{|L|} (\chi_l - \mathbb{E}(\chi_l)) \right| > \lambda \right) \leq 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{1-\frac{1}{d}} + \frac{2\lambda}{3}}\right).$$

Let

$$(3.17) \quad \mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{R'} \left( \left| \sum_{l=1}^{|L|} (\chi_l - \mathbb{E}(\chi_l)) \right| > \lambda \right).$$

Then using covering numbers, we have

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \leq (2e)^d \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} \cdot (N+1)^d \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot N^{1-\frac{1}{d}} + \frac{2\lambda}{3}}\right).$$

Let  $A(d, q, N) = d \ln(2e) + d \ln(N+1) - \frac{\ln(2\pi d)}{2} - \ln(1-q)$ , and we choose

$$(3.19) \quad \lambda = \sqrt{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot A(d, q, N) + \frac{A^2(d, q, N)}{9N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}}} \cdot N^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2d}} + \frac{A(d, q, N)}{3}.$$

Put it into (3.18), we have



$$(3.20) \quad \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}) \leq 1 - q.$$

Combining above and (3.14), we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R') \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot A(d, q, N) + \frac{A^2(d, q, N)}{9N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}}}}{N^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}}} + \frac{A(d, q, N)}{3N} \end{aligned}$$

holds with probability at least  $q$ .

Thus, obviously, we have

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \max_{i=0,1} D_N^*(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N; R_i) \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot A(d, q, N) + \frac{A^2(d, q, N)}{9N^{1-\frac{1}{d}}}}}{N^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}}} + \frac{A(d, q, N)}{3N} \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{24d\sqrt{d+3} \cdot A(d, q, N)}}{N^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2d}}} + \frac{2A(d, q, N)}{3N} \end{aligned}$$

holds with probability at least  $q$ .

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} A(d, q, N) &= \ln \frac{(2e)^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d} \cdot (1-q)} + d \ln(N+1) \\ &= c(d, q) + d \ln(N+1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.24) \quad c(d, q) = \ln \frac{(2e)^d}{\sqrt{2\pi d} \cdot (1-q)}.$$

The proof is completed.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *Theorem 3.1 gives the convergence order of probabilistic star discrepancy bound for stratified samples, which is  $O(N^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2d}} \cdot (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{2}})$ , comparing the asymptotic bounds using crude Monte Carlo point set, which are  $O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . See results in [4, 10] for this comparison.*

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

What we have seen from the above is the convergence of star discrepancy bound for HSFC-based sampling is  $O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2d}} \cdot (\ln N)^{\frac{1}{2}})$ , which matches the rate using jittered sampling sets and improves the rate using classical MC method. The strict condition for the sampling number  $N = m^d$  in the jittered case is removed, and the applicability of the new stratified sampling method for higher dimensions is enhanced. Our current results are conservative, although a better convergence rate of the upper bound leads to a better integration approximation rate, the strict comparison of the size of random star discrepancy under different stratified sampling models is still unresolved.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. G. M. Ahmed, H. Perrier and D. Coeurjolly, et al, Low-discrepancy blue noise sampling, *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 35(6)(2016), 1-13.
- [2] L. Ambrosio, A. Colesanti, and E. Villa, Outer Minkowski content for some classes of closed sets, *Math. Ann.*, 342(4)(2008), 727–748.
- [3] C. Aistleitner, Covering numbers, dyadic chaining and discrepancy, *J. Complexity*, 27(6)(2011), 531-540.
- [4] C. Aistleitner and M. Hofer, Probabilistic discrepancy bound for Monte Carlo point sets, *Math. Comp.*, 83(2014), 1373-1381.
- [5] C. Cervellera and M. Muselli, Deterministic design for neural network learning: An approach based on discrepancy, *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, 15(3)(2004), 533-544.
- [6] F. Cucker and D. X. Zhou, Learning theory: an approximation theory viewpoint, *Cambridge University Press.*, 2007.
- [7] J. Dick and F. Pillichshammer, Digital Nets and Sequences, *Cambridge University Press*, 2010.
- [8] B. Doerr, M. Gnewuch, A. Srivastav, Bounds and constructions for the star-discrepancy via  $\delta$ -covers, *J. Complexity*, 21(2005), 691-709.
- [9] M. Gnewuch, Bracketing numbers for axis-parallel boxes and applications to geometric discrepancy, *J. Complexity*, 24(2)(2008), 154-172.
- [10] M. Gnewuch, N. Hebbinghaus, Discrepancy bounds for a class of negatively dependent random points including Latin hypercube samples, to appear in *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 2020.
- [11] Z. He, A. B. Owen, Extensible grids: uniform sampling on a space filling curve, *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B*, 78(2016), 917-931.
- [12] Z. He, L. Zhu, Asymptotic normality of extensible grid sampling, *Stat. Comput.*, 29(2019), 53-65.
- [13] S. Heinrich, E. Novak, G. W. Wasilkowski and H. Woźniakowski, The inverse of the star-discrepancy depends linearly on the dimension, *Acta Arith.*, 96(3)(2001), 279-302.
- [14] Y. Lai, Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte carlo methods and their applications, Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Mathematics, Claremont Graduate University, California, USA, 1998.
- [15] Y. Lai, Intermediate rank lattice rules and applications to finance, *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 59(2009), 1-20.
- [16] M. Pharr, G. Humphreys, Physically Based Rendering, Second Edition: From Theory to Implementation, 2nd ed. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc, 2010.

- [17] A. Pilleboue, G. Singh, D. Coeurjolly, et al, Variance analysis for Monte Carlo integration, *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 34(4)(2015), 1-14.
- [18] R. Ramamoorthi, J. Anderson, M. Meyer, and D. Nowrouzezahrai, A theory of monte carlo visibility sampling, *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 31(5)(2012), 1-16.

X. XU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY, 510275 GUANGZHOU, CHINA.

*Email address:* xuxd26@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

J. XIAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND GUANGDONG PROVINCE KEY LABORATORY OF COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCE, SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY, 510275 GUANGZHOU, CHINA.

*Email address:* xianjun@mail.sysu.edu.cn