

The chopthin algorithm for resampling

Axel Gandy F. Din-Houn Lau

Department of Mathematics, Imperial College London

Abstract

Resampling is a standard step in particle filters and more generally sequential Monte Carlo methods. We present an algorithm, called chopthin, for resampling weighted particles. In contrast to standard resampling methods the algorithm does not produce a set of equally weighted particles; instead it merely enforces an upper bound on the ratio between the weights. Simulation studies show that the chopthin algorithm consistently outperforms standard resampling methods. The algorithm chops up particles with large weight and thins out particles with low weight, hence its name. It implicitly guarantees a lower bound on the effective sample size. The algorithm can be implemented efficiently, making it practically useful. We show that the expected computational effort is linear in the number of particles. Implementations for C++, R (on CRAN), Python and Matlab are available.

Key words: effective sample size; importance sampling; particle filter; resampling;

1 Introduction

Particle filters and more generally sequential Monte Carlo methods have gained importance and widespread use Doucet et al. (2001). One of their key steps is resampling, which is intended to prevent weight degeneracy. Broadly speaking, resampling starts with a set of particles x_1, \dots, x_n with associated weights w_1, \dots, w_n and produces a new set of particles (a subset of the original set with potentially duplicates) with less uneven weights (often equal weights).

A commonly used resampling algorithm is multinomial sampling, which selects a new set of particles by sampling n times with replacement from x_1, \dots, x_n with probabilities proportional to w_1, \dots, w_n . Other resampling schemes have been proposed, for example systematic resampling (Whitley, 1994; Carpenter et al., 1999), stratified resampling (Kitagawa, 1996), residual resampling Liu and Chen (1998) and branching resampling (Bain and Crisan, 2009, p. 278). All of these algorithms return a set of particles with equal weights.

The general consensus seems to be that, whilst it is possible to outperform multinomial resampling, the more advanced methods such as residual, stratified and systematic resampling are comparable in terms of their performance in particle filters (Douc and Cappé, 2005; Hol et al., 2006).

In this article we show that it is possible to improve the performance of the resampling step significantly. We do this by presenting a new resampling method that consistently outperforms the aforementioned methods.

The new algorithm, called chopthin, ensures that the weights are not too uneven by enforcing an upper bound, η , on the ratio between the resulting weight. Chopthin can outperform other methods because it does not return particles with equal weights.

The chopthin algorithm enforces the upper bound, η , on the ratio between the weights, as follows: Particles with large weights, above a threshold a , are potentially “chopped”, i.e. replicated with the original weight spread among the replicates. Particles with small weights, below the threshold a , are “thinned” by randomly deciding whether they should be deleted or kept, adjusting the weights by the selection probability to ensure unbiasedness. A similar approach to the thinning part of chopthin is used in Fearnhead and Clifford (2003) where the optimality of such a resampling method is shown in a certain sense.

Particle filters often only perform the resampling step if a criterion of the unevenness of the weights, such as the effective sample size (ESS), drops below a fixed threshold. This avoids resampling if the weights are relatively even and thus reduces the noise being introduced through the resampling. This results in measures of the evenness of the particles such as the ESS to fluctuate over time.

In contrast to this, chopthin can be executed at every step of a particle filter. This is because chopthin evens out the weights less than existing schemes. It will not alter the weights much (or at all) if they are already relatively even. Using it at every step leads to less fluctuation in the unevenness of the weights over time. Figure 4 (later in the paper) illustrates this in an example by looking at the ESS over time.

Chopthin can be implemented efficiently. Indeed, we present one version of chopthin, which can be implemented in expected constant linear effort in the number of particles.

We begin by presenting the generic chopthin algorithm in Section 2. In Section 3 we present a version of the algorithm that has expected linear effort and show in a simulation that its effort is comparable to other standard resampling methods. Simulation studies are conducted in Section 4 that compares the chopthin algorithm to other resampling schemes within a particle filter. The results show that our new algorithm consistently outperforms the other resampling methods. In Section 5 we prove that the algorithm implicitly controls the ESS.

Implementations of chopthin are available: as an R-package (chopthin on CRAN), as a python package (on the python package index), as C++ code and as a Matlab extension file (homepage of the first author).

2 The Generic Algorithm

Before introducing the chopthin algorithm, we first present the constraints that it satisfies. Denote the n particle weights before resampling as w_1, \dots, w_n and let \mathcal{G} be the σ -field generated by w_1, \dots, w_n . Further, denote the N weights after resampling as $\tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_N$. Let C^i be the number of replicates of particle i . We want chopthin to satisfy the following:

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{E}(C^i \tilde{w}_i | \mathcal{G}) = w_i \quad \forall i \quad (\text{Unbiasedness})$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n C^i = N \quad (\text{Target count})$$

$$(iii) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n w_i = \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{w}_i \quad (\text{Conserve weight})$$

$$(iv) \quad \frac{\tilde{w}_i}{\tilde{w}_j} \leq \eta \quad \forall i, j \quad (\text{Bounded ratio})$$

Property (i) is an unbiasedness condition ensuring the expected total weight of the offspring of a particle is equal to its original weight. Property (ii) ensures that exactly N particles are returned after chopthin. Typically, $N = n$ i.e. the number of particles is conserved. Properties (i) and (ii) are satisfied by other resampling methods (Douc and Cappé, 2005). Property (iii) ensures that the total sum of the weights before and after resampling are equal. Property (i) and (iii) ensure that any estimator based on the normalised weights will be unbiased. Finally, property (iv) bounds the ratio of weights returned from chopthin.

Algorithm 1 is a generic version of chopthin. As input it receives the weights $(w_i)_{1:n}$ of n particles, η , the desired upper bound on the ratio between weights, and N , the number of particles to be returned.

Every particle gets a (potentially) random number of descendants. For a particle with weight w , the expected number of offspring from chopthin will be $h_a^\eta(w)$, where $h_a^\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a given function which may depend on η and on a further threshold parameter a . To ensure that N particles are returned (in expectation), we need to find a such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n h_a^\eta(w_i) = N. \quad (1)$$

The mechanism that generates the descendants depends on the weight of the particle as well as on the parameter η , which is specified by the user, and the parameter a , which is determined by the algorithm.

The key steps of Algorithm 1 are:

Find a (Step 1): The parameter a will serve as a threshold parameter that determines which particles are “thinned” and which are “chopped”.

Algorithm 1: Generic chopthin

Input: particle weights $(w_i)_{1:n}$; maximal weight ratio η ; target number of particles N ; function $h_a^\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$

Output: ancestors $I \in \{1, \dots, n\}^N$, weights $\tilde{w} \in [0, \infty)^N$

- 1 Let a be a solution to $\sum_{i=1}^n h_a^\eta(w_i) = N$.
Let $L = \{j : w_j < a\}$ and $U = \{j : w_j \geq a\}$
Let $I = ()$ and $\tilde{w} = ()$
- 2 Draw $u \sim U(0, 1)$ // Thin
for $i \in L$ **do**
 $u = u + h_a^\eta(w_i)$
 if $u \geq 1$ **then**
 append (i) to I and (a) to \tilde{w}
 $u = u - 1$
- 3 Let $N_L = \text{length}(I)$, $N_U = N - N_L - \sum_{i \in U} \lfloor h_a^\eta(w_i) \rfloor$
and $\zeta := \frac{\sum_{i \in L} w_i - a N_L}{\sum_{i \in U} \{h_a^\eta(w_i)\}}$
- 4 Systematic $\{\{h_a^\eta(w_j)\}; j \in U\}; N_U$; returns m^j for $j \in U$.
for $i \in U$ **do**
 $c = \lfloor h_a^\eta(w_i) \rfloor + m^i$
 append $(i, \dots, i) \in \mathbb{N}^c$ to I
 $\hat{w}_i = w_i + \zeta \{h_a^\eta(w_i)\}$ // Adjusted weight
 append $(\frac{\hat{w}_i}{c}, \dots, \frac{\hat{w}_i}{c}) \in \mathbb{R}^c$ to \tilde{w} // Chop

return I, \tilde{w}

Thin (Step 2): Particles with weights below a get “thinned”, i.e. either have 1 offspring (with weight a) or 0 offspring.

Chop (Step 4): Particles with weights above a get “chopped”, which means that they get subdivided into smaller pieces, dividing the total original weight.

The chopthin algorithm returns a vector of resampled weights $(\tilde{w}_i)_{1:N}$ and an integer vector, I , containing the indices of resampled components of the original weights. Chopthin will return weights between a and ηa . This way the bound on the ratio of the weights, property (iv), will be satisfied.

We now discuss Algorithm 1 in detail. In Step 1 the threshold parameter a is found by solving (1). This depends on the choice of function h_a^η . Choosing h_a^η and solving (1) are discussed toward to end of this section and in Section 3.

The thinning step (Step 2) determines the new weight and the number of offspring for particles with small weights, $w_i < a$. Descending particles will have weight a , thus ensuring the range condition on the weights. The unbiasedness property (i) requires $h_a^\eta(w) = w/a$, uniquely determining h_a^η in this range. The number of offspring is determined by systematic resampling on $\{h_a^\eta(w_i) : w_i < a\}$, ensuring 0 or 1 descendants.

Step 2 returns N_L particles such that $\mathbb{E}(N_L | \mathcal{G}) = \sum_{i: w_i < a} w_i/a$. The total weight of the surviving thinned particles is $a N_L$. Thus, through the thinning step, the total sum of the weights may have changed. We compensate for this using ζ (step 3) in the chopping step, thus ensuring property (iii)

The chopping step (Step 4) determines how the large weights, $w_i \geq a$, are subdivided. Each large weight will receive $c^i = \lfloor h_a^\eta(w_i) \rfloor + m^i$ offspring. The m^i are determined by a second systematic resampling step on the fractional parts $\{h_a^\eta(w_i)\}$ where $\{x\} := x - \lfloor x \rfloor$. Performing systematic resampling on these fractional parts ensures $\mathbb{E}(C^i | \mathcal{G}) = h_a^\eta(w_i)$. This holds because the expected value of m^i is $(\zeta/a + 1)\{h_a^\eta(w_i)\}$ and $\mathbb{E}(\zeta | \mathcal{G}) = 0$. Further, this resampling step will return exactly N_U particles. The value of N_U is selected such that the total number of offspring produced from the entire algorithm is exactly N (step 3). Thus property (ii) is satisfied. Before chopping, the original weight is first adjusted using ζ . The adjusted weight is $\hat{w}_i = w_i + \zeta \{h_a^\eta(w_i)\}$. This adjustment ensures that the totals sum of the weights is conserved, property (iii) and that the chopped weights are unbiased (i).




Figure 1: Illustration of allowable chopping region, A , represented by gray area with black border. The black point represents a candidate point $(w, h_a^\eta(w))$, the arrows represent movement from the point by the adjustment vector $\rho(1, 1/a)$. The dark gray lined areas represent regions where $(w, h_a^\eta(w))$ cannot lie. All dashed lines have a gradient of $1/a$.

The restriction that the chopped weights are between a and ηa requires

$$a \leq \frac{\hat{w}}{\lfloor c \rfloor} \text{ and } \frac{\hat{w}}{\lfloor c \rfloor} \leq \eta a, \quad \forall w \geq a$$

where $\hat{w} = w - \zeta\{h_a^\eta(w)\}$ is the adjusted original weight and c is the number of offspring. These constraints define an area, A , in the (adjusted) weight-count space where

$$A := \left\{ (\hat{w}, c) : \left\lceil \frac{\hat{w}}{\eta a} \right\rceil \leq c \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\hat{w}}{a} \right\rfloor, w \geq a \right\}.$$

This region is illustrated in Figure 1 by the light grey area with black border for the case $\eta = 4.5$. This area is only valid if $\eta \geq 2$.

To show that the (\hat{w}, c) used in Algorithm 1 lies in A , we first write the adjusted weight and count as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{w} \\ c \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} w \\ h_a^\eta(w) \end{pmatrix} + \rho \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1/a \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\rho := \zeta\{h_a^\eta(w)\}$. We shall refer to the vector $\rho(1, 1/a)$ as the *adjustment* vector as it adjusts the original weight, w , to the adjusted weight, \hat{w} .

The requirement that $(\hat{w}, c) \in A$ leads to constraints on $h_a^\eta(w)$. Beside choosing $h_a^\eta(w)$ such that $(w, h_a^\eta(w)) \in A$ we also need to ensure that the adjusted weight (\hat{w}, c) is also in A . Possible constraints ensuring this are

$$h_a^\eta(w) \leq \frac{w}{a} - 1$$

and

$$h_a^\eta(w) \geq \frac{w}{a} - m(\eta - 1) + 1 \quad (3)$$

for $a(\eta m - 1) < w < \eta a m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$. The regions where $(w, h_a^\eta(w))$ are not allowed are represented by the dark grey lined areas in Figure 1. An alternative choice for h_a^η could be to choose such that $\{h_a^\eta(w)\} = 0$ for all w so that $\rho = 0$ (see end of this section). In this case, it is sufficient that $(w, h_a^\eta(w)) \in A$.

Figure 2 illustrates the systematic resampling used in the first for-loop in Algorithm 1, where $h_a^\eta(w) = w/a$ denotes the expected number of offspring for a particle with current weight $w < a$. This depends on the




Figure 2: Illustration of systematic resampling in Algorithm 1.




Figure 3: Expected number h_a^η of offspring as a function of the weight. Dot-dashed: chopthin (5); gray dotted: step-chopthin (4).

threshold a . All particles have $h_a^\eta(w_i) < 1$. Particle 1, 2, 4 and 5 each get one descendent and particle 3 receives no descendant.

We have considerable freedom in choosing h_a^η for $w \geq a$. One natural choice would be

$$h_a^\eta(w) = \begin{cases} w/a & \text{if } w < a \\ \lceil w/(\eta a) \rceil & \text{if } w \geq a \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

illustrated in Figure 3. We call the resulting algorithm *step-chopthin*. The requirement that $(w, h_a^\eta(w)) \in A$ implies $\lceil w/(\eta a) \rceil \leq \lfloor w/a \rfloor$ for all $w \geq a$. Considering values of w slightly less than $2a$ implies $\eta \geq 2$.

This choice does not guarantee the existence of a solution a of (1) due to the discontinuities. Instead of having an exact solution, one could use an approximate solution, using a numerical root finding algorithm, but this would not guarantee that the desired number of particles is returned property (ii).

3 Implementation in expected linear time

In this section we present our main version of the algorithm, which we simply call *chopthin*. For this we choose h_a^η such that it is continuous (in a) and such that (1) can be solved for a in expected linear effort. Consider the function

$$h_a^\eta(w) = \begin{cases} w/a & \text{if } w < a \\ 1 & \text{if } a \leq w < \eta a/2 \\ 2w/\eta a & \text{if } w \geq \eta a/2 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

which is depicted in Figure 3. The requirement that $(w, h_a^\eta(w)) \in A$ implies $2w/\eta a \leq \lfloor w/a \rfloor$ for all $w \geq a$. Considering values of w slightly less than $2a$ implies $\eta \geq 4$.

We use Algorithm 2 to solve $\sum_{i=1}^n h_a^\eta(w_i) = N$ using (5) for a . Lemma 1 proves that the expected effort of Algorithm 2 is linear in n , and overall the expected computational effort is $O(\max(n, N))$.

Algorithm 2 works by determining which weights are above or below a and which weights are above or below ηa , without fully knowing a yet. Due to the piecewise linear structure of h_a^η , the contributions of weights for which this determination has been made can be easily kept track of by the number and the sum

Algorithm 2: Fast determination of a

Input: particle weights w_i ; maximal weight ratio η ; target number of particles N
Output: $a > 0$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n h_a^\eta(w_i) = N$
 $w^u = w^l = w$, $s^l = 0$, $c^m = 0$, $s^u = 0$, $c^u = 0$
while $w^u \neq \emptyset$ *or* $w^l \neq \emptyset$ **do**

 if $|w^l| \geq |w^u|$ **then** sample a uniformly from w^l and let $b = \eta a/2$

 else sample b uniformly from w^u and let $a = 2b/\eta$

 $h = s^l/a + \sum_{v \in w^l} \min(v/a, 1) + c^m + \sum_{v \in w^u} \max(\frac{v}{b} - 1, 0) + s^u/b - c^u$

 if $h=N$ **then return** a

 if $h > N$ **then**

 $s^l = s^l + \sum_{v \in w^l} v \mathbb{I}(v \leq a)$

 $w^l = \{v \in w^l; v > a\}$, $w^u = \{v \in w^u; v > b\}$

 else

 $c^m = c^m + \sum_{v \in w^l} \mathbb{I}(v \geq a)$, $s^u = s^u + \sum_{v \in w^u} v \mathbb{I}(v \geq b)$, $c^u = c^u + \sum_{v \in w^u} \mathbb{I}(v \geq b)$

 $w^l = \{v \in w^l; v < a\}$, $w^u = \{v \in w^u; v < b\}$
return $a = \frac{s^l + 2s^u/\eta}{N - c^m + c^u}$

Table 1: Example run of Algorithm 2 with $N = n = 5$ and $\eta = 4$.

w^l	a	w^u	b	h
$\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, \boxed{0.9}, 1\}$	0.9	$\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.9, 1\}$	1.8	3
$\{0.1, 0.3, 0.5\}$	0.15	$\{0.1, \boxed{0.3}, 0.5, 0.9, 1\}$	0.3	9.67
$\{0.3, 0.5\}$	0.25	$\{\boxed{0.5}, 0.9, 1\}$	0.5	6.2
$\{\boxed{0.3}, 0.5\}$	0.3	$\{0.9, 1\}$	0.6	5.5
$\{0.5\}$	0.5	$\{0.9, \boxed{1}\}$	1	3.8
\emptyset	0.45	$\{\boxed{0.9}\}$	0.9	3.89
\emptyset		\emptyset		

 randomly chosen element

of those particles (see s^l , c^m , s^u , c^u and the computation of h in Algorithm 2). The algorithm maintains two lists — w^l , the weights for which we do not know yet whether they are above or below a , and w^u , the weights for which we do not know yet whether they are above or below $\eta a/2$. The exact value of a is only determined when $h = N$ or when both w^l and w^u are empty. At every iteration, a new candidate for a or $b = \eta a/2$ is selected from the longer of w^l and w^u . Depending on whether $h > N$ or $h < N$ the algorithm then removes elements from w^l and w^u and updates the counts/sums of decided weights. See Table 1 for an illustrative run through of Algorithm 2 for $N = n = 5$.

Lemma 1. *The expected effort of Algorithm 2 is $O(n)$. The expected effort of Algorithm 1 together with Algorithm 2 is $O(\max(n, N))$.*

Proof. We use a subscript to denote iterations in Algorithm 2 with $w_1^l = w = w_1^u$. The effort in the i th iteration of the while-loop is proportional to the number of elements in w_i^l and w_i^u . Thus the overall effort is proportional to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|w_i^l| + |w_i^u|)$$

Consider iteration i . The following statements are conditional on the sets w_{i-1}^l, w_{i-1}^u . Suppose that $|w_{i-1}^l| \geq |w_{i-1}^u|$. We show that $\mathbb{E}(|w_i^l|) \leq (3/4)|w_{i-1}^l|$. Let a be the randomly selected element from w_{i-1}^l . Let a^* be

Table 2: Effort of resampling N particles divided by the effort to generate N exponentially distributed random variables in R

	M1000	10000	10^5	10^6
chopthin	1.77	1.53	1.53	1.64
systematic	0.43	0.34	0.35	0.35
multinomial (sample.int)	0.88	0.89	1.02	1.36
multinomial (cond. Binomial)	1.81	1.90	1.92	2.03

such that $\sum_{i=1}^n h_{a^*}^n(w_i) = N$. Let $M^l = |\{v \in w_{i-1}^l : v < a^*\}|$, $M^u = |\{v \in w_{i-1}^l : v > a^*\}|$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}(|w_i^l|) = \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(|w_i^l| \middle| a < a^*\right) \frac{M^l}{|w_{i-1}^l|} + \mathbb{E}\left(|w_i^l| \middle| a > a^*\right) \frac{M^u}{|w_{i-1}^l|} \\
&= \left(\frac{M^l}{2} + M^u\right) \frac{M^l}{|w_{i-1}^l|} + \left(\frac{M^u}{2} + M^l\right) \frac{M^u}{|w_{i-1}^l|} \\
&= \frac{(M^l + M^u)^2 + 2M^l M^u}{2|w_{i-1}^l|} \leq \frac{1}{2}|w_{i-1}^l| + \frac{1}{4}|w_{i-1}^l| = \frac{3}{4}|w_{i-1}^l|
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}(|w_i^l| + |w_i^u|) \leq \frac{3}{4}|w_{i-1}^l| + |w_{i-1}^u| \leq \frac{7}{8}(|w_{i-1}^l| + |w_{i-1}^u|)$ as $|w_{i-1}^l| \geq |w_{i-1}^u|$. Similarly, it can be seen that the above also holds if $|w_{i-1}^l| < |w_{i-1}^u|$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(|w_i^l| + |w_i^u|) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[|w_i^l| + |w_i^u| \middle| w_{i-1}^l, w_{i-1}^u\right]\right) \\
&\leq \frac{7}{8} \mathbb{E}(|w_{i-1}^l| + |w_{i-1}^u|) \\
&\leq \dots \leq \left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^{i-1} \mathbb{E}(|w_1^l| + |w_1^u|) = \left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^{i-1} 2n
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (|w_i^l| + |w_i^u|)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{7}{8}\right)^{i-1} 2n = 2n \frac{1}{1 - 7/8} = 16n.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that the expected effort of Algorithm 2 is $O(n)$. The remainder of Algorithm 1 entails generating the output of length N and it runs through all n particles with an overall effort of $O(\max(n, N))$. Thus the expected effort of the combined Algorithms 1, 2 is $O(\max(n, N))$. \square

We now compare the effort of chopthin to the effort of sampling with replacement (multinomial resampling), via the in-built function `sample.int` in R and via a method using conditional Binomial distributions (Davis, 1993) and a (fast) C++-based implementation of systematic resampling.

We simulated N weights from an Exponential distribution, i.e. $w_i \sim \text{Exp}(1)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ independently. We then applied the resampling procedures to the simulated weights.

Table 2 reports the mean effort of the resampling procedures over 10000 repetitions. The reported effort is relative to the effort to generate the weights (a call of the in-built R function `rexp`). Constant values indicate that the effort is linear in N , as the effort of generating the random variables is linear in N .

Systematic, chopthin and multinomial resampling (the conditional Binomial implementations) are all approximately linear in N . As expected, chopthin is more computationally demanding than systematic resampling as part of the chopthin algorithm consists of systematic resampling steps.

Nevertheless, the computational effort of chopthin is very moderate, only slightly more than generating exponentially distributed random variables.

Algorithm 3: Particle filter

Input: target number of particles N ; ESS threshold β ; resampling scheme r ; observations y_1, \dots, y_T .

Output: weighted particles $(w_i, \tilde{x}_t^{(i)})_{1:n_t}$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$

Sample $\tilde{x}_0^{(i)} \sim p(x_0)$, $i = 1, \dots, N$

$w_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, N$

Let $n_0 = N$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**

 Sample $\tilde{x}_t^{(i)} \sim p(x_t | \tilde{x}_{t-1}^{(i)})$, $i = 1, \dots, n_{t-1}$

$w_i = w_i p(y_t | \tilde{x}_t^{(i)})$, $i = 1, \dots, n_{t-1}$

if $\text{ESS}(w) \leq \beta$ **then**

 Run r with a target of N particles to get a set of particles $(w_i, \tilde{x}_t^{(i)})_{1:n_t}$

 Normalise weights such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n_t} w_i = N$

4 Simulations

We now compare the performance of chopthin to other resampling methods within a particle filter. We also vary the bound of the ratio on the weights, η , and illustrate that chopthin results in a less variable ESS.

4.1 Linear Gaussian Model

Consider a model with hidden Markov process $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and observed process $Y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In this section, we are interested in the model

$$\begin{cases} X_t &= X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t, & \epsilon_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, 1) \\ Y_t &= X_t + \xi_t, & \xi_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_Y^2) \end{cases}$$

with $X_0 \sim N(0, 1)$ and known $\sigma_Y > 0$. For this model the Kalman filter (Kalman, 1960) gives the exact conditional distribution, giving us a benchmark.

4.1.1 Simulation

We use the particle filter in Algorithm 3 to give estimates of the hidden states X_1, \dots, X_T based on the observations y_1, \dots, y_T . We select $p(x_t | x_{t-1})$ and $p(y_t | x_t)$ as indicated by the linear Gaussian model. We are interested in the posterior $X_t | y_1, \dots, y_t$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$. Resampling is performed if the ESS drops below $\beta \in [0, N]$. The ESS of a weight vector, $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ is defined as

$$\text{ESS}(w) = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2}.$$

It is often used in particle filters to trigger the resampling step. If $\beta = N$ then resampling is performed at every step as $\text{ESS}(w) \leq N$. Lastly, potentially any resampling scheme r can be used in Algorithm 3.

For a given σ_Y^2 , resampling scheme r , target number of particles N and resampling trigger β , a single iteration of the simulation is conducted as follows: simulate from the model $T = 1000$ observations; y_1, \dots, y_T . Using this realisation of observations, run the particle filter to give estimates of the hidden states X_1, \dots, X_T . Lastly, the Kalman filter is run to obtain the exact conditional distribution. We use $M = 1000$ iterations. The simulation is conducted using combinations of the parameters: σ_Y , N , β , η (for chopthin) and various resampling schemes.




Figure 4: ESS before and after resampling for selected resampling schemes (one realisation).

4.1.2 Illustration of One Run

Figure 4 considers the effect of different resampling schemes on the ESS during the first 50 steps of one realisation of the particle filter (Algorithm 3) with $N = 10000$ target particles. It plots the ESS before and after resampling. As resampling for the multinomial and systematic algorithm only occurs if the ESS has dropped below $0.5N$, the ESS is far more variable than in the chopthin algorithm. For both $\eta = 3 + \sqrt{8}$ and $\eta = 10$, the chopthin algorithm after resampling stays significantly above its theoretical lower bound (given in Section 5), which is $0.5N$ and $0.33N$, respectively. Also the two choices of η within chopthin lead to similar behaviour.

4.1.3 Results

Table 3 shows the results of the full simulation for the following resamplers: chopthin, multinomial resampling (resampling with replacement), branching (Bain and Crisan, 2009, p. 278), stratified sampling, standard residual sampling (multinomial resampling of the residuals), residual sampling with stratified resampling of the residuals and systematic resampling.

For each iteration, we obtain the estimated posterior mean of X_t for $t = 1, \dots, T$. For a given σ_Y , N and β , denote the estimated posterior mean from iteration i , at time t , for resampling scheme r as $\tilde{\mu}_{i,t,r}$. Further, $\mu_{i,t}$ denotes the true posterior mean at time t given by the Kalman filter. We report the approximate mean squared error (MSE) for resampling scheme r as

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{\mu}_{i,t,r} - \mu_{i,t})^2 \right\}.$$

The MSE values, presented in Table 3, are divided by the MSE given by the systematic resampling. The results show that using the chopthin algorithm at every step ($\beta = N$) and using the trigger ($\beta = 0.5N$) with various values for the ratio bound η consistently achieves a lower MSE than the other resampling methods. The simulations using $\sigma_Y = 1/3$ is based on a setting where there is a small amount of noise between the state and observation. In this case, the particle filter will be resampling at nearly every step for all methods.

Table 3: Simulations Results - linear Gaussian model: MSE values for various simulation parameters and different resampling methods. Presented MSE values are divided by the MSE from the simulations using systematic resampling.

	β	η	N	100	100	100	100	10^3	10^3	10^3	10^3	10^4	10^4	10^4	10^4
			σ_Y	1/3	1	3	9	1/3	1	3	9	1/3	1	3	9
chopthin	N	4	0.99	<u>0.90</u>	<u>0.88</u>	0.91	0.98	0.90	<u>0.89</u>	0.92	0.97	0.91	0.90	0.94	
chopthin	N	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	0.97	0.90	<u>0.86</u>	<u>0.86</u>	1.00	<u>0.89</u>	<u>0.86</u>	<u>0.87</u>	0.95	<u>0.90</u>	<u>0.89</u>	0.90	
chopthin	N	10	0.97	0.92	<u>0.87</u>	<u>0.85</u>	0.98	0.91	<u>0.87</u>	<u>0.86</u>	0.94	0.93	<u>0.86</u>	<u>0.85</u>	
chopthin	$0.5N$	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	0.98	0.98	0.96	0.94	0.97	0.98	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.98	0.96	0.94	
multinomial	$0.5N$	-	1.01	1.05	1.15	1.21	0.99	1.04	1.15	1.24	0.98	1.04	1.15	1.22	
branching	$0.5N$	-	1.01	1.01	0.99	0.99	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.01	0.95	1.01	1.00	1.00	
residual	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	
stratified	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.02	0.99	1.01	1.02	1.04	0.96	1.02	1.01	1.01	
residual-stratified	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.01	1.01	1.01	0.97	1.00	1.01	1.01	0.96	1.03	1.00	1.05	
systematic	N	-	1.00	0.96	1.06	1.37	1.01	0.96	1.11	1.44	0.98	1.00	1.13	1.47	
systematic	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	

Underline: below 0.9.

Chopthin with $\beta = 0.5N$ is included in these simulations to support our suggestion that chopthin should be used in every iteration of a particle filter. In similar simulations, not presented here, we compared the MSE of using the chopthin with $\beta = N$ and systematic resampling with various values of β . These simulations still showed that the chopthin method consistently outperforms systematic resampling.

In general, chopthin appears to perform better than other resampling methods, particularly when σ_Y is large. This may be due to a combination of factors. First, chopthin with $\beta = N$ keeps the quality of the particle approximation more stable than methods using the ESS as resampling trigger (see Figure 4). Second, compared to using a standard resampling scheme at every iteration ($\beta = N$), chopthin leaves particles with weights between a and $\eta a/2$ unchanged; only thinning the particles with weights less than a and chopping those above $\eta a/2$. As a result, a better particle system seems to be maintained.

4.1.4 Estimation of the Likelihood

The likelihood of the observations $p(y_1, \dots, y_T)$ can be decomposed as

$$p(y_1, \dots, y_T) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(y_t | y_{1:t-1}).$$

The conditional distribution $p(y_t | y_{1:t-1})$ can be approximated from these simulations the average of the weights; that is

$$\hat{p}(y_t | y_{1:t-1}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N w_k,$$

where the w_k are the weights after the conditioning on the observation y_t .

For the model, presented in Section 4.1, the exact marginal likelihood can be computed using the Kalman filter, providing a comparison with the estimates given by the particle filter. For the same run of the simulation conducted in Section 4.1.3, we estimate the conditional likelihood as follows. Let $y_{1,t}^i$ denote the observations simulated in iteration i for $t = 1, \dots, T$. Then denote the estimate of $p(y_t^i | y_{1:t-1}^i)$ for iteration i , for a given resampling method, σ_Y , N and β as $\hat{p}(y_t^i | y_{1:t-1}^i)$. In Table 4 we report the following MSE

$$\frac{1}{M} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\log \hat{p}(y_t^i | y_{1:t-1}^i) - \log p(y_t^i | y_{1:t-1}^i))^2 \right\}.$$

Based on the MSE results, the chopthin method approximates the log likelihood better than systematic and consistently for other resampling methods. Accurate estimation of the likelihood is particularly

Table 4: Simulation Results - linear Gaussian model: MSE values of log likelihood for various simulation parameters and different resampling methods. Presented MSE values are divided by the MSE from the simulations using systematic resampling.

		N	100	100	100	100	10^3	10^3	10^3	10^3	10^4	10^4	10^4	10^4
β	η	σ_Y	1/3	1	3	9	1/3	1	3	9	1/3	1	3	9
chopthin	N	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	0.92	<u>0.88</u>	<u>0.85</u>	<u>0.86</u>	1.07	<u>0.88</u>	<u>0.85</u>	<u>0.87</u>	<u>0.89</u>	0.91	<u>0.89</u>	<u>0.90</u>
multinomial	$0.5N$	-	1.03	1.07	1.17	1.22	0.94	1.07	1.17	1.24	1.09	1.06	1.17	1.23
branching	$0.5N$	-	1.02	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.98	0.99	1.00	1.01	1.03	1.02	1.00	1.01
residual	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	0.99	1.00	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.02
stratified	$0.5N$	-	1.03	0.99	1.02	1.03	0.95	1.01	1.02	1.05	0.91	1.03	1.02	1.01
systematic	N	-	0.99	0.95	1.06	1.37	1.05	0.93	1.10	1.45	0.95	0.99	1.11	1.46
systematic	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 5: Simulations Results - Stochastic volatility model: MSE values for different resampling methods. Presented MSE values are divided by the MSE from the simulations using systematic resampling. Left table: MSE of the posterior mean, right table: MSE of the loglikelihood.

		100	10^3	10^4			100	10^3	10^4		
β	η				β	η					
chopthin	N	4	<u>0.82</u>	<u>0.82</u>	<u>0.85</u>	chopthin	N	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	<u>0.85</u>	<u>0.83</u>	<u>0.88</u>
chopthin	N	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	<u>0.84</u>	<u>0.83</u>	<u>0.87</u>	multinomial	$0.5N$	-	1.08	1.09	1.05
chopthin	N	10	<u>0.89</u>	<u>0.89</u>	<u>0.90</u>	branching	$0.5N$	-	0.97	1.00	0.99
chopthin	$0.5N$	$3 + \sqrt{8}$	1.05	1.04	1.01	residual	$0.5N$	-	0.99	1.01	0.97
multinomial	$0.5N$	-	1.09	1.10	1.05	stratified	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	0.98
branching	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	0.99	systematic	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00
residual	$0.5N$	-	1.01	1.00	1.00						
stratified	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	0.99						
systematic	N	-	1.00	1.00	0.98						
systematic	$0.5N$	-	1.00	1.00	1.00						

important in particle MCMC, see for example Andrieu et al. (2010), Doucet et al. (2015), Sherlock et al. (2015).

4.2 Stochastic Volatility Model

We now consider a more complicated model; a stochastic volatility model with hidden process $X_t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$ defined by:

$$\begin{cases} X_t = 0.9X_{t-1} + 0.25\epsilon_t, & \epsilon_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, 1) \\ Y_t = 0.1\xi_t \exp(X_t/2), & \xi_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} N(0, 1) \end{cases}$$

with $X_0 \sim N(0, 1)$. Unlike the linear Gaussian model, the posterior distributions are not available in closed form. As a benchmark we approximate these distributions using a numerical approach that discretises the hidden state space into a fine grid.

4.2.1 Results

We repeat the same simulation described in Section 4.1.1 for the stochastic volatility model. altering Algorithm 3 accordingly. The MSE of the posterior mean and loglikelihood is presented in Table 5. The results again show that using chopthin every iteration outperforms the other resampling method.

The results in Tables 3, 4 and 5 show that for a fixed number of particles, chopthin outperforms other resamplers in terms of MSE. However, as illustrated in Table 2, using chopthin is computationally more expensive than systematic resampling. Therefore, use of chopthin should be favoured when the computational expense of the other steps in the particle filter, i.e. the transition of the particle values and computational

of the weights, exceed the expense of resampling. In scenarios where the transition or weight computation are cheap, using systematic resampling may be preferred.

5 Implied control of the Effective Sample Size

The following lemma shows that imposing a bound on the ratio between the weights implicitly results in a lower bound on the ESS. It implies that chopthin has a lower bound on the ESS after resampling.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $w_1, \dots, w_n > 0$. Then*

$$\text{ESS}(w) = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^2} \geq 4 \frac{\eta n + 1 - \eta^2}{(\eta + 1)^2}$$

where $\eta = \frac{\max_i w_i}{\min_i w_i}$.

Proof. In the case where all weights are equal, i.e. $\eta = 1$, then $\text{ESS}(w) = n$, thus inequality holds. From now on consider the case $\eta > 1$.

Let $W_i = \frac{w_i}{\sum_j w_j}$ be the normalized weights corresponding to W . Then $\text{ESS}(w) = \text{ESS}(W)$. The set of possible normalized weights is compact and ESS is a continuous function, thus there exists a W^* that minimises ESS. Without loss of generality, assume $W_1^* \leq \dots \leq W_n^*$.

The normalised weight W_i^* has to be of the form $W_i^* = a$ for $i < k$, $W_k^* = a\tau$, $W_i^* = \eta a$ for $i > k$, where $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $a > 0$ and $1 \leq \tau < \eta$. To see this let W be a normalised weight vector for which there exist mutually distinct indices i, j, k, l such that $W_i < W_j \leq W_k < W_l$. Define a new weight vector V identical to W except for $V_j = W_j - \Delta$, $V_k = W_k + \Delta$ with $\Delta = \min((W_l - W_k)/2, (W_j - W_i)/2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1/\text{ESS}(V) &= \sum_{\nu} V_{\nu}^2 \\ &= 2\Delta^2 + 2\Delta(W_k - W_j) + \sum_{\nu} W_{\nu}^2 > 1/\text{ESS}(W) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that W does not minimise ESS. Hence, W^* can take at most 3 values, the middle one, if present, appearing exactly once. The two extreme values have to have a ratio of η , otherwise one could move them further apart and create a weight vector with smaller ESS.

As $\sum W_i^* = a[k-1 + \tau + \eta(n-k)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ESS}(W^*) &= \frac{[k-1 + \tau + \eta(n-k)]^2}{k-1 + \tau^2 + (n-k)\eta^2} \\ &\geq \frac{[k + \eta(n-k)]^2}{k-1 + (n-k+1)\eta^2} \geq \inf_{x \in [1, n-1]} h(x) \end{aligned}$$

where $h(x) = \frac{[x + \eta(n-x)]^2}{x-1 + (n-x+1)\eta^2}$.

It remains to derive the minimum of h . Candidates for minimizers of h are $x = \eta n / (\eta - 1)$ (which is not in the right range) and $x = (\eta(n+2) + 2) / (\eta + 1)$. Plugging this into h gives $h(x) \geq 4 \frac{\eta n + 1 - \eta^2}{(\eta + 1)^2}$ \square

Larger η allow for more variability in the weights and thus should lead to lower effective sample sizes. Consistent with this, the lower bound on ESS is decreasing in η . This can be seen by differentiating it with respect to η .

For large n , the leading term is $4 \frac{\eta n}{(\eta + 1)^2}$. Equating this to a desired minimal effective sample size γn gives

$$\eta = \frac{2 - \gamma + 2\sqrt{1 - \gamma}}{\gamma}$$

For example, for $\gamma = 0.5$, this leads to $\eta = 3 + \sqrt{8}$. Furthermore, for $\eta = 10$, the lower bound on the ESS is $\frac{40}{121}n - \frac{99}{121} \approx 0.33n$.

6 Discussion

6.1 Why not only impose an upper or a lower threshold on the weights?

The chopthín algorithm imposes a bound on the ratio of the largest and the smallest weight. Alternatively, one could have imposed only a lower or only an upper bound on the normalized weights. The following examples illustrate that there are situations in which these bounds would not lead to resampling despite very uneven weights. The chopthín algorithm (with $\eta < n$) would even out the weights in both examples.

Example 1. *Suppose our weight vector w of length n is produced by one importance sampling step, where the target distribution is a uniform distribution on $[0, 0.5]$ and the importance sampling distribution is a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. Then roughly half of the weights will be approximately $2/n$ and half of the weight will be 0. None of the weights is large, so imposing an upper bound on the weights would not lead to resampling.*

Example 2. *Consider the same setting as in the previous example, but now having as target distribution a mixture of two equally probably components: a uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$ and a uniform distribution on $[0, 1/n]$. Suppose the first particle is in $[0, 1/n]$ and all other samples are greater than $1/n$. Then the weight of the first particle is $(n + 1)/2$ and the weight of all other particles is $1/2$. Thus in this case, no weight is small, so imposing a lower bound on the weights would not lead to resampling.*

7 Summary

In this paper we have introduced the chopthín algorithm which bounds the ratio between the weights. We showed, in simulations, that chopthín consistently outperforms standard resampling schemes used in particle filters. The simulations also demonstrated that chopthín can be used at every iteration in a particle filter with no detrimental effects. The chopthín algorithm can be implemented efficiently and we have proved that its expected effort is linear in the number of samples. Lastly, we have shown that imposing a bound on the ratio between weights implicitly controls the ESS. As mentioned in Section 4, use of chopthín within particle filters over other, less computational expensive, resamplers should be favoured when the expense of resampling is negligible in comparison to the other steps in the particle filter.

Proving a central limit type theorem of the particle filter estimates using chopthín resampling is a natural next step. However, as the chopthín algorithm uses systematic resampling this will not be straightforward (Gentil and Rémillard, 2008). Replacing systematic resampling with a resampling method more amenable to theoretical developments could be a topic for future research.

References

- Andrieu, C., A. Doucet, and R. Holenstein (2010). Particle Markov chain Monte Carlo methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 72(3), 269–342.
- Bain, A. and D. Crisan (2009). *Fundamentals of Stochastic Filtering*. Springer.
- Carpenter, J., P. Clifford, and P. Fearnhead (1999). Improved particle filter for nonlinear problems. *Radar, Sonar and Navigation, IEE Proceedings* 146(1), 2–7.
- Davis, C. S. (1993). The computer generation of multinomial random variates. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 16(2), 205–217.
- Douc, R. and O. Cappé (2005). Comparison of resampling schemes for particle filtering. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Image and Signal Processing and Analysis*, pp. 64–69. IEEE.
- Doucet, A., N. de Freitas, and N. Gordon (Eds.) (2001). *Sequential Monte Carlo Methods in Practice*. Springer.
- Doucet, A., M. K. Pitt, G. Deligiannidis, and R. Kohn (2015). Efficient implementation of Markov chain Monte Carlo when using an unbiased likelihood estimator. *Biometrika* 102(2), 295–313.

- Fearnhead, P. and P. Clifford (2003). On-line inference for hidden Markov models via particle filters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 65(4), 887–899.
- Gentil, I. and B. Rémillard (2008, 06). Using systematic sampling selection for Monte Carlo solutions of Feynman-Kac equations. *Advances in Applied Probability* 40(2), 454–472.
- Hol, J. D., T. B. Schon, and F. Gustafsson (2006). On resampling algorithms for particle filters. In *Nonlinear Statistical Signal Processing Workshop, 2006 IEEE*, pp. 79–82.
- Kalman, R. E. (1960). A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Journal of basic Engineering* 82(1), 35–45.
- Kitagawa, G. (1996). Monte Carlo filter and smoother for non-gaussian nonlinear state space models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 5(1), 1–25.
- Liu, J. S. and R. Chen (1998). Sequential Monte Carlo methods for dynamic systems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 93(443), 1032–1044.
- Sherlock, C., A. H. Thiery, G. O. Roberts, and J. S. Rosenthal (2015). On the efficiency of pseudo-marginal random walk Metropolis algorithms. *The Annals of Statistics* 43(1), 238–275.
- Whitley, D. (1994). A genetic algorithm tutorial. *Statistics and Computing* 4(2), 65–85.