

Let us go back to our original problem.

Example: A gas. Consider a gas (fluid) of N molecules in a box of volume V . The **configurations** of the gas are specified by the set of positions $\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots$ (each vector defines a position inside the box) and of momenta $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2, \dots$. The **configuration space** is the phase space available to the system. The integral of momenta can be done analytically. We end up with **configurational integrals**.

For instance, we wish to compute the average **potential energy at constant volume** defined by

$$E = \frac{1}{Z} \int [dr] U e^{-\beta U},$$

where the integral is over the whole space, $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$ and Z is the **configurational partition function**.

We rewrite the integral using the probability (density) $\pi(r) = 1/V^N$ (normalized uniform probability in the box), as

$$E = \frac{\int [dr] \pi(r) U e^{-\beta U}}{\int [dr] \pi(r) e^{-\beta U}} = \frac{\langle U e^{-\beta U} \rangle_{\pi}}{\langle e^{-\beta U} \rangle_{\pi}}$$

In principle, one could imagine of using the following MC algorithm to compute E :

1. First, we generate a configuration randomly in the box (i.e., with a probability density $\pi(r)$). If the box is cubic, of size L , let $\mathbf{r}_1 = (LU_1, LU_2, LU_3)$, where U_i are random numbers uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$. Repeat the same for all N particles. We obtain a configuration $(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N)$.
2. Compute $n_i = U(r_i) e^{-\beta U(r_i)}$ and $d_i = e^{-\beta U(r_i)}$, which are the arguments of the two integrals.
3. Repeat steps 1 and 2 n_{iter} times (i goes from 1 to n_{iter}). An estimate of E is $\sum_i n_i / \sum_i d_i$. Indeed,

$$\text{estimate of } \langle U e^{-\beta U} \rangle_{\pi} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{iter}}} \sum_i n_i$$

$$\text{estimate of } \langle e^{-\beta U} \rangle_{\pi} = \frac{1}{n_{\text{iter}}} \sum_i d_i$$

This algorithm is **correct**, but, for any reasonable n_{iter} , the **error** on the estimate is **enormous**.

The method does NOT work for the very same reason why thermodynamics works.

Consider a system of N particles at fixed temperature T . The energy distribution is peaked around the mean energy E . The relative **width** of the distribution is of order $1/\sqrt{N}$.

It implies that the configurations that essentially contribute to the integral are those for which

$$E(1 - w/\sqrt{N}) < U < E(1 + w/\sqrt{N}),$$

where w is the width.

But, our algorithm generates configurations with any value of U : most of them will be outside the relevant interval (which shrinks as N increases) and thus they will not be relevant for the computation of E . The result will depend on the very few configurations that belong to the relevant interval and thus the error will be large.

An example. Suppose we wish to compute

$$I = \int_0^1 e^{-10000x} dx$$

The function is essentially zero outside a small interval around 0, of width of the order of $w/10000$, with $w \approx 5 - 10$.

We estimate I as $\langle e^{-10000x} \rangle_\pi$ using the uniform distribution in $[0, 1]$.

I performed 1000 iterations, obtained the following numbers (8 different simulations): $4.23 \cdot 10^{-6}, 3.30 \cdot 10^{-5}, 2.98 \cdot 10^{-22}, 9.13 \cdot 10^{-8}, 1.57 \cdot 10^{-8}, 5.80 \cdot 10^{-7}, 1.90 \cdot 10^{-5}, 4.71 \cdot 10^{-4}$. The correct result is $10^{-4} = 0.0001 = 10^{-4}$.

These results are very poor estimates of I .

Indeed, one can easily compute the error for N iterations: $(\text{Var } f/N)^{1/2} = 0.007/\sqrt{N}$. For $N = 1000$, the error is $2.2 \cdot 10^{-4}$: at this level of precision we could simply set $I = 0$, without any simulation.

To get a reasonable result, one should have $N_{\text{iter}} \gtrsim 10000$. This inequality is quite intuitive. If we generate the points randomly in $[0, 1]$, typically only w points every 10000 fall in the relevant region around 0 of width $w/10000$. If we use $N_{\text{iter}} = 100000$, there are typically $10w$ points in the relevant region: the result is essentially determined by those $10w$ points. If we set $w = 5 - 10$, this means that the result depends on 50-100 points, which is not much. The other $N_{\text{iter}} - 10w$ points are simply irrelevant: we have wasted our time generating them.

WAY OUT: use **importance sampling**. Configurations are not generated randomly, but according to the canonical measure.
Use

$$\pi(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta U(\mathbf{r})}$$

Unfortunately, it is very difficult to do it directly, except in a very few systems: dilute polymers (growth algorithms, dimerization), Gaussian models, percolation...

We need a new method: the **dynamic Monte Carlo method**, which mathematically is nothing but a **Markov process**.