

EFFICIENT INVERSE Z-TRANSFORM AND WIENER-HOPF FACTORIZATION

SVETLANA BOYARCHENKO AND SERGEI LEVENDORSKIĬ

ABSTRACT. We suggest new closely related methods for numerical inversion of Z -transform and Wiener-Hopf factorization of functions on the unit circle, based on sinh-deformations of the contours of integration, corresponding changes of variables and the simplified trapezoid rule. As applications, we consider evaluation of high moments of probability distributions and construction of causal filters. Programs in Matlab running on a Mac with moderate characteristics achieves the precision E-14 in several dozen of microseconds and E-11 in several milliseconds, respectively.

KEY WORDS: Z -transform, high order moments, Wiener-Hopf factorization, spectral filtering, conformal acceleration, sinh-acceleration.

MSC2020 CODES: 60-08,42A38,42B10,44A10,65R10,65G51,91G20,91G60

1. INTRODUCTION

The Fourier and Laplace transforms, their discrete analogs and Wiener-Hopf factorization are widely used in various fields of mathematics, natural sciences, engineering, statistics, finance and economics. In many important cases of interest, numerical realizations of the integrals in the formulas for the Fourier/Laplace inversion and Wiener-Hopf factors are far from trivial due to high oscillation and/or slow decay at infinity of the integrands. Additional difficulties arise if the integrands are not smooth as in the formulas for probability distributions in stable Lévy models and transfer functions in causal filtering of highly persistent shocks. In the result, many popular methods, FFT in particular, produce serious errors and/or are extremely time consuming. Examples of typical errors in the context of evaluation of probability distributions and option pricing can be found in [8, 28, 9]. Conformal deformations of the contours of integration alleviate this problem. See, e.g., [33, 23, 30, 3, 5, 1, 36, 34, 35] and the bibliographies therein. After an appropriate contour deformation, very efficient quadratures such as Gauss and Glenshaw-Curtis quadratures are applied. The weights and nodes must be accurately pre-calculated, and the weights can be rather large. To avoid large rounding errors, the integrands must be evaluated very accurately. In a number of situations of interest, the integrands are expressed in terms of special functions or evaluated using the Wiener-Hopf technique, hence, sufficiently accurate evaluation is difficult and time consuming; high precision arithmetic might be needed. Finally, generalizations of the constructions to new integrals and multi-dimensional integrals are far from straightforward.

S.B.: Department of Economics, The University of Texas at Austin, 2225 Speedway Stop C3100, Austin, TX 78712-0301, sboyarch@utexas.edu

S.L.: Calico Science Consulting. Austin, TX. Email address: levendorskii@gmail.com.

In the present paper, we apply the sinh-acceleration and other conformal accelerations to the inverse Z -transform and Wiener-Hopf factorization of functions on the unit circle \mathbb{T} . In different fields of science, two versions of the Z -transform of a series $\{u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ are used: $\tilde{u}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} u_n z^{-n}$ and $\tilde{u}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+} u_n z^n$. We use the latter version in Sect. 2-4, and the former in applications to signal processing in Section 5. Replacing \mathbb{Z}_+ with \mathbb{Z} , one obtains the two-sided Z transform. In examples in Sect. 2-4, we calculate moments of probability distributions, which is a standard tool for identification of the latter (see, e.g., [24, 32, 22, 27]). The key properties that we use are the decay of the moment-generating function in a cone around $(-\infty, 0]$ or around the imaginary axis; the efficiency of the numerical schemes increases with the opening angle of the cone. As it is demonstrated in [9, 14], wide classes of popular distributions enjoy one of these properties. In examples, we use the distributions of KoBoL processes constructed in [7]. If the distribution has atoms, then the sinh-acceleration is not applicable but a different family of conformal maps can be used. In Sect. 5, we consider the Wiener-Hopf factorization of functions on a circle in applications to causal filtering (see, e.g., [19, 21, 31]), and explain how the sinh-deformation of the contour of integration in the formulas for the Wiener-Hopf factors decreases the complexity of the numerical scheme and facilitates the application of efficient inverse Z -transform to the calculation of transfer functions.

The paper is a natural extension of a series of papers [9, 11, 12, 17, 15], where we used simple families of sinh-deformations and the corresponding conformal change of variables, in two versions: $\xi = i\omega_1 + b \sinh(i\omega + y)$ and $z = \sigma_\ell + ib_\ell \sinh(i\omega_\ell + y)$ for the Fourier and Laplace inversion, respectively. In the new variables, the integrands are analytic in strips around the real axis, hence, the simplified trapezoid rule is efficient. In the one-dimensional (1D) case, the rate of convergence of the resulting numerical scheme is worse than the rates of convergence in [29, 36, 34, 35]. However, the sinh-deformation technique is easier to apply to complicated integrals arising in probability and finance, and no precalculation of the nodes and (large) weights is necessary. Typically, it is possible to choose a deformation such that the integrand is not very large, and decays exponentially or faster at infinity. Hence, the discretization and truncation errors are fairly easy to control. The general scheme for the choice of appropriate sinh-deformations, number of steps and step sizes has been successfully applied to the Fourier-Laplace inversions in dimensions 1-5, which is a rather challenging task for the methods that are most efficient in 1D; the integrands are expressed in terms of the Wiener-Hopf factors, and the latter are calculated using the same family of deformations. With respect to some variables, the Gaver-Whynn-Rho algorithm for the Laplace inversion is used. The modification of the same scheme is successfully applied to the evaluation of probability distributions, special functions and pricing exotic options in stable Lévy models in [10, 18]. Instead of the sinh-deformations, appropriate rotations of the axis of integration and exponential changes of variables are used; in some cases such as non-symmetric stable Lévy models of index $\alpha = 1$ or close to 1, additional families of conformal deformations are used.

We remind to the reader basic formulas, error bounds and recommendations for the choice of the number of terms in the trapezoid rule in Sect. 2 (more involved and detailed error bounds and recommendations can be found in [22]). In Sect. 3-4, we construct several versions of the numerical scheme for the inverse Z -transform, introduced in [13]. We produce examples to demonstrate why several versions are needed, and outline additional useful modifications in Sect. 6. The Wiener-Hopf factorization with applications to filtering of highly persistent shocks are in Sect. 5. Sect. 6 concludes.

2. INVERSE Z -TRANSFORM AND TRAPEZOID RULE

Let $u \in l_1(\mathbb{Z})$. Then \tilde{u} is continuous function on \mathbb{T} , and the inverse Z transform is given by

$$(2.1) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{u}(z) z^{-n-1} dz.$$

Fix n , define $h(z) = \tilde{u}(z) z^{-n}$, denote by $I(h)$ the RHS of (2.1), and approximate $I(h)$ by

$$(2.2) \quad T_N(h) = (1/N) \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} h(\zeta_N^k),$$

where $N > 1$ is an integer, and $\zeta_N = \exp(2\pi i/N)$ is the standard primitive N -th root of unity. If h admits analytic continuation to an annulus $\mathcal{D}(a_-, a_+) := \{z \mid a_- < |z| < a_+\}$, where $0 \leq a_- < a_+ \leq +\infty$, the trapezoid rule converges exponentially. See [22] for various versions of the error bounds; we use the simplest one:

Theorem 2.1. *Let h be analytic in $\mathcal{D}_{(1/\rho, \rho)}$, where $\rho > 1$, and let the Hardy norm of h*

$$\|h\|_{\mathcal{D}_{(1/\rho, \rho)}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=1/\rho} |h(z)| \frac{dz}{z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=\rho} |h(z)| \frac{dz}{z}$$

be finite. Then

$$(2.3) \quad |T_N(h) - I(h)| \leq \frac{\rho^{-N}}{1 - \rho^{-N}} \|h\|_{\mathcal{D}_{(1/\rho, \rho)}}.$$

To satisfy a small error tolerance $\epsilon > 0$, it is necessary to choose $N = N(\epsilon, n)$ and $\rho > 1$ so that ρ^{-N} is small, hence, we may use an approximate bound

$$(2.4) \quad |T_N(h) - I(h)| \leq \rho^{-N} \|h\|_{\mathcal{D}_{(1/\rho, \rho)}}.$$

Remark 2.1. (1) If either $1 \geq a_- < a_+$ or $0 \leq a_- < a_+ \leq 1$, then the rescaling $z = rz'$ with an appropriate $r > 1$ and $r \in (0, 1)$, respectively, can be used to reduce to the case $0 \leq a_- < 1 < a_+$.

(2) If either $a_- = 0$ or close to 0 or $a_+ = \infty$ or very large, then the rescaling can be used to reduce to the case when a large ρ can be chosen. However, then, in the case of large n , the Hardy norm is very large. Thus, one is forced to use ρ close to 1.

(3) If analytic continuation to an annulus containing \mathbb{T} is impossible, then only real-analytical error bounds are applicable, and the rate of convergence of the trapezoid rule is very poor.

(4) If $a_+/a_- - 1$ is small, then, after an approximately optimal rescaling, we can reduce to the case $(a_-, a_+) = (1/\rho, \rho)$, where $\rho = \sqrt{a_+/a_-}$ is close to 1: $\rho = e^\delta$, where $0 < \delta \ll 1$. Assume for simplicity that $\|\tilde{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}_{(1/\rho, \rho)}} < \infty$ (if not, one chooses a smaller ρ). Then, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, the RHS of the error bound (2.4) is of the order of $e^{(n-N)\delta}$. Hence, to satisfy a small error tolerance ϵ , one is forced to use a large $N \approx n + (1/\delta)E$, where $E = \ln(1/\epsilon)$. If N is large, then, to avoid rounding errors, it can be necessary to evaluate $\tilde{u}(z)$ with high precision. This is especially time consuming if \tilde{u} is given by complicated expressions in terms of special functions as in [27] where the moments of probability distributions are calculated or evaluated using the Wiener-Hopf factorization technique as in [25, 26, 20, 13] where exotic options are priced. In the latter case, for each value of z used in the trapezoid rule, $\tilde{u}(z)$ is evaluated in terms of double integrals. The integrands are expressed in terms of

the Wiener-Hopf factors, which are expressed in terms of certain integrals. The evaluation of the latter is time-consuming.

In the case of the (one-sided) Z -transform, only $n \geq 0$ need to be considered. In the general case, we assume that $n \geq 0$. The case $n < 0$ reduces to the case $n > 0$ by changing the variable $z \mapsto 1/z$. Assume that \tilde{u} is analytic in the interior of \mathbb{T} , and the interior is the maximal disc of analyticity. Hence, we use (2.1) with integration over $\{z \mid |z| = r\}$, where $r \in (0, 1)$. Changing the variable $z \mapsto rz$ and letting $\tilde{u}_r(z) = \tilde{u}(rz)r^{-n-1}$, we obtain

$$(2.5) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{u}_r(z) z^{-n-1} dz.$$

We take $\rho \in (1, 1/r)$, and apply the bound (2.3) with $h_r(z) = \tilde{u}_r(z)z^{-n}$. The Hardy norm is

$$\|h\|_{\mathcal{D}(r_-, r_+)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=1/\rho} |\tilde{u}_r(z)z^{-n}| \frac{dz}{z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=\rho} |\tilde{u}_r(z)z^{-n}| \frac{dz}{z},$$

where $r_- := r/\rho < r < r_+ := r\rho < 1$. The choice of $r \in (0, 1)$ being arbitrary, we can use arbitrarily large ρ . However, if ρ is large, one has to multiply very small numbers by very large ones, and high precision arithmetic is necessary to avoid large rounding errors.

We make a realistic assumption that one can evaluate the terms in the trapezoid rule sufficiently accurately only if the terms are not too large. We impose the condition on the admissible size of the terms in the form $r^{-n} \leq e^M$. The following approximation $N_{appr} = N_{appr}(\epsilon, n, M)$ to $N = N(\epsilon, n, M)$ in terms of $E = \ln(1/\epsilon)$, n and M ¹ is derived in [16].

Lemma 2.2. *Let there exist $C_0 > c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(2.6) \quad c_0|1 - z|^{-1} \leq |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C_0|1 - z|^{-1}, \quad z \in \mathcal{D}(0, 1),$$

and let $r^{-n} = e^M$, where M is independent of n .

Then, if $n \gg 1$, $\epsilon \ll 1$, $n \gg E \gg \ln n$ and $E \gg \ln M$,

$$(2.7) \quad N(= N(\epsilon, n, M)) \approx N_{appr} := \frac{n}{M}(E + 2M).$$

For moderately large M 's and very large n , N is very large.

3. SINH-ACCELERATION I

3.1. General formulas and bounds. We deform the contour of integration $\{z = e^{i\varphi} \mid -\pi < \varphi < \pi\}$ into a contour of the form $\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} = \chi_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(\mathbb{R})$:

$$(3.1) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}} \tilde{u}(z) z^{-n-1} dz,$$

where $b_\ell > 0$, $\sigma_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega_\ell \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, and the map $\chi_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ is defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \chi_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(y) = \sigma_\ell + ib_\ell \sinh(i\omega_\ell + y).$$

We make the change of variables

$$(3.3) \quad u_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{b_\ell}{2\pi} \chi_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(y)^{-n-1} \cosh(i\omega_\ell + y) \tilde{u}(\chi_{L;\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(y)) dy,$$

¹We write $N(\epsilon, n, M) \approx N_{appr}(\epsilon, n, M)$ if there exist $c, C > 0$ independent of (ϵ, n, M) such that $cN_{appr}(\epsilon, n, M) \leq N(\epsilon, n, M) \leq CN_{appr}(\epsilon, n, M)$.

denote by $f_n(y)$ the integrand on the RHS of (3.3), apply the infinite trapezoid rule

$$(3.4) \quad u_n \approx \zeta_\ell \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} f_n(j\zeta_\ell),$$

and truncate the series replacing $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $\sum_{|j| \leq N}$. If u_n are real, then the number of terms of the simplified trapezoid rule can be decreased almost two-fold. The deformation is possible and a simple error bound is available under certain conditions on the domain of analyticity and rate of decay of $\tilde{u}(z)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. For $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$, denote $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \{\rho e^{i\varphi} \mid |\varphi| < \alpha, \rho > 0\}$.

CONDITION Z-SINH1($a_-, a_+; \alpha$). There exist $0 \leq a_- < 1 \leq a_+$ and $\alpha \in (0, \pi)$ such that

(a) \tilde{u} admits analytic continuation to

$$\mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha) := \mathcal{D}(a_-, a_+) \cup ((a_+ - \mathcal{C}_\alpha) \setminus \{z \mid |z| \leq a_-\});$$

(b) for any $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$ and $\alpha_1 \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$(3.5) \quad |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1)(1 + |z|)^{m_{\tilde{u}}}, \quad z \in \mathcal{U}(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1),$$

where $m_{\tilde{u}}$ depends only on \tilde{u} , and $C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1)$ depends on (r_-, r_+, α_1) .

Theorem 3.1. *Let Condition Z-SINH1($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) hold and $n > m_{\tilde{u}}$. Then*

- (a) *for any $\omega_\ell \in (\pi/2 - \alpha, \pi/2)$, there exist $\sigma_\ell > 0$ and $b_\ell > 0$ such that $b_\ell > \sigma_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell)$, and $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) \in (a_-, a_+)$;*
- (b) *if a triplet $(\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell)$ satisfies the conditions in (a), then the distance from $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ to the origin equals $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell)$, $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} \subset \mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$ and (3.1) is valid;*
- (c) *if $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$, then, for any $\omega_\ell \in (\pi/2 - \alpha, 0]$, $b_\ell > 0$ and $\sigma_\ell \in (a_- + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell), a_+ + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell))$, $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} \subset \mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$ and (3.1) is valid;*
- (d) *in both cases (b) and (c), there exists $d_\ell > 0$ such that the image of the strip $S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)}$ under $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$, and the distance from $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)})$ to the origin equals $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell)$.*

Proof. (a) If $\omega_\ell \leq 0$, we take any $b_\ell \in (0, a_-)$ and $\sigma_\ell \in (a_- + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell), a_+ + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell))$. If $\omega_\ell > 0$, we take any $\sigma_\ell \in (a_- \cos^{-2}(\omega_\ell), a_+ \cos^{-2}(\omega_\ell))$. For $b_\ell^0 = \sigma_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell)$, $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell^0 \sin(\omega_\ell) = \sigma_\ell \cos^2(\omega_\ell) \in (a_-, a_+)$. Hence, $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) \in (a_-, a_+)$ if $b_\ell - b_\ell^0 > 0$ is sufficiently small.

(b,c) If $\omega_\ell > 0$ and $\sigma_\ell < b_\ell / \sin \omega_\ell$, then it is straightforward to prove that

$$(3.6) \quad \text{dist}(0, \mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}) = \sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell),$$

therefore, $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} \cup \mathcal{D}(0, a_-) = \emptyset$, and $\mathcal{D}(0, a_-)$ is to the left of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$. If $\omega_\ell \leq 0$, the region to the right of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ is convex. We note that $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ intersects the real axis at $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) \in (a_-, a_+)$, and we conclude that $\mathcal{D}(0, a_-)$ is to the left of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$.

Next, $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) + e^{i(\pi/2 + \omega_\ell)} \mathbb{R}_+$ is the asymptote of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ in the upper half-plane. The asymptote is below the ray $a_+ + e^{i(\pi - \alpha)} \mathbb{R}_+$ since $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) < a_+$ and $\pi/2 + \omega_\ell > \pi - \alpha$, and the region to the left of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ is convex. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ is to the left of the right boundary of $\mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$. Thus, $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} \subset \mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$, and since $m_{\tilde{u}} - n - 1 < -1$, we can deform the contour $\{z = e^{i\varphi} \mid -\pi < \varphi < \pi\}$, first, into $((-\infty, -1] - i0] \cup \{z = e^{i\varphi} \mid -\pi < \varphi < \pi\} \cup (((-\infty, -1] + i0]$, and then into $\mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$ remaining in $\mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$.

(d) If d_ℓ is sufficiently small in absolute value then $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell \pm d_\ell} \subset \mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$. The proof is the same as for $d_\ell = 0$. We take into account that if $\sigma_\ell < b_\ell / (2 \sin(\omega_\ell))$ and $d_\ell > 0$ is sufficiently small, then $\sigma_\ell < b_\ell / (2 \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell))$ as well. \square

Let $\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell, d_\ell > 0$ and n satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.1. Then f_n admits analytic continuation to the strip $S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)}$ and exponentially decays as $y \rightarrow \infty$ remaining in the strip. It follows that f_n satisfies the conditions of the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2 ([30], Thm.3.2.1). *Let f_n be analytic in the strip $S_{(-d, d)}$,*

$\lim_{R \rightarrow \pm\infty} \int_{-d}^d |f_n(is + R)| ds = 0$, and

$$(3.7) \quad H(f_n, d) := \|f_n\|_{H^1(S_{(-d, d)})} := \lim_{s \downarrow -d} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(is + t)| dt + \lim_{s \uparrow d} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |g(is + t)| dt < \infty.$$

Then the error of the infinite trapezoid rule admits an upper bound

$$(3.8) \quad \left| u_n - \zeta_\ell \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} f_n(j\zeta_\ell) \right| \leq H(f_n, d) \frac{\exp[-2\pi d/\zeta]}{1 - \exp[-2\pi d/\zeta]}.$$

Note that the norm $H(f_n, d)$ is similar but not identical to the Hardy norm of f_n defined on $S_{(-d, d)}$. We will refer to $H(f_n, d)$ as a quasi-Hardy norm (q-Hardy norm).

Once an approximate bound $H_{\text{appr.}}(f_n, d_\ell)$ for $H(f_n, d_\ell)$ is derived, it becomes possible to satisfy the desired error tolerance $\epsilon > 0$ with a good accuracy letting

$$(3.9) \quad \zeta_\ell = \frac{2\pi d_\ell}{\ln(H_{\text{appr.}}(f_n, d_\ell)/\epsilon)}.$$

Since $f_n(y)$ decays as $((b_\ell/2)e^{|y|})^{m_{\tilde{u}}-n}$ as $y \rightarrow \pm\infty$, it is straightforward to choose the truncation of the infinite sum on the RHS of (3.4):

$$(3.10) \quad u_n \approx \zeta_\ell \sum_{|j| \leq N_\ell} f_n(j\zeta_j)$$

to satisfy the given error tolerance. A good approximation to $\Lambda := N_\ell \zeta_\ell$ is

$$(3.11) \quad \Lambda = \Lambda(n - m_{\tilde{u}}, C_{\tilde{u}}, b_\ell, \epsilon) := \frac{1}{n - m_{\tilde{u}}} \ln \frac{C_{\tilde{u}}}{\epsilon} - \ln(b_\ell/2) + \Lambda_0,$$

where $C_{\tilde{u}}$ and $m_{\tilde{u}}$ are from (3.5), and Λ_0 is the length of $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell} \cup \mathcal{D}(0, 1)$. Thus,

$$(3.12) \quad N_\ell \approx (2\pi d_\ell)^{-1} (\ln H_{\text{appr.}}(f_n, d_\ell) + \ln(1/\epsilon)) \Lambda(n - m_{\tilde{u}}, C_{\tilde{u}}, b_\ell, \epsilon).$$

3.2. Parameter choice. The construction of admissible deformation is simple in the case $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$. Fix $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$, and take $\omega_\ell \in (\pi/2 - \alpha, \pi/4)$ and $d_\ell > 0$ such that $0 \leq \omega_\ell - d_\ell < \omega_\ell + d_\ell < \pi/2 - \alpha$. Since the step of the infinite trapezoid rule increases with d_ℓ (provided the q-Hardy norm does not increase too fast), it is approximately optimal to choose ω_ℓ so that the ray $ie^{i\omega_\ell}\mathbb{R}_+$ bisects the angle $e^{i(\pi-\alpha)}\mathbb{R}_+ \cup e^{i3\pi/4}\mathbb{R}_+$. Thus, we set $\omega_\ell = -\pi/2 + 0.5(3\pi/4 + \pi - \alpha) = 3\pi/8 - \alpha/2$, define $d_\ell^0 := 3\pi/4 - (\pi/2 + \omega_\ell) = \alpha/2 - \pi/8$, and set $d_\ell = k_d d_\ell^0$, where $k_d < 1$ is close to 1, e.g., $k_d = 0.9$. Then we find $\sigma_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_\ell > 0$ such that $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell - d_\ell) = r_+$, $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell) = r_-$. The straightforward calculations give

$$(3.13) \quad b_\ell = \frac{r_+ - r_-}{\sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell) - \sin(\omega_\ell - d_\ell)} = \frac{r_+ - r_-}{2 \cos(\omega_\ell) \sin(d_\ell)},$$

$$(3.14) \quad \sigma_\ell = \frac{r_+ \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell) - r_- \sin(\omega_\ell - d_\ell)}{2 \cos(\omega_\ell) \sin(d_\ell)},$$

and $r := \sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell) \in (r_-, r_+)$. Note that we need to choose $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$ so that the distance from the left boundary $\mathcal{L}_{L;\omega_\ell,b_\ell,\omega_\ell+d_\ell}$ to the origin equals $\sigma_\ell - b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell)$. As we have proved in Theorem 3.1, an equivalent condition is $b_\ell > \sigma_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell)$. Hence, the recommendation for the choice of ω_ℓ, d_ℓ needs an adjustment. If $\alpha > \pi/2$, we choose $\omega_\ell = (\alpha - \pi/2)/2$, $d_\ell = -k_d \omega_\ell$. In Examples 3.3 and 3.4 below, we make this simplifying choice to compare the complexities of the trapezoid rule and sinh-acceleration algorithm. If $\omega_\ell + d_\ell \geq 0$, we derive an equivalent condition on r_\pm , ω_ℓ and d_ℓ :

$$(3.15) \quad r_-(1 - \sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell) \sin(\omega_\ell - d_\ell)) < r_+(1 - \sin^2(\omega_\ell + d_\ell))$$

using (3.13)-(3.14). If $a_- = 0$ or sufficiently small, we can choose r_\pm so that (3.15) holds. However, then r_- can be small, but if n is large, it is necessary to choose $r_- < r_+$ very close to 1. Then (3.15) can be satisfied only if $\omega_\ell + d_\ell$ is very small. We use an approximation

$$(3.16) \quad (\omega_\ell + d_\ell)^2 - r_-(\omega_\ell^2 - d_\ell^2) \approx \delta/2,$$

where $\delta = r_+ - r_-$. With a simple choice $d_\ell = 2\omega_\ell/3$, (3.16) gives $\omega_\ell = c\sqrt{\delta}$, where $c = \sqrt{9/48}$. In Example 3.5 below, it is necessary to choose ω_ℓ and $d_\ell > 0$ so that $\omega_\ell - d_\ell > 0$, hence, we use this prescription.

3.3. Examples.


Example 3.3. In Fig. 1 (A), we plot nodes used for the evaluation of the 100-th moment of the distribution of a KoBoL subordinator, with the moment generating function $M(z) = e^{\Psi(z)}$; $\Psi(z) = c\Gamma(-\nu)((\lambda - z)^\nu - \lambda^\nu)$, $c = 0.1, \nu = 0.5, \lambda = 1.01$. Moment $\mu_{100} = 5.32400799771669E - 05$; the difference between values obtained with the two algorithms is smaller than $E - 15$. Solid line: 1101 nodes used in the trapezoid rule. The number is chosen by hand as an approximately minimal number which satisfies the error tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$. Dots: 33 nodes used in the sinh-acceleration, with the parameters $\omega_\ell = -0.7854$, $d_\ell = 0.7069$. Parameters $\sigma_\ell = 0.978291504$ and $b_\ell = 0.021775623$ are calculated using (3.14) and (3.13) with $r_+ = 1, r_- = 0.98$. Step $\zeta_\ell = 0.1187$ is calculated using (3.9) with an approximation $H_{\text{appr.}}(f_n, d_\ell) = r_-^{-n} + 10$. The prescription (3.11) gives unnecessary large Λ , which we decrease by the factor 0.75. CPU times: 146 and 12 microsec. for the trapezoid rule and sinh-acceleration, respectively, the average over 100,000 runs. $\mu_{500} = 8.87234294030321E - 08$ can be calculated with the accuracy better than $E - 15$ using the trapezoid rule with 1801 nodes and sinh-acceleration with 30 nodes; the CPU times are 177 and 12 microsec., respectively, the average over 100,000 runs. ²

Example 3.4. We compare the complexity of the trapezoid rule and sinh-acceleration algorithm in the following more general situation. Assume that $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$, and the following condition similar to (2.6) holds: there exist $C_{\tilde{u}} > 0$ and $m_{\tilde{u}}$ such that

$$(3.17) \quad |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C_{\tilde{u}} |1 - z|^{-1} |z|^{m_{\tilde{u}}}, \quad z \in 1 - \mathcal{C}_\alpha.$$

Note that if n is small or moderate, then the sinh-deformation brings small advantages or none. Hence, we assume that n is large. In this case, the q-Hardy norm is very large unless the interval $[r_-, r_+] := \chi_{L;\sigma_\ell,b_\ell,\omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell,d_\ell)}) \cap \mathbb{R} \subset (0, 1)$ is very close to 1, and $\chi_{L;\sigma_\ell,b_\ell,\omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell,d_\ell)})$ is at the distance r_- from the origin.

²The calculations in the paper were performed in MATLAB R2023b-academic use, on a MacPro Chip Apple M1 Max Pro chip with 10-core CPU, 24-core GPU, 16-core Neural Engine 32GB unified memory, 1TB SSD storage.



(A) Illustration for Example 3.3

(B) Illustration for Examples 3.5 and 4.2

FIGURE 1. (A) Solid line: 1101 nodes used in the trapezoid rule, dots: 33 nodes used in the Z-SINH-I algorithm. (B) Solid line: 901 nodes used in the trapezoid rule. Almost vertical line and dots: 306 and 55 nodes used in the Z-SINH-I and Z-SINH-II algorithm in Examples 3.5 and 4.2, respectively.

ALGORITHM. Let Condition $Z\text{-SINH1}(a_-, a_+; \alpha)$ with $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ and (3.17) hold, and let n be large. Given M and the error tolerance ϵ ,

- (1) choose $M_1 < M$ close to M , e.g., $M_1 = 0.9M$;
- (2) set $r_- = e^{-(M+M_1)/n}$ and $r_+ = e^{-(M-M_1)/n}$;
- (3) define $\omega_\ell = \pi/4 - \alpha/2$ and $d_\ell = k_d(\alpha/2 - \pi/4)$, where $k_d < 1$ is close to 1, e.g., $k_d = 0.9$;
- (4) define (σ_ℓ, b_ℓ) by (3.14), (3.13);
- (5) define step ζ_ℓ and number of terms $N_0 = \Lambda/\zeta_\ell$ by (3.9) and (3.11).

To apply (3.9), we need an efficient approximation to the q-Hardy norm. The q-Hardy norm being an integral one, we may derive an approximate bound working in the z -plane. On the strength of (3.17), $H(f_n, d_\ell)$ admits an approximation

$$H(f_n, d_\ell) \approx \frac{1}{\pi} C_{\bar{u}} (r_+^{-n-1} H(r_+) + r_-^{-n-1} H(r_-)),$$

where

$$H(r_\pm) = \int_0^{+\infty} \left| 1 - r_\pm - t e^{i(\omega_\ell + \pi/2 \mp d_\ell)} \right|^{-1} (1+t)^{-n-1+m_{\bar{u}}} dt.$$

Straightforward calculations show that $H(r_\pm) \sim -2 \ln(1 - r_\pm)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If r_+ is chosen not too close to 1, then $H(f_n, d_\ell) \approx (2/\pi) C_{\bar{u}} e^{M+M_1} n / (M + M_1)$, $\ln H(f_n, d_\ell) \approx 2M + \ln n$, and

$$(3.18) \quad \zeta_\ell \approx \frac{2\pi d_\ell}{E + \ln n + 2M} \approx \frac{k_d \pi (\alpha - \pi/2)}{E + \ln n + 2M}.$$

Assuming that $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ is close to π , we have $\omega_\ell + d_\ell \approx 0$, $\omega_\ell - d_\ell \approx -\pi/2$,

$$b_\ell = \frac{r_+ - r_-}{\sin(\omega_\ell + d_\ell) - \sin(\omega_\ell - d_\ell)} \approx \frac{2M}{n},$$

and (3.11) gives Λ satisfying

$$(3.19) \quad \Lambda \approx C_{\tilde{u}} \frac{E}{n - m_{\tilde{u}}} + \ln n - \ln M,$$

where $C_{\tilde{V}, \gamma}$ is independent of ϵ and n . The number of terms is, approximately,

$$(3.20) \quad N_\ell \approx 2 \frac{E + \ln n + 2M}{k_d \pi^2} \left(C_{\tilde{u}} \frac{E}{n - m_{\tilde{u}}} + \ln(n/M) + \gamma \right).$$

Assume that n is large but not extremely large so that $n \gg m_{\tilde{u}}$, $n \gg E \gg \ln n$, and $E \gg M$. Then we may use the approximation

$$(3.21) \quad N_\ell \approx 2 \frac{(E + 2M) \ln(n/M)}{k_d \pi^2}.$$

Comparing (2.7) with (3.21), we see that the complexity of the trapezoid rule exceeds the complexity of the new numerical realization of the inverse Z -transform by the factor $K \approx (n/M)/\ln(n/M)$. Thus, the sinh-acceleration is more efficient than trapezoid rule if $n \gg M$.

Example 3.5. In Fig. 1 (B), we plot nodes used for the evaluation of the 100-th moment of the distribution of a KoBoL subordinator with positive drift (in Example 3.3, the drift is zero). The moment generating function is $M(z) = e^{\Psi(z)}$; $\Psi(z) = \mu z + c\Gamma(-\nu)((\lambda - z)^\nu - \lambda^\nu)$, $c = 0.1, \nu = 0.5, \lambda = 1.01, \mu = 0.05$. $\mu_{100} = 5.60408317840114E - 05$; the difference between values obtained with the two algorithms is smaller than $E - 15$. Circle: 1101 nodes used in the trapezoid rule. The number is chosen by hand as an approximately minimal number which satisfies the error tolerance $\epsilon = 10^{-15}$. The almost vertical angle: 306 nodes used in the sinh-acceleration. 56 dots are nodes used in the modification of Z-SINH algorithm constructed in the following section - see Example 4.2. Since $\mu > 0$, $M(z)$ decreases as $z \rightarrow \infty$ in the left half-plane but increases as $z \rightarrow \infty$ along any ray in the right half-plane. Hence, we may choose only $\omega_\ell > 0$ and $d_\ell > 0$ so that $\omega_\ell - d_\ell \geq 0$. We use $r_- = 0.98$ and $r_+ = 1$ close to 1, and the approximate recommendations at the end of Section 3.2. Explicitly, $\sigma_\ell = 1.005$, $b_\ell = 0.245$, $\omega_\ell = 0.0612$, $d_\ell = 0.0408$, $\zeta_\ell = 0.0069$ (rounded). The prescription (3.11) gives unnecessary large Λ , which we decrease by the factor 0.8. CPU times: 143 and 87 microsec. for the trapezoid rule and sinh-acceleration, respectively, the average over 100,000 runs.

4. SINH-ACCELERATION II AND III AND LOG-ACCELERATION

4.1. Sinh-acceleration II. If Condition Z-SINH1($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) holds with $\alpha < \pi/2$ and $\pi/2 - \alpha$ is not small, then the construction in Section 3 gives a small d_ℓ , hence, small ζ_ℓ . At the same time, the truncation parameter Λ is not small. Hence, the number of terms N_ℓ is large. We alleviate these difficulties imposing an analog of Condition Z-SINH1($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) in terms of the function $\tilde{v}(w) := \tilde{u}(w^2)$, and modifying the construction of the deformation as follows.

CONDITION Z-SINH2($a_-, a_+; \alpha$). There exist $0 \leq a_- < 1 \leq a_+$ and $\alpha \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ such that

- (a) \tilde{u} admits analytic continuation to $\mathcal{D}(a_-^2, a_+^2)$;
- (b) $\tilde{v}(w)$ admits analytic continuation to $\mathcal{U}^+(a_-, a_+, \alpha) := \{w \in \mathcal{U}(a_-, a_+, \alpha) \mid \operatorname{Re} w \geq 0\}$;

(c) for any $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$ and $\alpha_1 \in (\pi/2, \alpha)$,

$$(4.1) \quad |\tilde{v}(w)| \leq C_{\tilde{v}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1)(1 + |w|)^{2m_{\tilde{v}}}, \quad z \in \mathcal{U}^+(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1),$$

where $m_{\tilde{v}}$ depends only on \tilde{v} , and $C_{\tilde{v}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha_1)$ depends on (r_-, r_+, α_1) .

We change the variable $z = w^2$ in (2.1)

$$(4.2) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{|w|=1, \operatorname{Re} w \geq 0} \tilde{v}(w) w^{-2n-1} dw,$$

and note that $\tilde{v}(-w)(-w)^{-2n-1} = -\tilde{v}(w)w^{-2n-1}$ for $w \in i(-\infty, -1] \cup i[1, +\infty)$. Hence,

$$(4.3) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_0} \tilde{v}(w) w^{-2n-1} dw,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0 = i(-\infty, -1] \cup \{w \mid |w| = 1, \operatorname{Re} w > 0\} \cup i[1, +\infty)$.

The following theorem is a straightforward modification of Theorem 3.1 (c), (d).

Theorem 4.1. *Let Condition Z-SINH2($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) hold and $n > m_{\tilde{v}}$. Then*

(a) *for any $\omega_\ell \in (-\alpha/2, 0]$, there exist $b_\ell > 0$ and $\sigma_\ell \in (a_- + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell), a_+ + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell))$ s.t.*

$$(4.4) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_{L, \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}} \tilde{v}(w) w^{-2n-1} dw;$$

(b) *there exists $d_\ell > 0$ such that $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)}) \subset \mathcal{U}^+(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$.*

The sinh-change of variables, choice of parameters and error bounds are essentially as in Section 3. The differences are: 1) only $\omega_\ell \in (-\alpha/2, 0)$ are inadmissible, and $d_\ell \in (0, \min\{-\omega_\ell, \omega_\ell + \alpha/2\})$; an approximately optimal choice is $\omega_\ell = \pi/4 - \alpha/2$ and $d_\ell = -k_d \omega_\ell$, where $k_d < 1$. Hence, ζ_ℓ cannot be made as large as in Section 3; 2) in an approximation for the q-Hardy norm, $2n$ should be used instead of n , hence, the truncation parameter is smaller, 3) a choice of r_\pm sufficiently close to 1 is determined by $2n$ instead of n (the maximum of $|z|^{-n-1}$ over $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)})$ should be not too large to avoid large rounding errors).

Example 4.2. In Example 3.5, μ_{100} is calculated with the accuracy better than E-15 using Z-SINH-II algorithm with $N_\ell = 55$, the CPU time is 19 microsec., the average over 100,000 runs. See Fig. 1 (B) for illustration.

Example 4.3. The moment generating function is $0.3e^{\mu z} + 0.7M(z)$, where $\mu = 2$ and $M(z)$ is from Example 3.3. $\mu_{100} = 3.72680559839856E-05$ is calculated with the accuracy better than E-15 using the trapezoid rule, Z-SINH-I and Z-SINH-II algorithms with $N = 1101$, $N_\ell = 306$, $N_\ell = 56$, respectively. The CPU times are 183, 109 and 23 microsec., respectively.

In some cases, it is useful or even necessary to make a further change of variables in (4.3),

$$(4.5) \quad u_n = \frac{p}{\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_0^{1/p}} \tilde{v}(w_1^p) w_1^{-2np-1} dw_1,$$

where $p > 1$ and $\mathcal{L}_0^{1/p} := \{w_1 \mid \operatorname{Re} w_1 > 0, w_1^p \in \mathcal{L}_0\}$, and then apply the sinh-acceleration. The following theorem is a straightforward modification of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.4. *Let Condition Z-SINH2($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) hold and $n > m_{\tilde{v}}$. Then*

(a) for any $p > 1$, $\omega_\ell \in ((\pi - \alpha)/(2p) - \pi/2, \pi/(2p) - \pi/2)$, there exist $b_\ell > 0$ and $\sigma_\ell \in ((a_-)^{1/p} + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell), (a_+)^{1/p} + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell))$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad u_n = \frac{p}{\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_{L, \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}} \tilde{v}(w_1^p) w_1^{-2np-1} dw_1;$$

(b) there exists $d_\ell > 0$ such that $\{z^p \mid \operatorname{Re} z > 0, z \in \chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)})\} \subset \mathcal{U}^+(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$.

An approximately optimal choice is $\omega_\ell = (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-)/2$, $d_\ell = k_d(\gamma_+ - \gamma_-)/2$, where $k_d = 0.9$; $r_- < r_+$ are chosen so that $(r_\pm)^p \in (a_-, a_+)$ are close to 1, and (σ_ℓ, b_ℓ) are defined by (3.14), (3.13). In an approximation for the q-Hardy norm, $2np$ should be used instead of n .

4.2. Sinh-acceleration III. Conditions Z-SINH1 and Z-SINH2 are too restrictive if the moments of distributions not on \mathbb{R}_+ but on \mathbb{R} are evaluated. To cover this case, we rewrite (2.1) as

$$(4.7) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=1, \operatorname{Re} z > 0} (\tilde{u}(z) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-z)) z^{-n-1} dz.$$

Assume that \tilde{u} admits analytic continuation to an open domain \mathcal{U} in the right half-plane, containing $i(\mathbb{R} \setminus (-1, 1)) \cup \{z = e^{i\phi} \mid \phi \in (-\pi/2 - \epsilon, -\pi/2 + \epsilon) \cup (\pi/2 - \epsilon, \pi/2 + \epsilon)\}$, where $\epsilon > 0$. For $z \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $(\tilde{u}(-z) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-(-z))) (-z)^{-n-1} = -(\tilde{u}(-z)(-1)^n + \tilde{u}(z)) z^{-n-1}$, therefore, we may rewrite (4.8) as follows

$$(4.8) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_0} (\tilde{u}(z) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-z)) z^{-n-1} dz,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0 = i(-\infty, -1] \cup \{z \mid |z| = 1, \operatorname{Re} z > 0\} \cup i[1, +\infty)$. If the domain of analyticity of \tilde{u} is sufficiently large, we can deform \mathcal{L}_0 into an appropriate sinh-contour $\mathcal{L}_{L, \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$. A sufficient simple condition is the following analog of Condition Z-SINH1($a_-, a_+; \alpha$).

CONDITION Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$). There exist $0 < \gamma \leq \pi/2$, and $0 \leq a_- < 1 \leq a_+$ such that

(a) \tilde{u} admits analytic continuation to

$$\mathcal{U}^{\text{sym}}(a_-, a_+, \gamma) := ((-a_+, a_+) + i(\mathcal{C}_\gamma \cup \{0\} \cup (-\mathcal{C}_\gamma))) \setminus \{z \mid |z| \leq a_-\};$$

(b) for any $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$ and $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$,

$$(4.9) \quad |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \gamma')(1 + |z|)^{m_{\tilde{u}}}, \quad z \in \mathcal{U}^{\text{sym}}(r_-, r_+; \gamma'),$$

where $m_{\tilde{u}}$ depends only on \tilde{u} , and $C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \gamma')$ depends on (r_-, r_+, γ') .

Theorem 4.5. Let Condition Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$) hold and $n > m_{\tilde{v}}$. Then

(a) for any $\omega_\ell \in (-\gamma/2, \gamma/2)$, there exist $b_\ell > 0$ and $\sigma_\ell \in (a_- + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell), a_+ + b_\ell \sin(\omega_\ell))$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad u_n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_{L, \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}} (\tilde{u}(z) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-z)) z^{-n-1} dz;$$

(b) there exists $d_\ell > 0$ such that $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}(S_{(-d_\ell, d_\ell)}) \subset \mathcal{U}^{\text{sym}}(a_-, a_+, \gamma)$.

The choice of parameters and error bounds are essentially as in Section 3. The main difference is that only $\omega_\ell \in (-\gamma, \gamma)$ are admissible, and an approximately optimal choice is $\omega_\ell = 0$ and $d_\ell = k_d \gamma$, where $k_d < 1$ is close to 1.

Example 4.6. Changing the order $\nu = 1.5$ of KoBoL in Example 3.3: $M(z) = e^{\Psi(z)}$; $\Psi(z) = c\Gamma(-\nu)((\lambda - z)^\nu - \lambda^\nu)$, $c = 0.1, \nu = 1.5, \lambda = 1.01$, we obtain a function which does not satisfy Condition Z-SINH1 but satisfies Condition Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$) with $\gamma = (\pi/2) \min\{1 - 1/\nu, 3/\nu - 1\} = \pi/6$ (see [14] for the calculation of the maximal cone of analyticity of $M(z)$, where $M(z)$ is bounded), $m_{\tilde{u}} = 0$, $a_+ = 1.01$, and $a_- = 0$. $\mu_{100} = 3.00859241487316E - 07$; the difference between values obtained with the two algorithms is smaller than $E - 15$. The number of nodes: 1001 and 72, CPU times: 159 and 25 microsec. for the trapezoid rule and sinh-acceleration, respectively, the average over 100,000 runs.

Example 4.7. Let $M(z) = e^{\Psi(z)}$, where $\Psi(z) = \delta(\lambda^\nu - (\lambda^2 - z^2)^{\nu/2})$, $\nu \in (0, 2)$, $\lambda > 1$, $\delta > 0$, be the Laplace exponent of a symmetric Normal Tempered Stable (NTS) process [6]. Then Condition Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$) is satisfied with $\gamma = (\pi/2) \min\{1/\nu, 1\}$, $0 = a_- < a_+ \leq \lambda$. Non-symmetric case is treated similarly but if $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and the drift $\mu \neq 0$ is introduced then Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$) fails.

Remark 4.1. (1) In some cases, it is useful to change the variable $z = w^p$, where $p > 1$:

$$(4.11) \quad u_n = \frac{p}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_0} (\tilde{u}(w^p) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-w^p)) w^{-np-1} dw,$$

and then use a sinh-deformation with $\omega_\ell \in (\gamma_-, \gamma_+)$, where $\gamma_+ = \pi/2(1/p - 1)$, $\gamma_- = \gamma_+ - \gamma/p$. An approximately optimal choice is $\omega_\ell = (\gamma_+ + \gamma_-)/2$, $d_\ell = k_d(\gamma_+ - \gamma_-)/2$.

(2) It may be useful to start with the rotation of the complex plane $z = z'e^{i\varphi}$ in (2.1) so that $\tilde{v}(z') = \tilde{u}(z'e^{i\varphi})$ satisfies Condition Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \gamma$) with a larger γ , and then apply (4.8) or (4.11).

Example 4.8. Let \tilde{u} be a rational function without poles on \mathbb{T} , and let \mathcal{Z} be the set of poles outside \mathbb{T} . We choose $\varphi \in [-\pi, \pi)$ so that the angular distance from $\{e^{i\varphi}, e^{-i\varphi}\}$ to \mathcal{Z} is maximal.

4.3. Log-acceleration. If $\tilde{u}(z)$ is a linear combination of functions satisfying Condition Z-SINH3 with $\alpha > \pi/2$, exponentials functions e^{xz} with $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ (this is the case if \tilde{u} is Z-transform of a measure having atoms or moment generating function of probability distributions of wide classes of Lévy processes of finite variation with non-zero drift) then Condition Z-SINH3($a, b; \gamma_-, \gamma_+$) fails but a weaker form of this condition is satisfied.

CONDITION Z-LOG($a, b; \alpha$). There exist $\alpha > 0$ and $0 \leq a_- < 1 \leq a_+$ such that

(a) $\tilde{u}(z)$ admits analytic continuation to

$$\mathcal{U}^{\log}(a_-, a_+, \alpha) := \{z \mid (a_- < |z| < a_+) \vee (|z| \geq a_+, |\operatorname{Re} z| \leq a_+ + \alpha \ln(1 + |\operatorname{Im} z|))\};$$

(b) for any $a_- < r_- < r_+ < a_+$ and $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$,

$$(4.12) \quad |\tilde{u}(z)| \leq C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha')(1 + |z|)^{m_{\tilde{u}} + m'_{\tilde{u}}\alpha'}, \quad z \in \mathcal{U}^{\log}(r_-, r_+; \alpha'),$$

where $m_{\tilde{u}}, m'_{\tilde{u}}$ depend only on \tilde{u} , and $C_{\tilde{u}}(r_-, r_+; \alpha')$ depends on (r_-, r_+, α') .

We start with the reduction to (4.8), and then, instead of the function $\chi_{L; \sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell}$ defining the sinh-deformation and sinh-change of variables, we use the function

$$(4.13) \quad \chi_{\log; \sigma_\ell, A}(y) = \sigma_\ell + iy \ln(A + y^2),$$

where $A > 1$, and the contour (vertical line) $\mathcal{L}_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A} = \chi_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A}(\mathbb{R})$. Making the change of variables $z = z(y) := \chi_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A}(y)$, we obtain

$$(4.14) \quad u_n = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2\pi} (\tilde{u}(z(y)) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-z(y))) z(y)^{-n-1} \left(\ln(A + y^2) + \frac{2y^2}{A + y^2} \right) dy.$$

Denote by f_n the integrand on the RHS of (4.14). The restrictions on d_ℓ , the half-width of a strip of analyticity of f_n around \mathbb{R} , are $a_- < \sigma_\ell - d_\ell \ln(A - d_\ell^2)$, $\sigma_\ell + d_\ell \ln(A - d_\ell^2) < a_+$, and $\chi_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A}(S_{(-d_\ell,d_\ell)}) \subset \mathcal{U}^{\log}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$. It is easy to see that if R is sufficiently large and $\sigma_\ell + d_\ell \ln(A - d_\ell^2) < a_+$, then $\chi_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A}(S_{(-d_\ell,d_\ell)}) \cap \{z \mid (|z| > R) \vee (|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq 1/R)\} \subset \mathcal{U}^{\log}(a_-, a_+, \alpha) \cap \{z \mid (|z| > R) \vee (|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq 1/R)\}$. The complete verification is rather involved but, evidently, $\chi_{\log;\sigma_\ell,A}(S_{(-d_\ell,d_\ell)}) \subset \mathcal{U}^{\log}(a_-, a_+, \alpha)$ if $d_\ell > 0$ is sufficiently small. We are interested in the case of r_\pm close to 1, therefore, we choose A so that $(A - 1)/(r_+ - r_-) \gg 1$, $\sigma_\ell = (r_+ + r_-)/2$, and find d_ℓ from $\sigma_\ell + d_\ell \ln(A - d_\ell^2) = r_+$. Then, as $r_+ - r_- \rightarrow 0$, $d_\ell \sim (r_+ - r_-)/(2 \ln A)$. Since the discretization error of the infinite trapezoid rule decreases as d_ℓ increases, we choose A close to 1, e.g., $A = 1 + (r_+ - r_-)^{1/4}$. Then d_ℓ is of the order of $(r_+ - r_-)^{3/4}$. The integrand decays as $(y \ln y)^{m_{\tilde{u}}-n} y^{-1}$, therefore, if $n \gg m_{\tilde{u}}$, the truncations parameter Λ is not large. The q-Hardy norm is of the order of r_-^{-n} , as the Hardy norm in the case of the trapezoid rule is, therefore, given the error tolerance, the number of terms of the simplified trapezoid rule is, approximately, $(r_+ - r_-)^{-1/4}$ smaller than the number of terms of the trapezoid rule.

Example 4.9. Let $M(z) = e^{\Psi(z)}$, where $\Psi(z) = \mu z + \delta(\lambda^\nu - (\lambda^2 - z^2)^{\nu/2})$, $\nu \in (0, 1)$, $\lambda > 1$, $\delta > 0$, and $\mu \neq 0$. Then Condition Z-SINH3($a_-, a_+; \alpha$) fails but Z-LOG($a, b; \gamma$) is satisfied with any $\alpha > 0$, $m'_{\tilde{u}} = |\mu|$, $m_{\tilde{u}} = 0$. $\mu_{100} = 6.16741619667409E-05$, the error tolerance smaller than E-15 is achieved using the trapezoid rule and log-acceleration with 900 and 102 nodes, the CPU times are 221 and 47 microsec., respectively, the average over 100,000 runs.

The results are similar for $M(z)$ as in Example 3.5 but with negative drift $\mu < 0$.

Remark 4.2. The map (4.13) and corresponding change of variables is a special case of a more general class of the log-acceleration family of deformations in [8, 10]. In the current setting, it can be advantageous to use contours deformed into the right half-plane.

5. INVERSE Z-TRANSFORM, WIENER-HOPF FACTORIZATION OF FUNCTIONS ON \mathbb{T} , AND CONSTRUCTION OF CAUSAL FILTERS

Consider the problem of calculation of the impulse response $h[n], n = 0, 1, \dots, h[n] \in \mathbb{R}$, of a linear translation invariant filter given the power spectral density $PSD(z)$. For $z \in \mathbb{T}$, $PSD(z) = H(z)H(1/z)$, where $H(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h[n]z^{-n}$ is the transfer function of the filter. In order to apply the results of the preceding sections, we need to impose conditions on $PSD(z)$ which ensure that $\tilde{u}(z) := H(1/z)$ satisfies one of the conditions Z-SINH1 - Z-SINH3 or Z-LOG. We formulate conditions on $PSD(z)$, which allows us to prove that $\tilde{u}(z)$ satisfies Condition Z-SINH3, and apply SINH-III algorithm to calculate the impulse response. The Wiener-Hopf factorization can be done using the trapezoid rule or, more efficiently, the sinh-acceleration.

CONDITION WHF-SINH3($a; \gamma; m_+, m_-$). There exist $0 < \gamma \leq \pi/2$, $a > 1$, $c_\infty > 0$, $m_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$ such that

- (1) $PSD(z) > 0, z \in \mathbb{T}$;

- (2) PSD is analytic in $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) := \mathcal{U}^{\text{sym}}(-a, a, \gamma) \cup \{z \mid 1/z \in \mathcal{U}^{\text{sym}}(-a, a, \gamma)\}$;
(3) for any $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$, $PSD(1/z) = PSD(z)$ and $PSD(z) \notin (-\infty, 0]$;
(4) as $(\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{\pm \operatorname{Re} z > 0\}) \ni z \rightarrow \infty$, $PSD(z)$ admits the representation

$$(5.1) \quad PSD(z) = c_\infty e^{\mp i\pi m_\pm} |z|^{m_+ + m_-} (1 + B_\infty(z)),$$

where $B_\infty(z)$ admits the following bound: for any $1 < r < a$ and $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$,

$$(5.2) \quad |B_\infty(z)| \leq C(r; \gamma') |z|^{-\delta};$$

the constant $C(r; \gamma')$ depends on r, γ' but not on $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{z \mid |z| > 1/r\}$;

- (5) as $(\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{\pm \operatorname{Re} z > 0\}) \ni z \rightarrow 0$, $PSD(z)$ admits the representation

$$(5.3) \quad PSD(z) = c_\infty e^{\mp i\pi m_\pm} |z|^{-(m_+ + m_-)} (1 + B_0(z)),$$

where $B_0(z)$ admits the following bound: for any $1 < r < a$ and $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$,

$$(5.4) \quad |B_0(z)| \leq C(r; \gamma') |z|^\delta;$$

the constant $C(r; \gamma')$ depends on r, γ' but not on $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{z \mid |z| \leq r\}$.

Example 5.1. $PSD(z) = (a_+ - z)^{m_+} (a_+ - 1/z)^{m_+} (a_- + z)^{m_-} (a_- + 1/z)^{m_-}$, where $a_\pm > 0$, satisfies Condition WHF-SINH3($a; \pi/2; m_+, m_-$) with $a = \min\{a_+, a_-\}$, $c_\infty = a^{m_+ + m_-}$ and $\delta = 1$.

5.1. Wiener-Hopf factorization. Conditions (1)-(5) allow us to simplify the standard construction of the Wiener-Hopf factors and derive modifications of the formulas for the Wiener-Hopf factors amenable for efficient calculations. Introduce functions

$$(5.5) \quad A(z) = \frac{a^{m_+ + m_-}}{c_\infty (a - z)^{m_+} (a - 1/z)^{m_+} (a + z)^{m_-} (a + 1/z)^{m_-}} PSD(z),$$

$$(5.6) \quad A_\pm(z) = \exp \left[\pm \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z'|=r_\pm 1} \frac{\ln A(z')}{z - z'} dz' \right],$$

and define constants

$$(5.7) \quad d = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z'|=1} \frac{\ln A(z')}{z'} dz'$$

and $c_\pm = c_\infty^{1/2} a^{-(m_+ + m_-)/2} e^{\pm d/2}$. Then introduce

$$(5.8) \quad H_+(z) = c_+(a - z)^{m_+} (a + z)^{m_-} A_+(z),$$

$$(5.9) \quad H_-(z) = c_-(a - 1/z)^{m_+} (a + 1/z)^{m_-} A_-(z).$$

Let the curves $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}$ and $-\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}$ be subsets of $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{z \mid \operatorname{Re} z \neq 0\}$. On the former curve, the direction is up, on the latter - down. On each of the curves $1/\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\pm, b_\pm, \omega_\pm} = \{z \mid 1/z \in 1/\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\pm, b_\pm, \omega_\pm}\}$ and $-1/\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_\pm, b_\pm, \omega_\pm}$, the direction is anti-clockwise.

Theorem 5.2. (a) A_\pm and H_\pm admit analytic continuation to $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$;

(b) for $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$,

$$(5.10) \quad H_+(z) H_-(z) = PSD(z);$$

(c) for any $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cup \{|z| < a\}$ between $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}$ and $-\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}$,

$$(5.11) \quad \ln A_+(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}} + \int_{-\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}} \right) \frac{\ln A(z') dz'}{z - z'},$$

and for any $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cup \{|z| > 1/a\}$ in the exterior of the union of the regions bounded by $1/\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}$ and $-1/\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}$,

$$(5.12) \quad \ln A_-(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{1/\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}} + \int_{-1/\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}} \right) \frac{\ln A(z') dz'}{z - z'};$$

(d) for $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$, $H_-(1/z) = H_+(z)$;

(e) for any $1 < r < a$, $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$, and $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$,

$$(5.13) \quad A_{\pm}(z) - 1 = O((|z| + 1/|z|)^{-\delta'}), \quad (\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(r, \gamma') \ni) z \rightarrow \{0, \infty\}.$$

Proof. (a) It suffices to consider A_{\pm} . Clearly, A_+ (resp., A_-) is analytic in $\{z \mid |z| < a\}$ (resp., $\{z \mid |z| > 1/a\}$), and since $A(z)$ admits analytic continuation to $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$, we can define analytic continuation of A_- to $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma) \cap \{z \mid |z| \leq 1/a\}$ by $A_-(z) = A(z)/A_+(z)$. Analytic continuation of A_+ is by symmetry.

(b) For any $r \in (1, a)$, the function $A(z)$ is analytic in the closed annulus $\overline{\mathcal{D}(1/r, r)}$, therefore, by the Cauchy integral theorem, for any $z \in \mathcal{D}(1/r, r)$,

$$(5.14) \quad \ln A(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z'|=1/r} \frac{\ln A(z')}{z - z'} dz' + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z'|=r} \frac{\ln A(z')}{z - z'} dz'.$$

Since $r \in (1, a)$ is arbitrary, $A(z) = A_+(z)A_-(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{D}(1/a, a)$. On the strength of (a), $A(z) = A_+(z)A_-(z)$ for $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$, and (5.10) follows.

(c) On the strength of (5.1)-(5.4), for any $r \in (1, a)$, $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$,

$$(5.15) \quad \ln A(z) = O((|z| + 1/|z|)^{-\delta}), \quad (\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(r, \gamma') \ni) z \rightarrow \{0, \infty\}.$$

It follows that we can deform the contour of integration $\{z \mid |z| = a, \operatorname{Re} z > 0\} \cup \{z \mid |z| = a, \operatorname{Re} z < 0\}$ in the formula for $A_+(z)$ into the union of contours $\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}$ and $-\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}$, and obtain (5.11). The proof of (5.12) is by symmetry (use (b)).

(d) We make the changes of variables $z \mapsto 1/z$ and $z' \mapsto 1/z'$ in (5.12). Since $A(1/z') = A(z')$ and $-\frac{1}{(1/z - 1/z')z'^2} = \frac{z}{(z - z')z'} = \frac{1}{z'} + \frac{1}{z - z'}$, we derive

$$\ln A_-(1/z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}} + \int_{-\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}} \right) \frac{\ln A(z') dz'}{z - z'} + d = \ln A_+(z) + d,$$

where

$$(5.16) \quad d = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_+, b_+, \omega_+}} + \int_{-\mathcal{L}_{\sigma_-, b_-, \omega_-}} \right) \frac{\ln A(z') dz'}{z'} = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z'|=1} \frac{\ln A(z')}{z'} dz'.$$

Hence,

$$H_-(1/z) = c_-(a - z)^{m_+}(a + z)^{m_-} e^d A_-(1/z) = c_+(a - z)^{m_+}(a + z)^{m_-} A_+(z) = H_+(z).$$

(e) For $r \in (1, a)$ and $\gamma' \in (0, \gamma)$, we take $\omega_{\pm} \in (-\gamma, -\gamma')$, and then choose σ_{\pm}, b_{\pm} so that the curves $\mathcal{L}_{L; \sigma_{\pm}, b_{\pm}, \omega_{\pm}}$ are subsets of $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(a, \gamma)$ and the right boundary of $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(r, \gamma')$ is to

the left of $\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_{\pm},b_{\pm},\omega_{\pm}}$. Then $\mathcal{U}_{WHF}(r, \gamma')$ is sandwiched between $\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_+,b_+,\omega_+}$ and $-\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_-,b_-,\omega_-}$. Furthermore, since $\omega_{\pm} \in (\gamma', \gamma)$, the integrand in the formula (5.11) is bounded away from 0 by $c(|z| + |z'|)$, where c is independent of $z \in \mathcal{U}_{WHF}(r, \gamma')$ and $z' \in \mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_+,b_+,\omega_+} \cup (-\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_-,b_-,\omega_-})$. Using (5.15), we obtain that for any $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$, the integrand on the RHS of (5.11) admits the bound via $C(1 + |z|)^{-\delta'}(1 + |z'|)^{-1-\delta+\delta'}$, where C is independent of z and z' . Hence, as $z \rightarrow \infty$, $A_+(z) = 1 + O(|z|^{-\delta'})$, and in view of (5.15) and (5.14), $A_-(z) = 1 + O(|z|^{-\delta'})$ as well. By symmetry, $A_{\pm}(z) = 1 + O(|z|^{\delta'})$ as $z \rightarrow 0$. \square

In the next subsection, we use (5.12) with $\sigma_{\pm} = \sigma, b_{\pm} = b, \omega_{\pm} = \omega$. Changing the variable $z' = 1/\chi_{L;\sigma,b,\omega}(y)$ and $z' = -1/\chi_{L;\sigma,b,\omega}(y)$ in the first and second integral, respectively, and letting $\chi(y) = \chi_{L;\sigma,b,\omega}(y)$, we obtain

$$(5.17) \quad \ln A_-(z) = \frac{b}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \cosh(i\omega + y) \left[\frac{\ln A(\chi(y))}{z\chi(y) - 1} - \frac{\ln A(-\chi(y))}{z\chi(y) + 1} \right].$$

5.2. Calculation of the impulse response function. Let a, r, γ and m_{\pm} be as above. For $n \geq 0$

$$h[n] = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=1/r} H_-(z) z^{n-1} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=r} H_+(z) z^{-n-1} dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=r} \frac{PSD(z)}{H_-(z)} z^{-n-1} dz.$$

Set $\tilde{u}(z) = PSD(z)/H_-(z)$, deform the contour above using Z-SINH3 algorithm:

$$(5.18) \quad h[n] = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{L}_{L,\sigma_{\ell},b_{\ell},\omega_{\ell}}} (\tilde{u}(z) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-z)) z^{-n-1} dz.$$

It follows from (5.8)-(5.9) and (5.13) that \tilde{u} satisfies Condition Z-SINH3($1/a, a, \gamma$) with $m_{\tilde{u}} = m := m_+ + m_-$, hence, if $n > m$, the deformation is justified. We change the variable $z = \chi(y) := \chi_{L,\sigma_{\ell},b_{\ell},\omega_{\ell}}(y)$:

$$(5.19) \quad h[n] = \frac{b_{\ell}}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \cosh(i\omega + y) (\tilde{u}(\chi(y)) + (-1)^n \tilde{u}(-\chi(y))) \chi(y)^{-n-1},$$

and apply the simplified trapezoid rule:

$$(5.20) \quad h[n] \approx \frac{b_{\ell}}{2\pi} \sum_{|j| \leq N} \cosh(i\omega + j\zeta) (\tilde{u}(\chi(j\zeta)) \chi(j\zeta)^{-n-1} + \tilde{u}(-\chi(j\zeta)) (-1)^n \chi(j\zeta)^{-n-1}).$$

The parameters of the simplified trapezoid rule are chosen as in Section 4.2.

To calculate $\tilde{u}(\pm z)$, we need to evaluate d and $A_-(z)$ for $z = \pm \chi(j\zeta)$, $|j| \leq N_{\ell}$. The RHS in the formula (5.7) for d can be calculated using the trapezoid rule but if the annulus of analyticity is narrow: $a - 1 \ll 1$, then it is advantageous to use (5.16) and the sinh-acceleration

$$(5.21) \quad d = -\frac{b_{\ell}}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dy \cosh(i\omega + y) \frac{\ln(A(\chi(y))A(\chi(-y)))}{\chi(y)}.$$

To evaluate $A_-(z)$, we can use either (5.6) and the trapezoid rule or (5.12), sinh-changes of variables and the simplified trapezoid rule. The simplest choice of the deformations in (5.12) is to use the same parameter sets $(\sigma, b, \omega) = (\sigma_{\pm}, b_{\pm}, \omega_{\pm}) = (\sigma_{\ell}, b_{\ell}, \omega_{\ell})$. In order that $\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_{\ell},b_{\ell},\omega_{\ell}} \cap (1/\mathcal{L}_{L;\sigma_{\ell},b_{\ell},\omega_{\ell}}) = \emptyset$, we set $\omega = -\gamma/2, d_{\ell} = k_d \gamma/2$ and choose σ_{ℓ}, b_{ℓ} so that $1 \leq \sigma_{\ell} - b_{\ell}(\omega_{\ell} + d_{\ell}) < a$. We set $r_- = 1$, take $r_+ \in (1, a)$, and use the prescription (3.13)-(3.14)

to choose b_ℓ and σ_ℓ . Applying the simplified trapezoid rule to (5.17) we can use the same ζ as in (5.20). However, if $n - m$ is large, it is necessary to use longer grids to satisfy the same error tolerance. The reason is that $S_1(y) := \cosh(i\omega + y)/(2\chi(y)) \rightarrow 1/2$ as $y \rightarrow \pm\infty$, hence, bounded away from 0, and

$$S_2(y, z) := \ln A(\chi(y))/(z\chi(y) - 1) - \ln A(-\chi(y))/(z\chi(y) + 1) = O(|z|^{-1}e^{-|y|(\delta'+1)})$$

as $|z| + |y| \rightarrow \infty$, where $\delta' \in (0, 1)$ can be chosen close (but not very close) to 1. Hence, the truncation parameter must be chosen using $1 + \delta'$ instead of $n - m$, and the resulting N^1 is larger than N . The absolute error of the evaluation of $\ln A_-(z)$ translates into the relative error of $h[n]$, therefore, if $h[n]$ is small, then in (5.17), a larger step and smaller number of terms can be used. Thus, we use

$$(5.22) \quad \ln A_-(z) \approx \frac{\zeta^1}{2\pi} \sum_{-N^1 \leq j \leq N^1} S_1(j\zeta^1) S_2(j\zeta^1, z).$$

5.3. Algorithm. Let PSD satisfy Condition WHF-SINH3($a; \gamma; m$) with $a > 1$, $\gamma \in (0, \pi/2)$, $m_\pm \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c_\infty > 0$. Given ϵ and a finite subset $\vec{n} := [n_-, n_- + 1, n_- + 2, \dots, n_+]$, where $n_- > m := m_+ + m_-$, the array $\vec{h} = [h[n_- + j - 1]]_{j=1}^{n_+ - n_- + 1}$ is calculated as follows.

- I. Choose parameters $\sigma_\ell, b_\ell, \omega_\ell$ of the sinh-deformation.
- II. Choose parameters ζ, N and ζ^1, N^1 for the simplifying trapezoid rule in the inverse Z-SINH formula for $h[n]$ and the Wiener-Hopf factor A_- . For the former case, use $n = n_+$ to derive a bound for the Hardy norm and $n = n_-$ to find the truncation parameter.
- III. Set $\vec{y} = \zeta * (-N : 1 : N)$, $\chi = \sigma + i * b * \sinh(i * \omega + \vec{y})$, $\vec{\text{der}} = b * \cosh(i * \omega + \vec{y})$, $\vec{y}^1 = \zeta^1 * (-N^1 : 1 : N^1)$, $\chi^1 = \sigma^1 + i * b^1 * \sinh(i * \omega^1 + \vec{y}^1)$, $\vec{\text{der}}^1 = b * \cosh(i * \omega + \vec{y}^1)$.
- IV. Set $\kappa = a^{m_+ + m_-}/c_\infty$, $PSD^\pm = PSD(\pm\chi)$, $PSD^{\pm,1} = PSD(\pm\chi^1)$,
$$A^\pm = \kappa * (a \mp \chi)^{-m_+} * (a \mp 1/\chi)^{-m_+} * (a \pm \chi)^{-m_-} * (a \pm 1/\chi)^{-m_-} * PSD^\pm,$$

$$A^{\pm,1} = \kappa * (a \mp \chi^1)^{-m_+} * (a \mp 1/\chi^1)^{-m_+} * (a \pm \chi^1)^{-m_-} * (a \pm 1/\chi^1)^{-m_-} * PSD^{\pm,1}.$$
- V. Calculate d applying the trapezoid rule to (5.7) or simplified trapezoid rule to (5.21)

$$d = -(\zeta^1/2/\pi) * \text{sum}(\log(A^+ * A^-) * \vec{\text{der}}^1/\chi^1).$$

- VI. Calculate $A_-^\pm := A_-(\pm\chi)$:

$$\begin{aligned} S0 &= \text{conj}(\chi^1)' * \chi, \quad FR^\pm = 1./(S0 \pm 1); \\ A_-^+ &= \exp[(\zeta^1/(2 * \pi)) * ((\vec{\text{der}}^1 * \log(A^{+,1}) * FR^- - (\vec{\text{der}}^1 * \log(A^{-,1})) * FR^+)], \\ A_-^- &= \exp[(\zeta^1/(2 * \pi)) * ((\vec{\text{der}}^1 * \log(A^{-,1}) * FR^- - (\vec{\text{der}}^1 * \log(A^{+,1})) * FR^+)]. \end{aligned}$$

- VII. Calculate $\tilde{u}^\pm := \tilde{u}(\pm\chi)$:

$$\tilde{u}^\pm = e^{d/2} c_\infty^{-1/2} * a^{m/2} PSD^\pm ./ A_-^\pm * (a \mp 1/\chi)^{-m_+} * (a \pm 1/\chi)^{-m_-}.$$

- VIII. Calculate $h = [h[\vec{n}]]$:

$$\begin{aligned} Znp &= \text{conj}(\chi)' .^{-\vec{n}-1}, \quad Znm = \text{conj}(-\chi)' .^{-\vec{n}-1}; \\ h &= (\zeta/(2 * \pi)) * ((\vec{\text{der}} * \tilde{u}^+) * Znp - (\vec{\text{der}} * \tilde{u}^-) * Znm). \end{aligned}$$

Example 5.3. Let $PSD(z) = H(z)H(1/z)$, where $H(z) = (a_+ - 1/z)^{m_+}(a_- + 1/z)^{m_-}$, and $a_+ = 1.0001, a_- = 1.00015, m_+ = 3$, and $m_- = -1$. The impulse response function decays very slowly. We evaluate $h[n]$ for $n \in [100, 400]$ using the explicit formula for $H(z)$ and the trapezoid rule with $N = 800,001$ terms. The maximal relative error is $8.21\text{E-}15$; if we take larger numbers of terms, the accuracy decreases due to the rounding errors. With $N = 80,001$, the maximal relative error is $8.15\text{E-}06$. The algorithm in this section with $N = 172$ and $N^1 = 237$ achieves accuracy $4.55\text{E-}15$; the CPU time for the evaluation of all $h[n]$, $n \in [100, 400]$, is 13.4 msec., the average over $10,000$ runs.

If we use the Wiener-Hopf factorization and trapezoid rule to recover $H(z)$ and then apply the trapezoid rule, then the accuracy of the trapezoid rule significantly decreases.

Example 5.4. In Example 5.3, $H(z)$ has only one singularity outside the unit disc, and the performance of the trapezoid rule and method of the paper can be significantly improved making appropriate changes of the variable. If we let $m_{\pm} = -1$, then $H(z)$ has poles at $z = \pm 1$, and the analytic properties of the integrand are worse. In the result, the maximal relative error of the trapezoid rule with $N = 80,001$ terms is only 0.067 , and with $N = 800,001$ terms - $8.01\text{E-}11$. The method of this section, with the same parameters of the numerical scheme as in Example 5.3, achieves the relative accuracy $1.97\text{E-}11$ in 13.1 msec.

Example 5.5. In Example 5.4, we take $a_+ = 1.00001$ and $a_- = 1.000015$; the impulse response function decays extremely slowly, and the annulus of analyticity is very narrow. The trapezoid rule with $N = 800,001$ that uses the explicit formula for $H(z)$, produces the maximal relative error 0.67 . The method of this section with $N = 575$ and $N^1 = 626$, achieves the relative accuracy $4.08\text{E-}10$ in 26.4 msec.

6. CONCLUSION

In the paper, we applied the conformal deformations technique and simplified trapezoid rule to construct efficient versions of the inverse Z -transform and Wiener-Hopf factorization of functions on the unit circle. With one exception (LOG-acceleration), we used the sinh-acceleration, which is the most efficient if the integrand $f(z)$ in the inverse Z -transform formula decays as $z \rightarrow \infty$ in a symmetric sector with a not very small opening angle. If the angle is very small, then, after the sinh-change of variables is made, the strip of analyticity of the new integrand is too narrow, and the step in the infinite trapezoid rule must be very small to satisfy even moderately small error tolerance. Hence, the number of terms is very large. In these cases, a seemingly less efficient family of fractional-parabolic deformations is more efficient. The changes of variables are of the form $\chi_{P;\sigma,b,\beta,p}^+ = (\sigma + b(1 + iy)^\beta)^p$, where $\sigma > -b$, and $\chi_{P;\sigma,b,\beta,p}^- = (\sigma - b(1 - iy)^\beta)^p$, where $\sigma > b$. In some cases, the sub-polynomial deformations more general than (4.13) are necessary. See [10] for application of different families of conformal deformations to evaluation of stable Lévy distributions. As applications, we considered evaluation of high moments of probability distributions and impulse response functions given the power spectral density. In the latter case, we had to design an efficient numerical algorithm for the calculation of the Wiener-Hopf factors. Numerical examples demonstrate that if the impulse response function decays slowly at infinity, equivalently, the annulus of analyticity of the power spectral density is very narrow (the shocks are persistent), then the trapezoid rule is inefficient. The method of the paper admits the straightforward modification to the case when

the open annulus of analyticity does not exist, and the impulse response function decays slower than exponentially. In the definitions and constructions of the paper, it is possible to pass to the limit as the annulus shrinks into a circle. The sinh-deformed curves degenerate into angles, and on each ray, an exponential change of the variables is made, similarly to [10, 12]. The new variations of the inverse Z -transform suggested in the paper can be also used in situations where the first version of sinh-acceleration was applied. Namely, in [13, 16], we considered the evaluation of large powers of bounded operators, solution of boundary problems for difference-integro-differential equations and evaluation of lookback and barrier options with the discrete monitoring. In the latter case, it is necessary that the deformations of the lines of integration in the formulas for the Wiener-Hopf factors for random walks and in the formula for the inverse Z -transform be in a certain agreement.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. ABATE AND P. VALKO, *Multi-precision Laplace inversion*, International Journal of Numerical Methods in Engineering, 60 (2004), pp. 979–993.
- [2] J. ABATE AND W. WHITT, *The Fourier-series method for inverting transforms of probability distributions*, Queueing Systems, 10 (1992), pp. 5–88.
- [3] J. ABATE AND W. WHITT, *Numerical inversion of of probability generating functions*, Operation Research Letters, 12 (1992), pp. 245–251.
- [4] J. ABATE AND W. WHITT, *Numerical inversion of Laplace transforms of probability distributions*, ORSA Journal on Computing, 7 (1995), pp. 36–43.
- [5] J. ABATE AND W. WHITT, *A unified framework for numerically inverting Laplace transforms*, INFORMS Journal on Computing, 18 (2006), pp. 408–421.
- [6] O. BARNDORFF-NIELSEN AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Feller Processes of Normal Inverse Gaussian type*, Quantitative Finance, 1 (2001), pp. 318–331.
- [7] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Option pricing for truncated Lévy processes*, International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance, 3 (2000), pp. 549–552.
- [8] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient variations of Fourier transform in applications to option pricing*, Journal of Computational Finance, 18 (2014), pp. 57–90. Available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1673034>.
- [9] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Sinh-acceleration: Efficient evaluation of probability distributions, option pricing, and Monte-Carlo simulations*, International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance, 22 (2019), pp. 1950–011. DOI: 10.1142/S0219024919500110. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3129881> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3129881>.
- [10] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Conformal accelerations method and efficient evaluation of stable distributions*, Acta Applicandae Mathematicae, 169 (2020), pp. 711–765. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3206696> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3206696>.
- [11] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Static and semi-static hedging as contrarian or conformist bets*, Mathematical Finance, 3 (2020), pp. 921–960. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3329694> or <http://arXiv.org/abs/1902.02854>.
- [12] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient evaluation of expectations of functions of a stable Lévy process and its extremum*. Working paper, September 2022. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=4229032> or <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.12349>.
- [13] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient inverse Z -transform and pricing barrier and lookback options with discrete monitoring*. Working paper, July 2022. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4155587> or <https://arXiv.org/abs/2207.02858>.
- [14] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Lévy models amenable to efficient calculations*. Working paper, June 2022. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4116959> or <http://arXiv.org/abs/2207.02359>.

- [15] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient evaluation of joint pdf of a Lévy process, its extremum, and hitting time of the extremum*. Working paper, December 2023. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=4656492> or <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.05222>.
- [16] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient inverse Z-transform: sufficient conditions*. Working paper, May 2023. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=4451666> or <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10725>.
- [17] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient evaluation of double barrier options*, International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance, – (2024), pp. –. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=4262396> or <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.07765>.
- [18] S. BOYARCHENKO AND S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Efficient evaluation of expectations of functions of a Lévy process and its extremum*, Finance and Stochastics, (2024). To appear. Working paper version is available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4140462> or <http://arXiv.org/abs/2209.02793>.
- [19] R. BROWNS AND P. HWANG, *Introduction to Random Signals and Applied Kalman Filtering*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 3d ed., 1996.
- [20] A. CERNY AND I. KYRIAKOU, *An improved convolution algorithm for discretely sampled Asian options*, Quantitative Finance, 11 (2011), pp. 381–389.
- [21] C. GASQUET AND P. WITOMSKI, *Fourier Analysis and applications: filtering, numerical computation, wavelets*, Springer, New York, 1998.
- [22] G. CHOUDHURY AND D. LUCANTONI, *Numerical computation of the moments of a probability distribution from its transform*, Operations Research, 44 (1996), pp. 368–381.
- [23] M. FEDORYUK, *Asymptotic: Integrals and Series*, Nauka, Moscow, 1987. In Russian.
- [24] W. FELLER, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol II*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY, 1970.
- [25] G. FUSAI, I. ABRAHAMS, AND C. SGARRA, *An exact analytical solution for discrete barrier options*, Finance and Stochastics, 10 (2006), pp. 1–26.
- [26] G. FUSAI, G. GERMANO, AND D. MARAZZINA, *Spitzer identity, Wiener-Hopf factorization and pricing of discretely monitored exotic options*, European Journal of Operational Research, 251 (2016), pp. 124–134. DOI:10.1016/j.ejor.2015.11.027.
- [27] I. KYRIAKOU AND R. B. ABD G. FUSAI, *Unified Moment-Based Modeling of Integrated Stochastic Processes*, Operations Research, – (2023), pp. –. doi:10.1287/opre.2022.2422.
- [28] S. LEVENDORSKIĬ, *Pitfalls of the Fourier Transform method in Affine Models, and remedies*, Applied Mathematical Finance, 23 (2016), pp. 81–134. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1350486X.2016.1159918> or <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2367547>.
- [29] T. SCHMELZER AND L. N. TREFETHEN, *Computing the Gamma function using contour integrals and rational approximations*, SIAM J Numer. Anal., 42 (2007), pp. 558–571.
- [30] F. STENGER, *Numerical Methods based on Sinc and Analytic functions*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
- [31] P. STOICA AND R. MOSES, *Spectral Analysis of Signals*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2005.
- [32] J. STOYANOV, *Counterexamples in Probability*, Dover Publications, New York, 3rd ed., 2013.
- [33] A. TALBOT, *The accurate inversion of Laplace transforms*, J.Inst.Math.Appl., 23 (1979), pp. 97–120.
- [34] L. N. TREFETHEN AND J. A. C. WEIDEMAN, *Parabolic and hyperbolic contours for computing the Bromwich integral*, Mathematics of Computation, 76 (2007), pp. 1341–1356.
- [35] L. N. TREFETHEN AND J. A. C. WEIDEMAN, *The exponentially convergent trapezoidal rule*, SIAM Review, 56 (2014), pp. 385–458.
- [36] L. N. TREFETHEN, J. A. C. WEIDEMAN, AND T. SCHMELZER, *Talbot quadratures and rational approximations*, BIT Numerical Mathematics, 46 (2006), pp. 653–670.